# OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

# DEBATES

OF THE

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

## DOMINION OF CANADA

---

## FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

---

## 7-8 EDWARD VII., 1907-8

---

### VOL. LXXXIV

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

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1907-8

# House of Commons Debates

## FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 2, 1908.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

LANDS TITLES ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 113) to amend the Land Titles Act. He said : This Bili is intended to provide for the holding of land by the ecclesiastical authorities of the various churches in territories under the immediate jurisdiction of the Dominion government with regard to land.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ASH WEDNESDAY ADJOURNMENT.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I gave notice last week that on Friday of that week I would move that when this House adjourns on Tuesday next it stands adjourned until Thursday, March 5. Unfortunately, on Friday,the House was otherwise engaged, and I could not move my motion. I will move it to-morrow.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. TALBOT, M.P.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse.) Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. There is a two column editorial article in this morning's 'Citizen' to which I take very strong exception. One paragraph to which I call particular attention is as follows :—

Another feature of this remarkable session demands comment. It was noticeable that most of Hon. Mr. Brodeur's colleagues in the cabinet, with the exception of Hon. Mr. Bureau, maintained a discreet silence, or afforded him but little assistance, in the three days' struggle. With the exception of the ministers told off in relays to 'lead the House,' the others came and went with an ostentatiously detached air, and, except during the regular hours of session the Minister of Marine was only supported by a small but faithful guard of his Quebec colleagues. On several occasions they came to his assistance with vehement charges that the hon. gentleman was being 'persecuted' by the opposition because he was a French-Canadian. Anything more absurd in the face of the facts could not be conceived, and this invocation of the race cry took on all the semblance of a threat. Invoked under such unreasonable conditions, it suggested the attitude that a French-Canadian in public life can do no wrong, and that to attempt to hold a minister from that province accountable, no matter what the circumstances might be, was resented as a reflection upon French Canada.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. O. E. Talbot) must remember that a question of privilege refers to himself personally.

Mr. TALBOT. Where I am personally interested is in that I consider myself alluded to in the expression 'small but faithful guard of his Quebec colleagues.' I resent the way the article is written, and, with your kind permission, I will finish it, for there is only one further sentence :

It is only fair to the French Canadian members to say that this ill-advised attitude was only assumed by a minority of Liberal members from that province, headed by Hon. Mr. Bureau.

As I was one of those who thought, and still think, that I was performing my duty as a representative of the province of Quebec, and also as a representative of Canada, I resent this paragraph as meaning that this was an organized affair amongst us, to make a political cry of it, meaning that persecution was directed against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) because he is a French Canadian. I am satisfied that if the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), probably——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member must confine his remarks to himself personally.

Mr. TALBOT. I take it to myself personally, and I repeat that, so long as this sort of obstruction goes on, I shall stand by the Minister——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Talbot) is out of order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Order.

Mr. TALBOT. In so doing I will be fulfilling my duty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think this is not a question of privilege.

Mr. TALBOT. This article is only important as showing the unworthy attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite.

## BOOK-KEEPING IN DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—RETURN.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) laid upon the table copies of order in council and papers in connection with the revised system of book-keeping in the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

He said: I may add that there is a very voluminous final report of the 6th of September, 1907, which we have had no time to copy, therefore I lay the original on the table.

## INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the minister if he will also lay on the table the second order of the House with reference to his travelling expenses? I want also to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that in the correspondence on the cold storage an important letter has escaped his notice, a letter from Mr. Harry McKeown, of the city of St. John, to the Minister of Agriculture with reference to the application of Williams and the opposition it met with from certain parties. That letter was written to the Minister of Agriculture, but it is not included in the return.

Mr. FISHER. I have no memory of the letter. I had my officers look two or three times over the papers in consequence of the hon. gentleman's remarks about other letters. They looked over my department and my own office, and they assure me that there is absolutely nothing there but what has been brought down. But now that the hon. gentleman mentions this letter I will have a special search made.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I desire to say to the Minister of the Interior that I would like him to hurry up the return that I am awaiting for regarding immigration.

Mr. OLIVER. I expected to lay the return on the table to-day. I am sure it will be here to-morrow.

## GRAIN COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. LAKE. I would ask the government whether the evidence which was taken before the Royal Grain Commission has been printed, and if not, whether it will be?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot answer my hon. friend, but I will make inquiries. That evidence was taken under the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

## HAMILTON RADIAL ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 25) respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Mr. SPROULE. I have a telegram in my hand from the member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) who desired to be present when this Bill was being further considered. He expected to be present this morning, but owing to the train being snowbound he could not get here. He wants the Bill held over.

Mr. CLARKE. Does he not say for the third reading?

Mr. SPROULE. He says: 'Hold the Bill over, certainly for the third reading.'

Mr. CLARKE. I received a similar telegram from him. He spoke to me about it on Saturday night before leaving, as it had been suggested to him then that it should be held over until another day, but for another reason. He said 'after the way we had been knocked about with this Bill he did not have the conscience to ask that it be held over beyond to-day.' It is understood that it shall go on. He told me of certain amendments, of which notice had been given in the Votes and Proceedings, that he wished to move. I would suggest that we go on with the work in committee and that the third reading be not taken until he can move his amendments. The Railway Committee has discussed very fully the whole Bill, and it does not seem to me there is any reason why we should postpone the committee stage.

Mr. SPROULE. There is the additional reason, that the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is unavoidably absent and he would like very much to be here, though he did not feel like asking that the Bill be postponed on account of his absence.

Mr. FOSTER. There has been a great deal of discussion, both in the committee

and in the House, on this Bill. I would not like to ask anything unreasonable in the way of postponment; at the same time we all know what a great interest the hon. member for South Toronto has taken in this Bill. He gave up some very important engagements in Toronto in order to come up last night and be here to-day. He consulted with me before he left. If the chairman could see his way clear to postpone it for another day, I think I can assure him that there will be no undue delay in pressing it through. There is no obstruction so far as I know in reference to this Bill. Certain parties have taken very strong grounds on it and have felt obliged to push their reasons so far as they could. On behalf of the hon. member for South Toronto, I would very much like if the Bill could be held over until another day.

Mr. CLARKE. So far as I am concerned I would be glad to accommodate the hon. gentleman. But I have also put off engagements at different times in consequence of this Bill and I have matters now which may take me away at any day, and when it comes up again I may be away. I know that the member for South Toronto would be satisfied if we reserved the Bill for the third reading, when he can be here and move his amendments.

MR. GRAHAM. I got the same telegram from the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) and I want to meet every person's wishes. He suggested in the telegram and I think that what he really expects is that we shall not, at least, proceed with the third reading. He has an amendment which he wishes to move, he wishes to offer some reasons for this amendment and I do not want to deprive him or anybody else of the fullest opportunity of doing so. It would meet the suggestion which is implied in the telegram if we deferred the third reading. I am inclined to think that it would be better for the discussion to take place on the third reading than in committee, for he will then have an opportunity of dividing the House.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister is somewhat of a mind reader.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) and my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) desired to offer their amendments in Committee of the Whole so that they would be entitled, in the event of opposition, to speak more than once on them and state their views. It is their desire to move these amendments and to discuss them, not with the intention of unnecessarily delaying the passage of the Bill, because they have both reached the conclusion that the Bill is going to pass, but to place themselves on record, and I think it would be better to move these amendments in committee than to do it on the third reading.

Mr. PATERSON. I notice that in one of the leading papers, with reference to the French treaty, it is said that the government were not ready with their business. That is rather a reflection. I understand the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has been anxious to put that Bill through and if I remember aright the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked that it might stand over on his account and it has stood over. I think that the hon. member for North Toronto, if that is so, should rise and say that he was sorry to see such an article in the newspapers when it was such an unjust reflection upon the government and when the delay was absolutely due to himself. Such a wrong impression should not be allowed to go through the country.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) is too sweet altogether. The government must always be large enough to take these criticisms from the newspapers, but I think that if I asked that it be left over it was because there was some deficiency in the information—was there not ?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FIELDING. The papers are loaded down with information.

Mr. FOSTER. 'Loaded down,' in the mind of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and in my own mind, as regards information, are two different things. I think that what my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) really wishes is that the discussion in committee be left over, but if the government and my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) who has charge of the Bill do not think that they can stretch a point, or if they do not think that the full measure of generosity should be given, why, half a bite is better than none and I think that my hon. friends may take the third reading as being the minimum of what he would like, although he is such a lovable member that I should think that possibly he would be willing to meet his desire.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is not a matter with which the government has anything to do. This is the third Monday that this Bill has been on the Order Paper. It has been put off twice already.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the government has it in its own hands, of course.

Mr. HENDERSON. Last Monday, when this Bill was before the committee, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) made a statement in regard to an amendment which I had proposed with the view of securing the enforcement of clause 10 of the Bill intended to protect municipal

rights, I have been wondering what he had in his mind. He told me that he thought that a Bill which he was going to introduce would accomplish the same purpose and perhaps in a better way. That is something like the language he employed. I have been waiting anxiously to learn just whether the measure which the hon. minister proposes would really accomplish what I want to accomplish. I wonder if he to-day can give us some more definite statement of what that Bill will contain so that I need not necessarily wait until the third reading to ascertain just whether the municipalities in which I am chiefly concerned are sufficiently protected without my moving the amendment again on the third reading which I proposed in committee. There is this point too and I assume that the government would give us some guarantee by which we could get over the difficulty, assuming that the Bill would go through committee without any amendment—and there is no amendment so far submitted—the Speaker would be in the chair on the third reading and he might take the technical objection to an amendment that there had been no change in committee. I think it is the ordinary practice that unless a Bill had been amended in committee we would have no opportunity to move an amendment on the third reading even if we had given notice. We do not know just what the Speaker would do, and although this Bill may be allowed to stand over for a third reading at some future time we must have some assurance that the technical point will not be taken against an amendment which might be moved on the third reading.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Go on with the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Sections 1, 2 and 13 stood.

On section 13,

The company shall not sell, dispose of, or distribute electric power or energy within, or for use within, the limits of any city which owns and operates its own electric lighting or power plant without the consent of the council of such city.

Mr. SPROULE moved :

That section 13 be amended by inserting after the word 'consent' in the thirteenth line the words 'expressed by by-law.'

Where such consent is given it ought to be given by by-law.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think there is any objection to that.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. That is a very important clause. It is well known that the Ontario government have inaugurated a power policy and many of these towns and cities on the route of this railway have already passed by-laws and are prepared to enter into arrangements with the Ontario government for supplying power. This clause may conflict with that policy, and if this clause is to apply only to municipalities already operating their own plants, it may happen that a town or village installing a plant say in five years' time, will be excluded from its protection. For instance, the city of Brantford is to-day paying great attention to the power question. We have a local company there and the city may, in the near future, decide to establish a municipal plant and why should it be subjected to this competition because it was not fortunate enough to be in the field as early as some other municipalities ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think it would be ; I think that the clause would apply say if Brantford established a plant next year and the following year this company undertook to supply electricity in that city. Brantford would then come under this clause.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would move that where the word 'city' occurs in lines 13 and 14, the word 'municipality' should be substituted.

Amendment to the amendment agreed to.

Mr. HENDERSON. When I spoke before I had reference only to clause 11 of the Bill ; I simply wanted to make sure of an opportunity to move my amendment to clause 11. The difficulty, as I understand, has now been overcome as a change in the Bill has been made in the Committee of the Whole House and therefore any amendment can be moved on the third reading, after notice, and I have given notice. I hope the minister will be able to tell us whether he has provided a way out of the difficulty so that I will not be obliged to press that amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not wish to discuss a Bill before I have brought it down, but I think my hon. friend will not move his amendment if I get my Bill down before this one goes through.

Mr. HENDERSON. The government are so slow in bringing down their measures that we cannot tell what to do.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W F. Maclean) the other day pointed out that the different railway companies empowered to be amalgamated under this Bill have arrangements with several municipalities by which the passenger rate is limited to two cents a mile, and he thought and I think that under this Bill these roads may be allowed to charge what they like. The minister stated that if he would wait until the introduction of a Bill which he intended to bring down, that would be guarded against as he intended to

give to the Railway Commission the power of fixing the passenger rate per mile. If the municipalities have such an arrangement with these companies, I think the arrangement should be protected in this Bill and that the municipalities should not be wholly dependent on the protection to be given by the Railway Commission.

Mr. CLARKE. I think the hon. member (Mr. Haggart) has overlooked setion 10 which expressly provides that all arrangements made with municipalities shall be adhered to and that if there is any conflict between these agreements and the Railway Act the by-laws and agreements shall prevail to the exclusion of the Railway Act.

Mr. FOSTER. That would protect them fully.

Mr. CLARKE. I think so.

Mr. HAGGART I did not look carefully into it and I judged by the remarks of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and the reply of the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) that this Bill would not fully protect these agreements.

Mr. GRAHAM. We were not talking particularly of that agreement ; we got a little further afield on the two cent rate. I pointed out that this road would be under the Railway Commission as to its passenger rates as well as other things. I did not mean that any contracts with municipalities would be overridden.

Mr. CLARKE. Besides that the munipalities have approved of this clause.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I am very much interested in the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and I agree that this is his opportunity to move an amendment. As I understand the rules that is the customary proceeding, to move an amendment in committee. I wish to see an amendment moved because Brantford is very much concerned in that very matter. They sent down deputations to appear before the Railway Committee on several occasions, before the pace became too warm and there were so many meetings that they could not have representatives at them all. I think the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) should have a direct assurance from the minister that he will have a proper opportunity to move an amendment if he wishes because there are other municipalities that desire to support such an amendment if it should come before the House.

Mr. CLARKE. The amendment was moved and voted on in the House the other night.

On the preamble.

Mr. SPROULE. There was a motion to be moved that this Bill be referred back to the Railway Committee in order to have the committee give reasons in accordance with the rule why they amended the preamble. The chairman informs me that that question was discussed at a previous meeting and was allowed to pass. Therefore I do not desire to revive it again.

Bill reported.

## MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 47), respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. Stewart.

On section 2,

Mr. SPROULE. I have only this further remark to make in regard to this Bill, that before we were asked to extend the time, I think the company ought to have presented to parliament some approximate statement of the expenditure they have made on the undertaking up to the present time. I think also, that the government should take it up themselves, and not leave it in the hands of any private company, because every additional month or year that it runs, there will be additional expenses piled up that the country ultimately will be obliged to pay.

Mr. STEWART. I may say that I asked the solicitor of the company if he could give me the information the hon. gentlemen desired, and he was unable to do so. The criticism by some hon. members was that the company were going on spending money. I may say that they are not now spending money. Knowing that the government are making surveys, they have no desire to duplicate the work. They ceased spending money on surveys, &c., when the matter was taken up by the government.

Mr. SPROULE. That is different from the information which was given to us the last time the Bill was considered. We were told that they were going on spending money. If they are not piling up expenses, I do not see that the objection to the Bill is so very serious.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that all that is required is to prolong the life of this company. They do not propose to go into any operations until the government have made up their mind what they propose to do. May I ask if the field work of the survey is finished ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not sure, but I understand that it is.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

THE CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 81) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Mr. SPROULE. There are a number of amendments to this Bill, and it is not reprinted. I understand that the clerk has the power to have Bills reprinted when amended such as this is. This would require reprinting before we can have any intelligent understanding of what we are passing. I move that the committee rise and report progress until the Bill is reprinted.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no objection. I am at a loss myself until it is reprinted.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. This should be the general rule. We get our file of Bills, the Bills are amended, and we do not know what amendments are made.

Mr. GRAHAM. I agree thoroughly with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Well, see that it is done.

Progress reported.

DOMINION ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 50) respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Copp.

On section 6,

Mr. SPROULE. Generally we fix the number of directors at from five to nine. In this case the number is fixed at three, with power to increase to five. What is the reason for that?

Mr. COPP. I presume the reason is that this is an old company and an English company, and I think the three directors are all they ever had. They were incorporated in 1860, or thereabouts, and have been acting under the old charter ever since.

Mr. SPROULE. Then some portion of the road is built?

Mr. COPP. Yes; this is the road that runs from Halifax to Yarmouth.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SASKATOON, SASKATCHEWAN, PEACE RIVER AND DAWSON RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Railway Company. —Mr. W. McIntyre.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER

On section 14,

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, the company seems to be given the right under this section to carry on every kind of business except a barber shop and a laundry. I think we might as well throw these in.

Mr. SPROULE. This seems a most extraordinary Bill in the powers given to the company.

Mr. FOSTER. This section certainly is a tremendous section for a railway company. I was not in the committee when it went through, but being in the House now these look like very extended powers. What we are doing nominally is to incorporate a railway company. We give that company all the powers in connection with its road, including telephone and telegraph powers as regards the railway—and large powers at that. We give them electric powers with respect to surplus waters or electric power developed but not required for the purposes of the railway. But it also, in effect, makes them a general electric company. Then it goes on and says that they may:

Acquire, lease, hold or operate timber limits, and acquire, lease, construct, maintain, equip, operate or erect sawmills, pulp and other mills, and sell timber, wood products and lumber.

They may do the same with reference to coal, the same with reference to mines and minerals, the same with reference to hotels and restaurants. Hotels and restaurants along the line of the railway would be unobjectionable so long as they were used in connection with the road.

They may acquire, purchase, lease and hold lands required for, and lay out, establish and manage parks and pleasure grounds, and give a lease thereof.

A park along the railway which contributes to its tourist travel is not objectionable. But I think as to these powers with regard to timber lands, coal lands, mines and minerals, it is ridiculous to give them to a railway company. You might as well tell them to go out into the wide world and do as they please.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman will notice that the section is qualified by the words 'For the purposes of the railway.' They may do these things for the purpose of their undertaking. It is to be remembered that a great deal of this road, with the exception possibly of 100 miles, is built in an uninhabited country. It may be necessary for them to build saw-mills in order to obtain the timber required. It is only for the purpose of their undertaking. The same may be said of the mineral lands.

Mr. FOSTER. But are they going to make pulp mills for the purpose of building their roads ?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The Canadian Northern in that country operate their own mines for the purpose of supplying their own coal. What is the meaning of the phrase 'for the purpose of its undertaking' ?

Mr. FOSTER. What is its undertaking ? It is to lay out, construct and operate a railway. I know there are a good many ways in which adjuncts are necessary, and can be well undertaken in connection with the road, and for its purposes. But I think this is altogether too wide. We know that in the United States of America to-day there is a great deal of agitation in regard to the wide powers given to railway corporations, and there is now legislation going on compelling them to loosen their hands upon coal areas, mines and the like of that. It is on the same principle as this. The question is whether it is best for a country to have its carriers also the producers of coal, lumber and so forth, where they have the double interest of being not only producers but carriers to their customers. The coal roads in the United States, the Reading Company in Pennsylvania and other companies are bound, as I understand, to cut the connection within a year or two. You can easily see to what a disadvantage a corporation is put, which is not a railway, when it has to compete against a railway corporation which is in the same business as itself, and which also does the carrying. It is almost impossible to get fair treatment for the transport of its products. This road, it is proposed, is to have its own coal mines, its own timber lands, it is to make pulp, it is to do almost everything under the sun. It will have a great advantage over its competitors. I think we are doing wrong in giving these all embracing powers to a railway company. There are other ways : A company may be formed to make pulp, a company may be formed as a lumber company. But to put all this into an omnibus clause is a serious matter, and I call the attention of the Minister of Railways to it.

Mr. TURRIFF. When this Bill was before the committee this point was discussed at some length, and the view the committee took was somewhat different to the view enunciated by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). This company applied for these powers to acquire timber limits, coal lands and other mineral lands, and it was pointed out that in an unsettled country they needed to establish these undertakings for the purpose of making traffic for their road. There was an amendment made in committee to subsection 'h' of section 14, that prohibited them from disposing of these timber limits or coal lands that they might acquire until they had built and put in operation 500 miles of road. Therefore they cannot get a railway charter to acquire limits, coal mines and other lands for merely speculative purposes, and not dispose of them without having first carried out the intention of the project to the extent of putting into operation at least 500 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that makes much difference.

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not think it does.

Mr. FOSTER. You see to what it leads. Here is a corporation going on with one legitimate business, it is brought into being as a public utility, to do work for other people. It has to see that the people get decent travel accommodation and proper carriage for their products, and we have a Railway Commission to control their operations. The prime object of a railway is to serve the public. Now if you divert its attention from that purpose and allow it to develop another set of activities, you throw its energies into another channel and allow it to develop profitable undertakings which are not at all in the line of a public utility. But there is worse than that. You put power into the hands of that wide-awake corporation, stretching out into all parts of the country, to acquire the very best areas of coal or timber lands, water-powers for electricity, and so forth; in fact a wide-awake company like that could take everything within the sweep of its influence for forty or fifty miles each side of the railway. In this way it would become a monopoly, and get hold of vast resources, which would bring them into conflict with the population which is sure to flow in. The vista is a pretty wide one, and I think we are not wise in giving a railroad corporation an immense endowment like this.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a good deal of force in what my hon. friend says about these wide powers and although the committee did pass the Bill I took occasion to make a few observations along the line of what my hon. friend says to-day. I thought it was about time that we should confine railway companies to the building and operations of railways. Heretofore large powers have been given to some companies, but the country is gradually getting opened up and I feel that we may be placing ourselves in the position in which our neighbours across the line find themselves. For instance, the coal carrying business is controlled by the transportation companies as well as the coal itself. With that state of affairs our transportation facilities and natural products would be interwoven in such a way that one company might control the whole situation.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not the same with timber and lumber as well ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, I am just taking that as an example. I would suggest to the promoter of this Bill that we take up something else and consider this a little further, because I have some strong views on the question myself.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before we consider that point, may I ask whether this Bill was before the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee ? I see that an important part of the Bill has relation to commercial industries. We have a committee specially charged with the examination of Bills of this kind. They are not supposed to be dealt with by the Railway Committee and if this Bill has not been reported on by the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee I think it had better be postponed until it has been referred to that committee so that we may have the benefit of the opinions of the experts in commercial transactions, who are supposed to sit on that committee. The Bill is certainly an extraordinary one. It involves commercial transactions, just as much as it does railway building ; in fact, I am not sure but that the clauses not appertaining to the construction of a railway would not be in the end the more important part of the Bill. I submit that so long as we have select committees to consider the various Bills which come before the House they should not be considered in the House until these committees have reported upon them, and if the promoters of railway Bills will persistently insert in railway charters clauses such as reference has been made to, we should refuse the consideration of such Bills until they have been reported upon by other appropriate committees as well as the Railway Committee. Comparatively few members were at the Railway Committee when this Bill was considered, we know very little about it and it would certainly be much better that the Bill should be considered by the other committee as well ; then let them bring down their report and if it is approved by that committee we would have more confidence in passing it even although we had not had the opportunity of getting the details of all its various clauses. I raise that objection to the Bill now, and if it is not referred to the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee before it is taken up again I shall take a decided stand, raise that objection and ask that it be referred to the committee before we consider it further here. I think a point of order on that line would be well taken.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a dim recollection that somewhere around where the sealed pattern of the Ross rifle is, or somewhere else, there is a model railway Bill. Does the minister know whether there is or not? I would like to have that model trotted out at least once in a decade so that it might stand as an example of what might be avoided.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The promoters of this Bill drew it on the plan of the various other Bills that have gone through the Railway Committee. The statement of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is undoubtedly true. I think that railway charters should refer to railways and not to other industries, but if this has been a matter of common practice I cannot see why it should be changed in this particular instance.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. gentleman give us the name of a railway Bill that has as wide powers as this one ?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I think that if you look at the Grand Trunk branch lines you will find identically the same clause as that which has been referred to by the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. That is where the trouble comes ; it was a government Bill.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. There is another Bill which went through last session which is practically the same and that is the Bill incorporating the Dunvegan road. I do not know that I can give the exact title of it. But we will have an opportunity to look at the various Bills which have been passed and make a comparison between them and the provisions contained in this Bill. This Bill is planned on various other Bills and we are not asking for something which has not been granted to other companies. In reference to the point raised by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) I will say that other Bills went through in the same way without being referred to the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee or any other committee but the Railway Committee.

Mr. HENDERSON. Whilst it may have been the case that a goodly number of Bills have gone through this House it has not been the absolute practice because I have a distinct recollection of a Bill of this very character having been referred to both committees, referred to the Railway Committee, certain clauses dealt with there, and referred to the Private Bills Committee for consideration of the commercial clauses. As I said before if the promoters of these mixed Bills persistently present them in this form I think that in future they ought to understand that their Bills must have the approval of both committees before they will be proceeded with in the House. I think that is only reasonable. What do we send a Bill to the committee for ?—to have it investigated with reference to the purpose that is intended to be accomplished by the Bill. The Railway Committee is only intended to deal with a Bill providing for the construction and operation of a railway. The Private Bills Committee has a duty to perform

and that is to examine and report upon all that appertains to the commercial character of the transactions that are authorized to be carried on by the Bill. I submit that even if we have been following a bad precedent it is time we should make a change. To my mind this Bill goes so very far along the line that I have indicated that it would be well to have it referred to the Private Bills Committee to give us their opinion. There are supposed to be men on that committee who are experts in these matters. Men are selected on these committees as I understand by reason of their knowledge of various transactions. A man may be put on the Railway Committee because he has some knowledge of the construction of railways. A man is put on the Committee on Banking and Commerce presumably because he has some technical knowledge of the matters that will come before that committee. It is the same in regard to the Private Bills Committee ; men are put on that committee who have had experience for the last twenty-five years, possibly many of them, or for years and years, in dealing with matters of this kind and their opinion would be of very much more importance than that of a committee that has never been charged with the consideration of transactions of this kind. If we have been making a mistake in the past by all means let us make a change and lay down a new principle. If that Bill is not referred to Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee, and if it comes up in the House again I shall take a decided stand against its progress until a reference has been made and a report brought down from that committee approving of it. That is only reasonable and I am quite sure we will be supported by many members on that line.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought there was some rule of the kind I suggested. I find rule 101 of the House reads :

Before any private Bill is considered by the committee to which it may be referred, a report shall first be submitted to the committee by the examiner, stating that he has examined the same, and has noted, opposite each section, any variations from the provisions contained in the model Bill; and to insure uniformity, the examiner shall revise and certify every private Bill passed by the committees, and the reports thereon, before they are presented to the House.

I believe the Railway Committee is the only committee which has a model Bill, and I would suggest to the Minister of Railways that he should resuscitate that much-abused and may be long-lost article and get his examiner to work on it, and pass these Bills as they come up. I presume that the examiner referred to is Mr. Hartney.

Mr. GRAHAM. He is the clerk of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. He knows the model Bill and is supposed to examine all Bills that come up. May be this rule is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. In reply to my hon. friend who has the Bill in charge, there always comes a time when you note extravagances that are going on, and we have to make a protest at this time, even although there may be examples of something almost similar. I think it would be well to hold this Bill over.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The powers granted by clause 14 seem to be very much too wide for any railway Bill. I for one desire to protest against the granting of a large number of the privileges asked for in that clause. It may be said that I should have raised this objection in the Railway Committee. That is certainly the proper place to object, but it must be remembered that the Banking and Commerce Committee has been sitting on the same day as the Railway Committee for the last two or three weeks, and being on that committee I have been attending its meetings when this Bill was before the Railway Committee. Had I been at the Railway Committee I would certainly have protested against this clause. What the minister has said with regard to the coal supply of Pennsylvania should be a lesson to us and a warning never to get into the same box. This is bound to be a great country in the near future, and this railway company, with all its powers, can do immense damage to any person or corporation operating coal fields or carrying on lumbering operations anywhere along its line. The railway company might grant great favours to their own products and discriminate against the products of any company carrying on either the coal or lumbering business. A very unfair advantage might be taken. With all deference to the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. W. McIntyre), I cannot recall a Bill that approaches what he is asking for in this Bill. It may be there are such Bills, but I doubt if the wide range of powers proposed to be given here can be duplicated by any other Bill. He spoke of the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Bill, but I do not think it contained anything like this clause, permitting the company to carry on all these operations. I think the Bill should certainly be held up until this is looked into.

Mr. GRAHAM. The difficulty here, as I think I find it in the Railway Committee, and as I found it in the Railway Committee of the Ontario legislature, is that every railway company asking for railway legislation has its solicitor look over all other Railway Acts that have been passed, and put in their Bill all they want themselves ; then they add everything that any person else ever got. That is one of the difficulties. We may as well hold the Bill over for a few days and look into it more thoroughly before we go on with it.

Mr. HENDERSON. As this Bill will come up to-morrow during the hour for private Bills, I shall give notice to-night of an amendment to strike out clause 14, but if we have an assurance from the minister that it will not come up to-morrow, I will consider my amendment more fully.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It may come up.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the minister will guarantee that it will not come up, I will defer my notice of amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine it will not be taken up, but my hon. friend might as well put in his notice, because a little inconvenience to a private member might serve the convenience of the whole House.

Progress reported.

THE EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 68) respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

On section 1,

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is it possible for members to obtain copies of these Bills as they are read from the chair? Where amendments are made in this way it is impossible to follow their meaning by one reading from the chair.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a good deal in what my hon. friend says. We cannot all attend the Railway Committee, and therefore we do not know what has taken place. A conscientious member reading over these Bills the night before they come up in the House does not know of the amendments made in committee, and may find when he comes here that several sections have been added to a Bill. The cost of printing the amendments would not be great, and then each member would have in his file of Bills everything that it is proposed to bring before the committee.

Mr GRAHAM My hon. friend is right. I certainly thought that it was the rule that these Bills were reprinted, and I am heartily in sympathy with my hon. friend's view. We cannot discuss the Bill properly unless we have the reprinted Bill before us.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. I wish to refer to a matter connected with this Bill which might be taken into consideration now or before it is reprinted. The Bill provides for very wide latitude as to where the railway may reach the Pacific coast. Apparently it may find an outlet anywhere. I think that should be specified more particularly and the promoters of the Bill might have that arranged before it comes up again.

Mr. GRAHAM. The promoter of the Bill is not here.

Progress reported.

Mr. GRAHAM.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 51), respecting the Erie, London and Tillsonburg Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 74), respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company —Mr. Grant.

Bill (No. 67), respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 76), respecting the Interprovincial Railway and Bridge Company of New Brunswick—Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure).

Bill (No. 83), respecting the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.—Mr. Telford.

Bill (No. 87), to incorporate the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company. —Mr. Sloan.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 73), respecting the Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.—Mr. Power.

Bill (No. 77) respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Dubeau.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 98), respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Blain.

Bill (No. 101), respecting the Fort William Terminal Railway and Bridge Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 103), respecting the Eastern Trust Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 108), respecting the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 107), respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

Bill (No 110) respecting a certain Patent of Frederick C. Rehm, Elias Frank and Isidor Frank.—Mr. Béland.

QUESTIONS.

FISH EXPORTS—MANITOBA AND THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette)—by Mr. Foster—asked :

What is the quantity and value of fish exported from Manitoba and Northwest Territories, respectively, for each of the five years ending March 31, 1907?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The quantity and value of fish exported from Manitoba and Northwest Territories during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906 and 9 months of 1907, were as follows :

MANITOBA.

| | | Fiscal Years. | Quantity. | Value. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | $ |
| Mackerel, pickled | brls. | 1906 | 1 | 18 |
| Halibut, fresh | lbs. | 1907 (9 mos.) | 27,985 | 1,189 |
| Herrings, fresh | " | 1903 | 200 | 5 |
| Sea fish, other, preserved | " | 1905 | 190 | 16 |
| Oysters, fresh | brls. | 1903 | 4 | 18 |
| Salmon, fresh | lbs. | 1903 | 154 | 14 |
| Fish, all other, fresh | $ | 1903 | | 315,883 |
| | | 1904 | | 384,083 |
| | | 1905 | | 533,326 |
| | | 1906 | | 450,991 |
| | | 1907 (9 mos.) | | 356,865 |
| Fish, all other, pickled | brls. | 1905 | 10 | 67 |
| | | 1906 | 66 | 416 |
| Total | | | | 2,042,891 |

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Halibut, fresh | lbs. | 1907 (9 mos.) | 161,627 | 6,638 |
| Herrings, pickled | brls. | 1903 | 110 | 510 |
| | " | 1905 | 375 | 2,263 |
| | " | 1906 | 461 | 2,387 |
| | " | 1907 (9 mos.) | 1 | 5 |
| Salmon, fresh | lbs. | 1903 | 1,500 | 106 |
| | " | 1905 | 50,545 | 2,696 |
| | " | 1906 | 50 | 4 |
| | " | 1907 (9 mos.) | 52 | 12 |
| Salmon, canned | lbs. | 1907 (9 mos.) | 150 | 9 |
| Salmon, pickled | brls. | 1903 | 185 | 2,945 |
| | " | 1904 | 201 | 3,489 |
| | " | 1907 (9 mos.) | 280 | 4,000 |
| Fish, all other, fresh | $ | 1903 | | 3,063 |
| | | 1904 | | 54 |
| | | 1905 | | 5,125 |
| | | 1906 | | 21,031 |
| | | 1907 (9 mos.) | | 870 |
| Total | | | | 55,207 |

The foregoing represents the exportation of the various kinds of fish exported from ports in Manitoba and Northwest Territories, but cannot be said to represent the whole amount of fish which originated in these territorial divisions which was exported, as it is possible that some fish, the product of Manitoba and Northwest Territories, may have been exported at eastern points and is credited in the statistical returns to the port of exit by which it left Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. What does that reference to eastern points mean ?

Mr. PATERSON. Suppose fish had been sent down and remained in bond and was taken from Montreal or Fort Erie, it would be credited to those ports.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be fairly accurate.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

RETURNS—NUMBER OF.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked :

1. How many returns have been brought down on the order of parliament by the Interior Department during the sessions of 1905, 1906 and 1907, respectively, and during the present session to date?

2. How many questions asked after notice have been answered by the Interior Department during the sessions 1905, 1906, 1907, and during the present session to date?

3. How many days of five and a half working hours each were occupied by employees of the Interior Department in preparing these returns and answers to questions during the sessions of 1905, 1906, 1907, and during the present session to date?

4. How many returns have been ordered from the Interior Department but not yet brought down?

5. How many days of five and a half working hours each is it estimated that it will require to complete the returns now ordered from the Interior Department by parliament, but not yet brought down?

6. How many original files or parts of files from the Interior Department have been brought before the House during this session?
7. How many of such files or parts of files have been brought before any committee of the House during this session?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior.) As far as the Department of the Interior is concerned:

1. Twelve returns were brought down during the session of 1905, forty-three during the session 1906, thirty-five during the session of 1906-7, and twenty-six during the session of 1907-8 to date.

2. No record was kept of questions asked by members in 1905. Seventy-one questions were asked in 1906; one hundred and eight in 1906-7, and ninety-three during the present session, to date.

3. No record was kept of time occupied on returns during the session of 1905. Equal to 2,083 days of one man's time were occupied preparing returns and answers to questions in 1906. Equal to 1,050 days of one man's time were given to returns and questions in 1906-7. Equal to 677 days of one man's time were occupied in preparing returns and answers to questions during the present session to date.

4. Forty.
5. Equal to 660 days of one man's time.
6. Twentysix.
7. Two hundred and thirty-six.

Mr. FOSTER. How many hours of one man's time has been used in getting an answer to this question?

Mr. OLIVER. That would be included in a supplementary return which will be brought down later.

JAPANESE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MACPHERSON asked:

1. How many Japanese have been allowed to enter British Columbia since February 1, 1908?
2. Had all of these passports?
3. How many were Japanese returning to this country?
4. How many were bound for the United States?
5. What was the occupation as shown by their passports?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. One hundred and fifty-two, including 4 naturalized Canadians and 10 in transit to other countries.
2. All except the 4 naturalized Canadians.
3. Nine Japanese and 4 naturalized Canadians.
4. Nine.
5. Cooks.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 2
   Farmers.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 11
   Students.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 8
   Labourers.. .. .. .. .. .. .. 70
   Merchants.. .. .. .. .. .. .. 19
   Fishermen.. .. .. .. .. .. .. 13
   Wives of resident Japanese.. 19
   Clerks.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 4
   Consul and suite.. .. .. .. .. 5
   Unclassified (in report).. .. .. 1
   Total.. .. .. .. .. .. 152

LA SOCIETE CANADIENNE D'IMMIGRATION ET DE PLACEMENT.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. Has 'La Société Canadienne d'Immigration et de Placement,' the offices of which are in Montreal, made any request for assistance in money or otherwise from the government?
2. Has the government given or does it intend to give assistance to that society and in what manner?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Applications have been made for assistance to members of the government, and the matter is under consideration.

OFFICE SPECIALTY COMPANY AND ECLIPSE MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

What amount was paid to the Office Specialty Company for supplies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, sold to the Dominion government of Canada, and also to the Eclipse Maufacturing Company for the same time, for supplies sold by them as aforesaid?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Office Specialty Company, $50,272.38; Eclipse Manufacturing Company, $24,098.63.

DREDGING—BOONE COMPANY.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

What amounts have been paid for dredging or other work done by C. S. Boone or the C. S. Boone Company since 1896, showing the amounts, if any, by years, and places where the work was performed?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways):

1. C. S. Boone was paid on contract No. 15861 for deepening and widening channel-way at upper entrance of the Sault Ste. Marie canal, for the year 1905, $79,573.
For the year 1906, $49,805.
For the year 1907, drawback, $8,000.
For the year 1908, $22,213.47.
Paid on contract No. 16521, 1907, for widening channel-way at the upper entrance Sault Ste. Marie canal, $126,538.
Paid on contract No. 16474 for stone protection to bank backing to new extension, south pier, upper entrance, not completed, $7,799.

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked:

What was the amount paid as bounty on iron and steel each year ending June 30, from 1903 to 1907, both years inclusive?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). 1903, $1,401,804.78; 1904, $908,962.16; 1905, $1,540,203.48; 1906, $2,004,338.02; 1907, $1,899,319.03.

PORT COLBORNE ELEVATOR.

Mr. LANCASTER—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. What is the total amount expended to date on the elevator at Port Colborne?
2. What is the total amount estimated as required to complete said elevator?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):
1. $598,700.07.
2. $151,299.93.

WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. LANCASTER—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. What has been the total cost of construction of, and improvements to, the Welland canal to date?
2. Has any estimate yet been obtained of the probable cost of enlarging the locks, or deepening the Welland canal to twenty or twenty-two feet? If so, what is such estimate?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):
1. $31,825,856.36.
2. No estimate has yet been obtained with reference to enlarging the locks or deepening the Welland canal to twenty-two feet.

Mr. LANCASTER—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. What is the total amount expended to date on the culvert and dock at Welland, on the Welland canal?
2. What is the total amount estimated as required to complete said culvert and dock?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):
1. $93,897.87.
2. $2,882.13.

YUKON PLACER CLAIMS.

Mr. LENNOX—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. How many renewals of placer claims were granted by the Gold Commissioner at Dawson on or subsequent to the first of August, 1906,, at $10 each?
2. Why was a fee of $15, as required by 6 Edward VII., chapter 39, not collected in these cases?
3. Were the shortages afterwards collected? If not, why not?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would ask that this be allowed to stand as a notice of motion for return.

Mr. LENNOX—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. How many renewals of placer claims were granted by the Assistant Gold Commissioner at Whitehorse on or subsequent to August 1, at $10 each?
2. Why was a fee of $15, as required by 6 Edward VII., chapter 39, not collected in these cases?
3. Have these shortages since been collected? If not, why not?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would ask that that be allowed to stand as notice of motion for return.

INTERNATIONAL RAILWAY.

Mr. DANIEL—by Mr. Foster—asked:

1. Who are now the directors and officers of the International Railwav in New Brunswick?
2. What amount of stock has been subscribed for and paid up?
3. What are the terms with the company under which Thomas Malcolm is building the road?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The officers, as far as this department is aware of, are as follows: David Richards, president, Campbellton, N.B.; J. Bradshaw MacKenzie, secretary, Campbellton, N.B.; David Brown, chief engineer, Campbellton, N.B.
2. The department has no information in regard to this question.
3. Answered by No. 2.

ST. BONIFACE, MANITOBA, PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE—by Mr. Foster—asked:

1. Has the government contracted for the erection of a public building in St. Boniface, Manitoba, with the view of utilizing it as a post office?
2. If so, from whom has the land been purchased, what was the price paid for such land, size of lot, and to whom has such sum been paid?
3. Who was the contractor, when was contract signed, and when will the building be open to the public?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.
2. (a) and (d) J.Bourgeaut. (b) $4,500. (c) 120 feet by 66 feet.
3. (a) J. McDiarmid Company, Ltd. (b) March 4, 1907. (c) Date of completion, September 4, 1908. Building can be occupied as soon thereafter as fittings, &c., can be installed.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of (a) an order in council of the 19th May, 1902, and the regulations therein referred to and approved for the disposal of coal lands, the property of the Dominion government, in Manitoba, the Northwest Territories and British Columbia.

(b) A copy of all orders in council altering, amending or cancelling any such regulations for the aforesaid purposes, and the said amended or other regulations.

(c) A copy of all orders in council approving, amending or cancelling regulations as regards the Yukon for the purposes aforesaid, and the said regulations and amended regulations.—Mr. Barker.

For a return showing: 1. How many fishery officers there are at present in Canada having jurisdiction as ex-officio justices of the peace to try offences against the fishery laws or regulations.

2. How many convictions were made during the last fiscal year for offences against fishery laws or regulations, and how many of said convictions were made before fishery officers acting as justices.

3. The gross amount collected in fines for offences against the fishery laws or regulations for each year during the past five years, and what part of same in each year was paid by foreigners.

4. How much of the penalties so collected was awarded to fishery officers under the provisions of section 101 of chapter 45, Revised Statutes of Canada.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a return showing who made the seizures under the Inland Revenue Department in the fiscal years 1906 and 1907, in Cornwall, London, Ottawa, St. Catharines, Toronto, Joliette and Montreal, and what the seizures consisted of; the name of the party or parties from whom the material was seized; the amount realized by the sale of such seized material; and how this seized material was disposed of.—Mr. Barr.

For the production of all the original applications and tenders filed in the Department of the Interior in respect of timber berths 1046, 1047, 1052, 1058, 1068, 1073, 1093, 1094, 1099, 1191, 1192, and that the same be laid upon the table of the House, said papers not to be part of the archives of this House, but to be returned by the clerk to the Department of the Interior after exhibition.—Mr. Ames.

For the production of all original tenders filed in the Department of the Interior in respect of timber limits Nos. 645, 646, 675, 703, 705, and 733 to 737, and that the same be laid upon the table of the House, said papers not to be part of the archives of this House, but to be returned by the clerk to the Department of the Interior after inspection.—Mr. McCraney.

For a return showing the total amounts spent from the first of December, 1904, to the first of February, 1908, on dredging works: (a) at or near the entrance of the Nicolet river; (b) at Port St. François; (c) at River Godfroi; (d) at the wharfs of Ste. Angele, Becanfor each year during the past five years, and court, Gentilly, and of St. Pierre-les-Becquets; how the dredging was done, whether by tender or otherwise, and through what newspapers tenders were called for; if the said work was executed by the lowest tenderer; the name of the dredging contractor in each case and the amount received by each contractor for the work done.—Mr. Monk.

For a return showing what changes have occurred in the House of Commons branches of the clerk of the House and the Sergeant-at-Arms service since July 1, 1907.—Mr. Owen.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

## THE BANK ACT.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Stormont) moved:

That in the opinion of this House it is an opportune time to consider the advisability of amending and revising the Bank Act, and that the following, among other amendments, should receive consideration:

1. To provide for government inspection.
2. To provide more stringent regulations as to circulation.
3. To make provisions as to percentage of capital and reserve that may be loaned to any one borrower.
4. To make provision for percentage that a bank may loan to its combined directors.
5. To limit the amount of interest or discount that banks may contract for.
6. To revise the powers of the Bankers' Association.

He said: I am fully aware of the great importance of the subject of this motion. We have been passing through a great financial stringency, a stringency which has not been confined to this continent, but has to some extent been world-wide. There have been many causes leading up to this stringency, and I may mention that one of the causes, to my mind, which has operated in that direction is the enormous loss of money which has been sustained the world over. It has been estimated that there has been a loss of some five billions of money in consequence of the Boer war, the Russo-Japanese war, the Spanish-American war and the San Francisco disaster. That is money which has been absolutely wiped out. While our gold production during the past two or three years has probably been the largest in the history of the world, it has not been sufficient to make up for the enormous losses sustained through these causes. I apprehend that the proper cure for that will be retrenchment.

I was much pleased in reading a day or two ago a very able speech made by my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) in the city of London. He covered very fully the great advance that has been made during the last decade. In pointing out to his audience that we had made a remarkable expansion he gave certain figures. For instance, if I remember correctly, he said that ten years ago the total foreign trade, on the basis of imports for home consumption and domestic exports, amounted to some $234,926,000. In 1907, on the same basis, our total imports for home consumption and domestic exports amounted to the very large sum of $571,783,000. He also gave figures in regard to our population. He stated the population of 1901 at 5,370,000 and the increase by immigration at some 930,000. To that should be added the natural increase, which brings our population, I think, to-day up to about 6,600,000. But he did not tell his audience that the foreign trade balance had been running heavily against us during past years. He did not tell his audience that the excess of

imports over the value of domestic exports during five years from 1902 was no less than $291,850,000. Nor did he tell his audience that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, the excess of imports was somewhere about $187,760,000, the greatest in Canada's history. This is a balance which has got to be liquidated sooner or later by the people of Canada. I think it would have been only fair for the hon. gentleman to have pointed out, not only the bright side of the shield, but the other side, which is not so bright, when we consider that owing to the policy of this government the balance of trade has been running very heavily against us, and during the last year it was the heaviest in the history of Canada.

Now, Sir, our banks have made during the last decade enormous strides forward. We have only to refer to the figures to see that during the last ten years our banks have increased their paid-up capital by some $35,000,000, and they have increased their reserve funds by about $43,000,000. We are all glad that our banks are in that strong and healthy position; and while we are well pleased to see their reserves carried up to the large amount of $69,412,774, while their total paid-up capital is $96,167,889, we must remember that forty odd million dollars has been taken out of the people of this country during the past ten years. That is not all they have taken out of the people. They have paid dividends, some of them, as high as 12 per cent, and all of them, I think, exceeding 6 per cent, that is all who have been in business for some years. Their deposits have increased at a very great rate during the last ten years, showing that the people of Canada are thrifty and have been to a great extent prosperous. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we have had during the past few years certain bank failures which have called attention to the necessity of some amendments to our Bank Act. I say again it is unfortunate that when one discusses any proposed amendment to the banking laws of this country he is immediately attacked by financial journals, he is immediately attacked to a certain extent by bankers. They seem to consider that no one has any right to discuss the banking laws of this country except the bankers themselves. For my part, I believe there are certain principles in regard to banking to which we need to give very serious consideration. I am not attacking the banks of this country. I am glad to know that any bank which has pursued conservative methods has been successful, has made money for its shareholders and depositors have been absolutely safe in placing their money with it. It is only when banks go beyond conservative lines, it is only when they go into gambling, if I may so speak, or where they make loans they should not make, that they have met with disaster. Go back to 1847, look at the banks that were in existence at that time. To-day some six or seven of those banks are in existence yet, and have grown year by year. They have gone through all the financial depressions which have occurred in the interval, and still they have very strong reserves, and are unquestionably in an exceedingly strong financial position.

But, Sir, where the banks have gone wrong they have gone wrong by adopting methods which our conservative banks do not adopt, and it is for that reason that I intend to ask the House to carefully consider whether the time has not come when we can place upon the statute-books of this country, by amendments to our banking laws, such provisions as will prevent a recurrence of what has taken place during the past few years. I think we will all concede that the bank is the most important instrumentality in the modern system of industry and trade. Without it this system would never be developed and without it it could not be maintained. I think we will all concede that the vast expansion and complicity of industrial, commercial and financial relations have compelled the use of credit upon a scale never before imagined and have wrought wonderful changes in the manner of applying it with effect and safety. We will all concede, I am sure, that modern business cannot be carried on without credit and that the latter depends upon confidence. Banks do not receive their powers for their own sake, but for the advantage of the people. It is the representatives of the people that grant these powers. I say that the true principle in regard to banking legislation is that the legislation must be considered in relation to the country at large and not simply in its bearing on the interest of a particular class. We all, I think, agree that there must be, in order that the banks shall be successful, absolute confidence in the banking institutions of our country and while I say, in regard to most of our banks, that I believe there is that absolute confidence, and I believe it is the duty of every representative of the people in this House to endeavour to encourage that confidence in the banking institutions of our country, yet, I say that no man should be prevented from discussing fairly and honestly what he considers to be necessary amendments to the banking laws of our country. Now, Sir, it has been said and it has been wrongly said, that our banks are in a very much better position than the banks of the United States of America. We have to consider the position taken by the United States in regard to their banks. About the year 1830 the United States came to the conclusion that by incorporating banks and permitting them to have branches extending all over the United States they were going to encourage an enormous monopoly in their country which would be to the disadvantage of the United States and, there-

fore, they did not follow the lines laid down in Great Britain, where population is dense, where the business is only spread over a small area, but they carved out for themselves what they consider was the best banking system for the United States and they adopted the system of national and state banks. There are to-day in the United States 6,000 national banks. National banks, as we know, are confined to absolutely commercial business. State banks number at the present time over 12,000, making in all in the United States over 18,000 banks. How would the western states have been developed if it had not been by the national banks going into those states and establishing their agencies. Look at the history of Kansas, Missouri and other western states and you will find that the growth of the national and state banks went hand in hand with the development of the resources of the western states. What do we find in western Canada? We find that the people have been taken by the throat—literally taken by the throat—by the large banks which require their capital in the east and have been told: We have not a dollar to move the produce of the western country. The banks in western Canada, requiring the money for their large schemes in the east, had to shut down on the producers in the west. No such thing could have occurred under the system of banks in the United States where, in each locality, they have a national or state bank. I was reading a short time ago the resolutions passed by the Grain Growers' Association of Saskatchewan, and I was interested when I took up the Manitoba 'Free Press' and read the report of a recent meeting of that association. They passed a very strong resolution in regard to the attitude of the banks towards the western producers and they called the attention of the government to the position the banks are taking in western Canada. A number of these resolutions have been forwarded to my hon. friend for Macdonald (Mr. Staples). Here is a report from the Manitoba 'Free Press' of February 13, 1908. It gives a resolution which refers to the banking system and which is as follows:

> That great loss and inconvenience to farmers having been occasioned through the banks refusing advances on stored wheat and bills of lading, the government be urged to devise some remedy.

Then the report goes on and gives an account of the speeches that were made to this motion. Notwithstanding the government return which shows that our banks have somewhere about a hundred million dollars invested in foreign securities I say that our banks have over $200,000,000 of the savings of the people of this country invested in foreign securities. It is not very difficult to get it. All you have to do is to take the call loans of our banks running up to $60,000,000 odd, and the investments such as are contained in the annual statements of the banks, aggregating some $41,000,000 in stocks and bonds. If you examine these stocks and bonds you will find that ninety per cent of them are the stocks and bonds of American companies. Take the Canadian Annual Register for 1906 and you will find the enormous amounts of money which are invested by the Canadian banks, which do not show in the returns at all, in such securities as Mexican Heat, Light and Power, Rio Cuba, Detroit United Railway, Toledo Electric Railway, San Paulo, Porto Rico Railway The Cuba Light and Power Company, Twin City, and dozens of other companies outside of Canada entirely into which the banks of this country have put an enormous amount of money. These securities are pledged as collateral to our banks and when the slump occurred in 1907 they had to withdraw their money from the west and they said to the producers of that country: We cannot lend you a dollar. Why?—because they needed all this money in the east to look after the investments which they had made in foreign securities. I say that the day has not come in Canada when we can afford to be a lending country. The proper function of a bank in this country is to assist the producers in the development of the country and not to limit credit in a critical time such as we have had during the past year. Now, Sir, while I say that our banks have grown stronger during the past ten years I do not know that it is so much to the benefit of Canada. Let us go back in the history of this country for a short time, see how the banks stood and compare the position there with the position at the present day. We have fewer chartered banks in Canada to-day than we had thirty years ago. During thirty years the paid up capital of our banks has increased only to the extent of between thirty-five and forty millions of dollars, a sum $12,000,000 short of the divided profits for 1906 and 1907 of the banks of this country. In the forty years since confederation the capital of the Canadian banks has increased by about $63,000,000 or a sum short by $40,000,000 of their dividend profits for the last seven years.

Is it wise that we should create in Canada a monopoly greater than the Standard Oil monopoly in the United States? It is time that we considered the advisability of putting our laws in such shape that the public will be interested and will be benefited by our banking institutions. I am told: Oh, you advocate the curtailing of loans to directors. I certainly do. It has been said that that is a most unwise thing to do, that the directors are all great business men, all men in whom the shareholders have absolute confidence, and why should they

not be permitted to borrow money from their banks if they see fit? Even to-day the directors of the banks of Canada have over one-fifth of the total paid up capital of the banks borrowed from the banks. In the old days of Upper and Lower Canada, when there was a difficulty in regard to the chartering of banks in this country and when Downing street had something to say in regard to these charters, what occurred? We had been giving charters by which the banks could loan any sum they saw fit to their directors. In 1830, attention was called to the fact that the Bank of Montreal reported direct loans and discounts to directors of £120,173 and indirect loans, for which directors were liable, of £65,570, making a total liability by the directors to their banks of £161,042.

On February 5, 1831, the Quebec Bank returned discounts to directors of £23,002, and the directors were also liable for £45,713 as endorsers, making a total of £68,715. The directors were liable, either directly or indirectly, for advances of nearly the entire paid up capital and nearly one-half the total amount of debt due to the bank.

As we know, the banks incorporated in Upper Canada were incorporated under charters differing in some details from those of Lower Canada, but as far as concerned the limiting of loans and discounts to directors, their charters were alike, no restrictions being imposed.

The first check given to this questionable privilege enjoyed by the directors of banks in Canada came from the British Colonial Office in Downing street. So prejudicial to the interests of the public had this practice grown and so repugnant had it become to the British authorities that in 1833 they threatened to advise the exercise of the Royal prerogative and disallow several Bills for colonial bank charters unless regulations were inserted to correct this and other abuses. Among the regulations they insisted upon being added to the respective charters we find this one:

> The directors as drawers, acceptors or endorsers not to have more than one-third of the total discounts of the bank.

Thereafter this provision was inserted in the charters.

Further pressure being brought from the same source, the legislature of the province of Canada, in 1855, amended bank charters so that discounts bearing the names of directors were limited to one-tenth of the total discounts. At this time the legislature appears to have been forcibly struck with the propriety of still further curtailing the privileges of the directors. In Acts to amend the charters of the Bank of Montreal, Bank of Upper Canada, Commercial Bank, Quebec Bank and City Bank passed in 1856 the directors were in each case limited to one-twentieth of the total discounts.

We know that men like Lord Sydenham, Lord John Russell and Mr. W. E. Gladstone felt strongly on this point and limited the directors to one-twentieth of the discounts, as I have said. What occurred? That arrangement stood until the amendments to the Bank Act commenced to be made, after confederation. After confederation the bankers controlled the Bank Act and have done so up to the present time. They said to the legislators of this country: We do not like to be hampered and restricted, we do not like to be tied down to one-twentieth of the discounts of our banks. Just put a clause in there by which the shareholders can pass a by-law regulating the amount that can be loaned to the directors and the government of the day, as governments have done ever since, took the suggestions of the bankers and they eliminated those very wise clauses which were insisted upon in the days when Downing street had something to say in regard to our banks.

What is the position to-day? I venture to say that not a by-law has been passed by the shareholders of any bank in this country limiting the amount that can be loaned to directors. It is the law true enough, but we know that in 99 cases out of 100 the directors hold the proxies for the shareholders of their different institutions and the directors have never seen fit to pass by-laws by which the amount of loans to directors is regulated. It is true that after confederation the nervy grasp of Downing street relaxed and the banking institutions were soon able to dictate to parliament and to efface the distasteful limitations imposed on their loose banking methods by watchful Downing street. The lapse of thirteen years sufficed to mellow if not to erase the memories of the many castigations and fierce denunciations administered from the Colonial office. The scathing criticism of Canadian banking methods transmitted by such able statesmen as Lord John Russell, Lord Sydenham and Mr. W. E. Gladstone were quickly enough being forgotten.

Then, following down the intervening years, the Bank Act revision of 1890 left this matter where it was placed ten years before and so on down to the present time until there is no clause in our Banking Act regulating and limiting the amount of money that can be loaned to the directors of our banks.

I have particularly directed attention in my resolution to five amendments which I think are necessary and advisable in the interests of the public of this country. I am not speaking to-day in the interest of the banker, I am speaking in the interest of the public. I recognize that the banking institutions of this country are the strongest institutions we have in Canada. I recognize that to-day the press—and I do not blame

them—do not care about even commenting upon amendments to our banking laws. I recognize that if you take up the financial press of this country we will find them, and this is a great opportunity for them, clamouring in the interests of the banks We find in some of the press some silly utterances. To show what some of these gentlemen think of the legislators of this country I quote from a writer in the 'Monetary Times':

I have noticed some of Mr. Pringle's ebullitions against the banks, as given in the newspapers. They are not worth paying any attention to. The criticism of the average member of parliament of the banks, and his ideas about banking and currency, are usually little better than drivel. The banking system of Canada is probably better than her people deserve. People who have not intelligence enough to see through the barbarism of protection are hardly entitled to possess what is probably the best banking system in the world. It is certain, however, that she does not owe it to her politicians. It would almost seem that nearly the whole intelligence of the country outside of parliament is required to watch the said parliament and see that it does as little mischief as possible. The best thing both the people of the country and its parliament can do, so far as the banks are concerned, is to let them alone and give themselves no concern about them.

This is the style of criticism that appears in one of the leading monetary papers of this country when a humble member of parliament desires to bring forward for consideration amendments which he thinks are necessary and advisable, not only in the interest of the banks, but in the interest of the great public. The banks of this country are unquestionably strong; they have been strong enough to control parliament for many years. There is one body, however, which is stronger, that is, the people of this country; and the people of this country are beginning to consider the manner in which their interests have been taken care of and the manner in which the interests of the banks have been taken care of. In what is to my mind the leading work on banking published in Canada, that of Mr. Falconbridge, appears the following comment on the action of parliament:

In the Bill which he introduced the minister gave effect to the representations of the bankers on all points.

This question arises on the occasion of every revision of our banking laws in this country. Now, the first point to which I desire to call attention is that of government inspection. On that subject the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) made a pretty good stand in 1890. He brought down a Bill in which he provided for an independent audit of our banks, and he had the support of such men as the present Lord Strathcona, then Donald A. Smith, an ordinary member of parliament, who said in the debate which took place at that time:

Mr. PRINGLE.

I feel that it is very little indeed to give in order to improve the Banking Act as it at present exists.

You will find that in 'Hansard' of 1890, at page 2249. We all look up to Lord Strathcona as one of Canada's ablest men; we all looked up to him at that time, when he was sitting here as a member of this House; I think he was at the same time a director of the Bank of Montreal. But the bankers were too strong even for the ex-Minister of Finance; they came here in force, and he had to eliminate this provision from his Bill, and bring it down just as the bankers wanted it; and so it continued from that time down to the present. Now, what is the answer of the bankers to the proposal for an independent audit? They say it is not feasible, that it is utterly impracticable, under our system of branch banks. To a certain extent I agree with the bankers; but I say it is perfectly feasible, perfectly practicable, to have an independent audit of the head offices of our banks. Go to every other country under the sun; go, for instance, to Japan, which to-day has modern up-to-date banking laws, and you find there a controller or prefect, as they term him. The Minister of Finance in Japan can say to this official, give me a report on the head office of this bank or that bank. They do not require a monthly return such as we require, which is unsworn-to and absolutely untrue, as it has been proven to be when a bank fails in this country. Take the case of the Ontario Bank—$7,000,000 reserve, $1,500,000 paid up capital, securities galore, a return month after month for sixty consecutive months, deceiving the government of this country. Could that have occurred with an independent audit? I say no. An independent audit has to come in Canada. This country is getting to be a great country and the interests involved are enormous. The people of this country have over $600,000,000 deposited with their banks, and they want some government inspection and some government control; and I am pleased to see that the attitude taken by the very strongest banks in Canada is that the sooner it comes the better.

In 1900 Mr. H. C. McLeod, the general manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, said that he had urged the government of this country to have an amendment made to the banking laws by which there should be an independent audit of our banks; but the government, sitting quietly by, not seeing what was going on, no independent audit was provided for. But the Bank of Nova Scotia said: We will have an independent audit of our institution; and from that time to the present, every year, two Edinburgh accountants go over the accounts of the bank, so that it gives to its shareholders an absolutely correct statement of every security it holds. That has been followed by the

Bank of New Brunswick. The Bank of British North America always has had an independent audit, because, its head office being in England, it has always followed the English practice. I am not going to discuss the banking laws of the United States; but we know that they have controllers and inspections. Inspections will not make men honest. Failures have occurred in the banks of the United States. But inspections would let the people know whether the returns made from month to month by the banks were correct or not, and no such failure as that of the Ontario bank could occur. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he was present at a gathering of the Canadian Bankers' Association held shortly after the failure of the Ontario bank, where they were considering the advisability of amendments to the Bank Act; for I find that Mr. Hopkins, in his Canadian Annual Review, says that the hon. Finance Minister was present at that meeting. I have heard that the hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) had pretty strong views with regard to some amendments, but the Canadian Bankers' Association views seem to have prevailed upon him. However, he does not state just what was said or done at this meeting of November 8, What is stated is simply this:

The Canadian Bankers' Association met in Toronto, with Mr. E. S. Clouston, president of the Bank of Montreal, in the chair, and about thirty other representatives of banking institutions were present, together with the Hon. W. S. Fielding, Minister of Finance. It is understood that amendments to the Bank Act, in view of that being dealt with, were under consideration.

I do not know whether that is correct or not, but I do know that at that time there was a strong agitation by the leading Liberal organs in this country in favour of some amendments to the Banking Act which would provide for better government inspection.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. PRINGLE. When the House rose at six o'clock I was dealing with the question of inspection. I do not think I could do better than refer to a statement made by Mr. McLeod, the general manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, some years ago, in connection with this matter. In the annual report of the Bank of Nova Scotia for 1091, Mr. McLeod advocated government inspection of all chartered banks. His language was as follows:

The oft expressed anticipation of benefit to be derived from supervision by the Canadian Bankers' Association of the circulation of banks have not been realized. And as they appear impossible of realization, we should again urge on the government the propriety of having this work undertaken by the Finance Department, where it properly belongs. The banking system of Canada is one of the best in the world, and with a few added safeguards such as public inspection and fixed cash reserves, would be ideal.

Now, Sir, that is the language of an experienced banker, a gentleman who is at the head of one of our most successful banks, a bank that has been in existence some 76 years; and in 1901 he states:

We should again urge on the government the propriety of having this work undertaken by the Finance Department, where it properly belongs.

So I say we have the authority of a leading banker that government inspection is practicable, that government inspection is feasible, and in 1901 he urged upon the government of this country the advisability of having that government inspection. He goes on to say in his address at that time:

Some argue that government inspection is impracticable in a bank with numerous branches, but in the United Kingdom where banks have more numerous branches than here, chartered accountants are called in to make an examination and to certify to the correctness of statements. What is practicable there is worth a trial here, and in view of the magnitude of the interests involved, that trial should be made under the supervision of the Finance Department.

Notwithstanding that the bankers of this country say that bank inspection in the United States of America has not been successful, it has been in operation for 43 years, and in that 43 years it is conceded by all that it has done an immense deal of good. It is quite true there have been bank failures in the United States, but it is not true that the proportion of bank failures in the United States has reached anything like the proportion that has been reached in the Dominion of Canada. On that point I might also refer to an article which appeared in the Toronto 'Globe' of November 20, 1906. It is a letter of Mr. McLeod, who again, after the failure of the Ontario bank, cried out for government inspection. The letter is undoubtedly familiar to the members of the government, who of course paid no heed to it, as they paid no heed to the request in 1901. While I do not like to detain the House with long quotations, I think this letter is so important that I will read it:

Toronto 'Globe,' November 20, 1906.

To the editor of the 'Globe':

Call for an independent inspection of banks.

Through the press and from the platform the banking system of Canada is lauded as being the best in the world. In many particulars the system is admirable, our elastic

bank currency and the readiness with which the banking requirements of new districts are met by branch extension being its strongest features. However, it is not without defects, some of them of vital importance. Of these the most prominent is the lack of external inspection, which experience in the western hemisphere has demonstrated to be essential. The public have been reminded of this necessity by the recent failure of the Ontario Bank and the leading papers of the country are almost a unit in demanding reform in this particular. The reasonableness of this demand is made clear by a review of Canadian banking history sine 1880 and before, and is confirmed by the experiences of our near neighbours prior to the civil war. In 1880 there were in existence in Canada forty-one banks; since then seven have been incorporated and have commenced business, making a total of forty-eight banks. Of this total, twelve have failed and some others have saved themselves by amalgamation. The failures are, therefore, twenty-five per cent within a period of twenty-six years, the last ten of which were years of unexampled prosperity, with steadily rising deposits, conditions under which even insolvent banks seldom close their doors. Most, if not all, of the above-mentioned failures were fraudulent, and it is now plainly evident that a few hours' examination by a skilled banker would have disclosed an insolvent condition in any one of the banks, years before it collapsed. In each of the two most recent disasters a correct diagnosis could have been made ten or more years ago. Some urge that the government should call for special returns, but what value should attach to special returns from the Bank of Yarmouth? from the Ontario Bank, or from any of the other wrecks gone before? They would simply have enlarged the piles of incorrect and deceptive bank returns in the Finance Department.

There is the language of a banker, the general manager of a very strong banking institution, and he refers to these returns as 'piles of incorrect and deceptive banking returns.' Then he goes on to say:

What is written by one having unusual facilities for observation is eminently true: 'it' is extremely rare to find a bank has failed without some of the officers committing fraudulent or illegal acts to hide it.' There is at least sufficient truth in the above to dispose of the suggestion of special returns and to dispel faith in the returns of badly managed banks.

Some Canadian bankers, including one writer, whose words are entitled to great weight, contend that government inspection has failed in the United States. Under the National Bank Act of that country there has been a somewhat imperfect system of bank examination and a more imperfect system by some of the state bank departments. I say imperfect, for under the national system there were employed last year 78 examiners, whose duties required the making of no less than 11,516 inspections each year. For the forty-three years during which the National Bank Act has been in operation there have been established 7,966 banks. Of these 460 have failed, the failures being equal to 5½ per cent of the whole number for the period.

Mr. PRINGLE.

As for the banks other than national, with a more imperfect system of inspection, or no system at all, the failures reached 17½ per cent. The comparison of the percentages appears as follows:

Failed in 43 years—
National banks, 5½ per cent.
Other United States banks, 17½ per cent.
Failed in 26 years—
Canadian banks, 25 per cent.
National banks, 5 per cent.

External inspection must not be regarded as an unfailing cure; it has its limitations, and the best that can be said of it is that it is a preventative that, if properly applied, will make bank failures almost unknown. An inspector cannot discover an embezzlement until after the act is committed; neither can he avoid a ruinously bad debt made before his visit, but the progress toward failure is generally slow and in the majority of cases a prudent inspector would, by his advice and authority, save the situation and direct the management into safe channels.

The subject of the establishment of an effective bureau of inspection is one of the utmost importance, for unless it is founded on conservative lines, in which the interests of all sound institutions are carefully conserved, much more harm than benefit would ensue. Bank shareholders are the parties with the major interest at stake, and for the present the subject would be better left to them and to their representatives, in the hope that a satisfactory solution of the problem may be reached.

H. C. McLEOD.

Toronto, November 21.

That is a letter from one who is an authority on banking, and he advocates in the very strongest terms some action on the part of the Department of Finance in the direction of government inspection. My own suggestion in regard to that is that there should be an absolutely non-partisan board of commissioners, with full power to inspect the head offices of our banks. If we had had that non-partisan board of commissioners, with power to inspect, we should not have had the bank failures that we have had within the past few years. This question of bank inspection has been a live question in many countries. Some system of bank inspection has been adopted in nearly every country under the sun. I have been much interested in reading the banking laws of China, Japan, Mexico and other countries. I find that in every one of these countries they have a system of inspection, probably a stronger system than that of Great Britain and Australia. As to our Canadian banks, I believe that, of the thirty-four banks doing business to-day, they are in fairly good condition, and, with conservative management, they must of necessity make money. If we had had a bank inspection system, do you suppose we should have had the failure of the Banque Ville Marie? I made the statement the other day that this bank had exceeded its circulation to the extent of $300,000. I find that I was wrong, and that that bank had exceeded its legal

circulation to a very much larger extent. Consequently, the depositors and others interested suffered enormous loss. The Bank of Yarmouth could not have gone down, causing enormous losses to the people of that district, if there had been a system of government inspection. This system has been possible for forty-three years in the United States. And, let it be remembered that, in one city alone, the city of New York, there is a greater banking capital than in the whole Dominion of Canada, and the banks of that city are inspected regularly. We hear of the evidence with regard to the old Ontario Bank. It is common for people to say: Oh, the Ontario Bank was a gambling institution ; it went to pieces through gambling. But, if we had a system of inspection, the Ontario Bank could not have gone on gambling year after year ; it could not have gone on sending to this government, month after month, returns which were absolutely false. But, while we are on that point, is there no other gambling bank in Canada ? Has not the Minister of Finance had the knowledge of one such, has he not had it before him since the publication of the report of the Royal Insurance Commission, that the Bank of Commerce is the biggest gambling bank in the Dominion of Canada ? Yet, has he opened his mouth —has any man opened his mouth in this House, or raised his voice with regard to the Bank of Commerce? It was a matter of gambling. McGill placed his money on the red and lost. Hon. Geo. A. Cox and Mr. B. E. Walker placed their money on the red, and I am inclined to think that they have lost, judging from the report of the Royal Insurance Commission. At any rate, we find, according to that report, that Hon. Geo. A. Cox and Mr. B. E. Walker—we look up to Mr. Walker as a great banking authority in this country, a man who goes about the country lecturing on banking, a man who has written on banking—well, Sir, we find him joining in a pool for the purpose of gambling in the stock markets of this country. We find Mr. B. E. Walker having a five per cent interest in a pool formed to manipulate Dominion Iron and Steel and Dominion Coal. We find it stated on page 16 of the report of the Royal Commission on Life Insurance that Mr. Walker led the Canadian Bank of Commerce to buy 1,000 shares of Dominion Coal because Hon. Geo. A. Cox wanted to buy 1,000 shares. And Mr. Cox bought 1,000 shares of Dominion Coal at 112, and the Bank of Commerce bought 1,000 shares of Dominion Coal around 112 ; and I venture to say they have it to-day. And, if Hon. Geo. A. Cox and the Canadian Bank of Commerce have Dominion Coal to-day, they have made a net loss of $144,000. But that is not all. Hon. Geo. A. Cox saw Twin City disappearing down the toboggan slide, and he jumped in and took 1,000 shares. And he admits in his evidence that he said to the Canadian Bank of Commerce: You support the market and jump in and buy 1,000 shares of Twin City. And the Bank of Commerce, being pulled about by Hon. Geo. A. Cox, jumps in and buys 1,000 shares of Twin City ; and Twin City—an American security—as we know slumping from that day to the present, has never seen the prices at which these men jumped into it. I say the time has come when men in this House, irrespective of the influence of the banks, should speak out, so that we may get an amendment of our banking laws which will prevent great banks like the Canadian Bank of Commerce speculating in the market. It is true the Canadian Bank of Commerce lives to-day and the Ontario Bank has gone down. It is true that McGill, who, if he had followed the market, probably would have been successful, is to-day suffering punishment for what he has done, while these other gentlemen, who are just as guilty as McGill are paraded as great financiers. I am not speaking about something which has not been proved. It has been absolutely proved, and the report of the Royal Commission on Life Insurance, says in clear terms that Hon. Geo. A. Cox was able to use these banking institutions, the Canadian Bank of Commerce and the Dominion Securities Corporation—that the Dominion Securities Corporation borrowed $500,000 at 5 per cent from the Canada Life Assurance Company—and then goes on to say :

> These transactions indicate to your commissioners that the funds of the company were employed with the utmost freedom in transactions with institutions in which Mr. Cox was largely interested. In many of these transactions the conflict of Mr. Cox's interest with his duty is so apparent that the care of the insurance funds could not always have been the sole consideration.

So, they say also :

> In April, 1903, the Canada Life Assurance Company's board authorized the purchase of 1,000 shares of Dominion Coal Company's stock, together with 1,000 shares of another stock (Twin City), and in connection with that purchase Mr. Cox states that the Bank of Commerce, of which he was the president, was acting in concert with the Canada Life Assurance Company, purchasing a like quantity of both stocks.

I ask the Finance Minister if this was not made known to him many months ago, when the report of the Royal Insurance Commission came down? There is no man in this House dare open his mouth and mention the name of Hon. Geo. A. Cox, or find any fault with the Canadian Bank of Commerce for gambling in the stock markets. If he does he is immediately put down by the bankers as attacking the banking institutions of this country. As far as I am concerned, I think it is time we spoke out clearly on these matters, and if we can get a law, if we can so amend our law, as to prevent our banks from using the funds of the people for speculation, then I say let

us get that law, and the sooner we can get it the better for our country. Let me say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are in this country to-day depositors from the Atlantic to the Pacific who are looking on, who are watching this government to see if this government are ready to act, not only in the interest of the banks, but in the public interest, to secure the depositors of the country. There are sharehoulers to-day from the Atlantic to the Pacific who are not satisfied with the management of the banks and who are anxious to see amendments to our banking law. Let me go further. There are banks to-day — strong banks that have conducted their business on conservative lines—which do not approve of that sort of work, and which would like to see the laws amended so that it will be stopped. There are the smaller banks, and while I mention smaller banks, I will say to the credit of the smaller banks, to the credit of our latest creations, that they are doing good work to-day in Canada, and I was very pleased to see by the annual statement of the infant bank—the Farmers' Bank—that it has a greater percentage of assets to liabilities than the Canadian Bank of Commerce. Let us look for a moment or two at this table giving a percentage of assets to liabilities, and I will show that the Canadian Bank of Commerce has a lesser percentage of assets to liabilities than any other bank doing business in the Dominion of Canada. Is it any wonder that it has been losing deposits by the million during the past few months? Let us just compare these two banks. I am going to take the smallest bank we have. The latest bank, which, for a young bank, seems to be in a fairly strong position, shows a ratio of total assets to liabilities to the public of 152, while the Canadian Bank of Commerce shows a ratio of total assets to the public of 117—the smallest of any chartered bank doing business in the Dominion of Canada, a bank that has had great opportunities, a bank that to-day, if it had followed conservative lines, should have been in as strong a position as any bank in this country They have been gambling with the funds, and I am afraid they did not always place their money on the winning stock. I say we should devise some sort of means to prevent that sort of thing in connection with our banks.

I am not going to say anything more in regard to the first amendment, which, I think, is a proper amendment to our Banking Act, and which is an amendment which will give government inspection ; but I will pass on to the second, and that provides for more stringent laws in regard to circulation. I know the answer that the banks will make when it is suggested that we should provide more stringent regulations as to circulation. They say at once : Oh, leave that to us ; the Canadian Bankers' Association have passed very stringent by-laws in regard to circulation ; we will watch circulation very closely. Now, just while we are discussing that, let me say that I have not yet found any country that deals as liberally with banks as Canada. I personally am finding no fault with permitting the banks to issue circulation for every dollar of paid-up capital. That is what we are doing. Any bank that has a paid-up capital, we will say of $5,000,000, is entitled at once, without any expense, without paying any tax to the country, without any burden imposed on it in any shape, manner or form, to issue notes to the extent of the paid-up capital of $5,000,000. No country under the sun permits it except Canada. Therefore, I say that when we permit it we should regulate it. There is only one method of doing that, and it is the method adopted by all other countries in which the government take the circulation into their own hands. When a bank comes to the government and shows that it has a paid-up capital of whatever it may be—one, two or three million—the government will issue to the bank a circulation. I am not complaining in regard to the security of our note circulation. We all know that the circulation is practically guaranteed by all the banks of this country, and that it is a first lien on the assets of the bank. Therefore, I say that the note holder is perfectly safe. We know that in England there is supervision of circulation. We know that notes issued by the Bank of England are secured by the actual gold, plus the amount due the bank by the British government ; so that notes in Great Britain have practically absolute security. I believe that in this Dominion of ours they have absolute security as well, although, if there were a demand to-day upon any one of the large banks for the redemption of their note circulation, they would have to scurry pretty well to redeem it.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). Did the Bank of England never fail?

Mr. PRINGLE. Once. But Great Britain passed stringent laws in regard to banking, and from that day to this the Bank of England and other banks are very closely watched and restricted, and we do not see the failures. Oh, the Bank of England did fail once ; at least, that is my recollection from reading the history of that institution. The notes of the United States banks, as we know, are secured by government bonds. That is an important difference between the two countries. A national bank desiring to do business with the United States has to deposit government bonds. When it has deposited these government bonds it is entitled to a circulation up to 90 per cent of their value. It does not get the free use of millions of dollars. These bonds are only bearing 2 per cent, and yet the national banks of the United States of America have been able to make money while paying their depositors 3½ to 4 per cent. They are re-

stricted in the amount of interest they can charge the borrower in the state of New York to 6 per cent, and in the majority of the states to 6 per cent, while in this country they are not restricted. If they have $5,000,000 capital they immediately get another $5,000,000, which is $10,000,000, and they can charge as high as 10, 12 and even 24 per cent on the double amount. There is the difference between the two countries in that respect. We have no government restrictions in regard to circulation. I know what the answer is. The answer is: You do not require it, because the Canadian Bankers' Association will look after that. We do know that the banks of this country have execeeded their circulation to an enormous extent and have brought about disaster. We have in Canada no reserve whatever for deposits. Critics of the American system must remember that when a man goes into a national bank, say in New York city, and deposits $1,000, $250 in gold is immediately put away to protect that $1,000. During the panic of 1907 there was not a bank in the United States that did not show that it had its deposit reserve on hand. Every depositor is protected at the start. I am not advocating that we should have that reserve, because I believe our depositors are fairly well protected by the security they have in the assets of the bank and the double liability of the shareholders.

We are often told that this banking system gives us great elasticity of currency and that the American system does not do so. It is a very strange thing then that the circulation in the United States of America is over $31.39 per head, while the circulation in Canada is $19.62 per head. I believe the day is coming when the government will assume control of the bank notes in this country and see our banks are kept absolutely within their rights. If our laws were so good in regard to these points, it does seem strange that no other country has copied the Canadian banking system either on this continent or in Europe.

I now come to the third suggestion, that is the making of provision as to the percentage of capital and reserve that may be loaned to any one borrower. The banker's answer is that we have a provision in the law by which the shareholders can limit that percentage. I say it is no answer, that the old law as it stood years ago is the best law, that we should have it on the statute book and limit that percentage. What occurred here a short time ago? The Sovereign Bank which was doing a good healthy business and which was reported in 1906 to be in a very flourishing condition, went to the wall, simply because they had loaned their whole capital to two concerns. They made two loans, practically out of the Dominion of Canada and when they came to get their money they could not and were obliged to go into liquidation. What harm would there be in limiting the banks of this country to 10 per cent of their capital and reserve as a loan to any individual or corporation? We saw the little Bank of Yarmouth loan her whole capital and reserve to one institution, and when that institution failed down went the Bank of Yarmouth and the people suffered; the shareholders lost practically everything. We find that for forty-three years the law in the United States has limited this percentage to 10 per cent.

I have been studying the banking laws of Japan, and I believe they are as modern and up-to-date as any in existence; but their Banking Act limits the amount that can be loaned to one borrower to 10 per cent paid up capital and reserve. Mexico, which has gone on gold basis and has taken the precaution to frame very modern banking laws, also limits the amount to be loaned to any one individual or corporation. If a similar amendment were made to our Banking Act, we would not have had the failure of the Sovereign Bank nor some other failures that have occurred in recent years, such as that of the Bank of Yarmouth. This is a point so well known, which has been so thoroughly considered by other countries which have adopted this limitation, that I think it is time we in Canada considered it, and put some limit on the amount a bank can loan to any one individual or corporation. We need only look back a few years to the time when the Ontario Bank got into trouble and had to reduce its capital by 50 per cent. That was caused by their lending all their capital to one concern in Toronto and I might mention other similar instances. We have incorporated a large number of banks in recent years. Many of these have gradually and quietly slipped out of existence. It is said: But the public did not suffer any loss. The public did suffer loss, the depositors suffered a loss of $4,928,096.50, and the shareholders lost every dollar they had invested in these banks. In the last few years we have had a large number of banks go out of existence, some of which would not have failed if we had had this restriction. It is only a year ago that the Canadian Bank of Commerce, probably requiring more capital to speculate in Dominion Coal and Steel, got their eye on the Merchants Bank of Prince Edward Island, with a capital of $350,400 and assets of over $3,000,000, and absorbed it. They treated the shareholders well, giving them 93 per cent profit on their shares. A prominent gentleman from Prince Edward Island, only two or three days ago, told me that it was a sad day for Prince Edward Island when the Bank of Commerce took over the Merchants Bank, that they could not get the accommodation from the Canadian Bank of Commerce that they got from the Merchants Bank. I say the policy of

the banks is a policy of absorption; the large banks are absorbing the smaller ones, and becoming a larger and stronger trust every day. It would be a wise precaution and a wise provision to amend our Banking Act and provide, as is provided by the American Consolidation of 1906, that not more than 10 per cent of the paid up capital and reserve may be loaned to any one individual or corporation. Such an action would be welcomed by the shareholders of the banks and by the depositors as well. I do not think it would be objected to by most of our banks, although those who require money for speculative purposes would no doubt object to it.

We should also have a limitation as to the percentage that may be loaned to the combined directors. In the old days, there was a limitation that only one-twentieth of the discounts should be loaned to directors. I have pointed out that strong ground was taken in England in renewing charters to the banks and that provision was retained until the bankers succeeded in eliminating it some years ago.

I now come to one of the most important suggestions I have to make, that is the limitation of the amount of interest for which banks can contract. We have, as is well known, a clause in our Bank Act which says:

> The bank may stipulate for, take, reserve or exact any rate of interest or discount, not exceeding seven per centum per annum, and may receive and take in advance any such rate, but no higher rate of interest shall be recoverable by the bank.

But we also have in the Revised Statutes of Canada the following provision:

> Except as otherwise provided by this or by any other Act of the parliament of Canada, any person may stipulate, allow and exact on any contract or agreement whatsoever, any rate of interest or discount which is agreed upon.

Now, we are in this position in the Dominion of Canada to-day, that if our banks see fit to create a shortage of money in this country, they can contract for any rate of interest they see fit. How has that come about? We had usury laws pertaining to our banks for many years; but our bankers, not satisfied with the privilege which the people of this country gave them of issuing dollar for dollar to the full amount of their paid-up capital, worked away until they got eliminated from the Bank Act all penalties in regard to usury, and to-day they can charge any rate of interest they see fit. It has been said to me, none of the banks contract for any higher rate of interest than 8 per cent. That is absolutely untrue. The records show that the banks will go into a town in western Canada and fix their rate there at one per cent a month. I venture to say that the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Thompson) will tell this House that the banks have charged the men who require money for the purpose of developing the mines in that country as high as 24 per cent. We have the evidence in cases which have gone through our courts, that 24 per cent is a common charge in the western country. Now, should that be permitted in this country? I do not want to go into a long dissertation on usury. We could go back to the old Roman days, when money lenders were permitted to charge high rates of interest, until the people of Rome were almost ruined, when they passed laws limiting the rate to 8 per cent. Coming up, century after century, we find that country after country protected its people with usury laws. Our neighbours to the south have a system of usury laws prevailing from one end of the country to the other. They have a provision in the National Banking Act, prohibiting any bank from charging more than the rate that may be fixed by the state in which it does business and the different states fix reasonable rates of interest. The producer in this country works under a great handicap when he is charged a high rate of interest; he cannot afford to pay eight, ten or twelve per cent on the money he uses in the work of production, and compete with the producers of other countries who get their money at a lower rate. In the United States the question of the rate of interest which can be charged by the national banks has been well settled by the supreme court. I might mention the rates of interest to which the national banks and the state banks are limited in some of the states of the union: Connecticut, 6 per cent; Delaware, 6 per cent; Kentucky, 6 per cent; Maryland, 6 per cent; Missouri, 6 per cent; New Hampshire, 6 per cent; New Jersey, 6 per cent; New Mexico and Indian Territory, 6 per cent; New York, 6 per cent, except on call loans, which are usually for stock purposes, for $5,000 and over, with collateral, on which any rate may be charged; Tennessee, 6 per cent; Vermont, 6 per cent; Virginia, 6 per cent; Washington, 6 per cent; West Virginia, 6 per cent; and so on through the list. Now, Sir, if the banks in the United States, which put up government bonds for 90 per cent of their value for all the notes they put into circulation, are limited to 6 per cent, why should the banks of this country, which have the privilege of issuing notes to the full amount of their paid-up capital, be permitted to charge our people any rate of interest they can squeeze out of them? I say it is unreasonable, and the time has come, notwithstanding what the Bankers' Association says, that we should go back to the old usury laws which we had in this country until the bankers had them eliminated from our banking laws. The subject of usury charged by national banks

received consideration by the United States Supreme Court in the case of the Farmers' and Mechanics' Bank of Buffalo vs. Deering, and the decision was: where a national bank makes a loan at a usurious rate of interest it can recover the principal only, the interest being forfeited. Where a usurious rate of interest has actually been paid double the amount so paid may be recovered in an action brought within two years. Let us look at the records of one or two of the cases in this country. Take, for instance, the case of the Canadian Bank of Commerce vs. Macdonald. In that case the rate of interest charged varied from 18 to 24 per cent, and the court held that the bank had a right to charge it, because the borrower had agreed to it, because it was a voluntary contract, and judgment was entered against Macdonald. In 1905 we passed what was called the Money Lenders' Act, in which we restricted the ordinary Shylock to 12 per cent; but we took good care that that Act did not cover the banks. The banks were afraid that we were going to put them on the same basis as the ordinary Shylock; but that Act left them free to charge by voluntary contract any rate they saw fit. Now, I want to be perfectly fair in regard to this matter. I believe the great majority of our banks in this country do not attempt to do that class of business, but are satisfied to get from their borrowers a reasonable rate of interest; but I do say that we should not leave it in the power of any bank to charge an exorbitant rate of interest to the producers of this country. I might just say so that there will be no question about this, if a bank charges its debtors account with interest in excess of 7 per cent, the debtor is entitled to recover the excess. If, however, the debtor voluntarily pays the excessive interest over 7 per cent, such as by giving his cheque to the bank for such excess as shown by the bank's monthly statement, he cannot recover back the excess.

That was the decision in the Canadian Bank of Commerce vs. McDonald. There were also a number of other cases which went through our courts, but in each the courts followed the decision in the Bank of Commerce vs. McDonald and the Bank of British North America vs. Bossuth in the latter of which 24 per cent was charged a number of years and then 18 per cent.

From 1893 to 1897 we had a depression, the result of which was an increased amount of money. Our banks got loaded down with money and the Finance Minister properly reduced the rate of interest to depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank. Of course we know that the government rate controls the bank rate, but if the rate of interest to depositors was reduced in 1897 owing to the surplus of money, now that money is scarce it would only be fair to put the rate back where it was before the reduction. I hope that the government will give special consideration to this suggestion with regard to usury. I know of my own knowledge many hard working business men who have been held up year in and year out for 9 per cent and 10 per cent for the money they require in their business. No business man in this country can succeed and pay those high rates. No manufacturer can be successful and pay exhorbitant rates of interest in this country when his neighbour to the south cannot be compelled to pay higher than 6 per cent.

There are other suggestions I would like to make, but I have taken up more time than I anticipated. I would ask the Finance Minister to consider the question of branch banks. We have to-day gone ahead at an enormous rate in establishing branch banks. No bank should have the right, the moment it starts business, to establish branches all over the Dominion for the purpose of gathering in money from the different localities and sending it to the head office. Should this system continue, we shall have what occurred in the United States and was there subsequently prevented, namely, an enormous monopoly in the hands of two or three banks. Limit the number of branches of a bank according to its capital. If it has $14,000,000 paid up capital, give it the right to have more branches than a bank which has a capital of perhaps half a million or a million dollars. I do not think it is good policy in this country to have these branch banks spread out all over the Dominion. What occurs under it? Take a small bank to-day—and our small banks are doing good work; I know of small banks in my own community which are giving greater assistance to the people there than the larger institutions—and what occurs? The moment a small bank starts a branch out in a village the big bank puts in a competing branch to prevent the other doing business. There should be a limitation put on the number of branch banks.

There is another suggestion I would make. Our banks are tying up millions of dollars in real estate—in brick and mortar. That is not done in any other country. Take the banking laws of the United States and of every other country under the sun except ours, and you will find that there the banks are looked upon as public utilities for the purpose of taking care of the small savings of the people and distributing them in loans for commercial and business purposes. In the United States for forty-three years they have prevented their banks from tying up their assets in real estate. They have a very stringent provision with regard to investments by banks in real estate. That provision is this:

A National Banking Association may purchase, hold and have real estate for the fol-

lowing and no other purposes. First, such as shall be necessary for its immediate accommodation in the transactions of its business.

And so on. In like manner our banks should be limited absolutely to investments in real estate necessary for their own business. But we see every day one bank putting up a million dollar building in this or that city and another following suit. Only Saturday night I read in the papers that a million dollar building of the Canadian Bank of Commerce in the city of Montreal was just about completed. A few days before I read of a beautiful building for the same bank in Saskatoon and of a magnificent building going up in the city of Toronto. Millions and millions of dollars thus being tied up by the banks in brick and mortar throughout the country. Is it then any wonder that our banks had to come begging to the government for money to assist them in moving the crops?

I may be wrong, but I view this matter as one of great public importance. The thoughts to which I have given expression I venture to say are passing through the brain cells of thousands of people in this country. The people are alive to this situation and are wondering why the government does not act. They want to know whether the government is, as reported, absolutely under the control of the Canadian Bankers' Association. I may be told: Leave this until 1910. But, Mr. Speaker, I may not be here in 1910. I am here to-day, and I believe that, in what I am advocating, I am speaking in the public interest. Why should we leave it until 1910? We are incorporating six new banks this session. Let us amend our laws so that the people who are taking stock in those banks—and it is mighty hard to get anybody to take stock in banks to-day because they do not think our laws are strict enough—may be protected. Our people have seen too many bank failures. They have seen too many banks wiped out of existence.

I say, let us amend our banking law to-day before we launch these six other banks upon the country. At our revision in 1900, there was quite a list of banks. What has become of them? Where have they disappeared to? Many of them are out of business; many have been absorbed by larger banks. This latter process has been going on ever since we incorporated the Canadian Bankers' Association. I have had shareholders in small banks say to me: We are afraid of that Canadian Bankers' Association; it seems to be powerful enough to take over any bank at any time. And it is—there is no question about it. The Act incorporating the Canadian Bankers' Association went through this House without any criticism whatever. That association took to itself powers which, some day, the people of this country may find, are not in the public interest. Now, let us see what has become of some of the banks which were in existence in 1900. The Banque Ville Marie had suspended a short time before that, and was in process of liquidation, but it is still included in the schedule. The Bank of Yarmouth suspended March 6, 1905. The Halifax Banking Company was absorbed. And by whom? By the Canadian Bank of Commerce—probably wanted more money for Dominion Coal and Dominion Steel. The Exchange Bank of Yarmouth was absorbed by the Bank of Montreal; the Commercial Bank of Windsor was absorbed by the Union Bank of Halifax; the Bank of Summerside was absorbed by the Bank of Nova Scotia; the Merchants Bank of Prince Edward Island was absorbed by the Canadian Bank of Commerce; the assets of the Bank of British Columbia were purchased by the Canadian Bank of Commerce. The Ontario Bank is out of existence; the Sovereign Bank is out of existence. What encouragement is there to incorporate a small bank? The small bank has no power to-day to resist the Canadian Bankers' Association. By amending the law, we can give the small banks a chance for existence.

Now, it will be said to-morrow, 'Pringle has attacked the banks' Pringle has not attacked the banks. Pringle believes that public confidence is absolutely necessary for the success of our banks. I am ready to state that a large precentage of our banks are in a splendid position. I believe that the depositors of these banks are as safe as are the noteholders. But I believe we shall create greater confidence in our banks if we show the people that we are not controlled by the Bankers' Association, but that, as public representatives, we are ready to adopt amendments which will protect the shareholders and depositors of our banks and be of advantage to the producers of this country who may require banking accommodation. I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will see his way clear to accept my suggestions and to allow this matter to go to the Banking and Commerce Committee to be thoroughly threshed out there.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). If one gives heed to what one sees in the daily newspapers and to some of the articles in the financial press, he must reach the conclusion that our bankers regard themselves as a class above criticism either by the people, the press or parliament. No sooner does a member of parliament make any observations on the banks than at once a certain class of the press speak of him in the most uncomplimentary terms as attacking the banks, as doing something shortsighted, improper, something that no public man should be guilty of doing. Now, banks —what are they? They are one of our public utilities, and, no doubt, intended for

a good purpose. But they are liable to do wrong, as other corporations are, and they must submit to the same criticism and to the same control by law as other public utilities. Any man who fears to criticise the banks, just as he would an insurance company, a railway corporation or a loan company, is wanting in moral courage. He should not be intimidated by the criticisms of the press holding him up to contumely and contempt for demanding that these corporations shall serve the public. But the money changers, from the time when they were driven out and scourged with cords at Jerusalem, down to the present, and in every age and every country, appear to think that they own creation, or somehow control it; that they are above criticism, and must be, as they say, left alone and not interfered with. We criticise loan companies and put them under legal restrictions and compel them to be subject to inspection and to make periodical returns under oath. We do the same with regard to railway corporations and with regard to insurance companies and other corporations which serve the public. Why cannot we, with equal propriety, do this with regard to the banks. In my judgment, we ought to. Our banking system is said to be the finest in the world. I frankly confess that my limited examination of it has convinced me that, while it is comparatively good, it is not only not the best but it is very much below the best in the world. Here is a strange commentary on this statement of the perfection of our banking system: In 1880, we had 41 chartered banks in Canada; in the meantime, the country has increased 50 per cent in population; and what increase has there been in our banks ? The number to-day is 36—five less than the number of thirty years ago. What has become of the banks ? Some have failed, some of the smaller ones have been absorbed by the larger. And the result is that these larger banks have been working themselves up to a monopolistic position, so that, to-day, they practically control the smaller banks.

To effect that purpose, a few years ago they formed the Banking Association, that has helped them a great deal. No doubt it was intended for a good purpose, but it has not worked out wholly as it was intended. I say that law tends to make a monopoly of the banking system, and to keep the smaller banks down and absorb them, thereby keeping in the hands of the stronger banks the control of the circulating medium of the country. While the population has increased nearly 50 per cent, the banks have not increased 6 per cent. Twelve of them have failed during the last twenty years, others have had to amalgamate to be kept alive. Although 25 per cent of our banks have failed inside of twenty years, still we say we have the best banking system in the world. In the United States during the same time only 5 per cent of their banks have failed, while 25 per cent of our banks have failed. Does that not suggest that there is something wrong in our banking system as compared with the American banking system ? In my judgment the banking system of Japan is far ahead of ours, and in many respects the banking system of the United States is ahead of ours, though behind it in other respects.

Now, here is a proposal to amend our banking system in some respects. What are banks for ? Banks are public utilities, operated under special charters, which confer upon them certain powers and rights which are denied to all others members of the community, powers and rights out of which they make immense wealth. In consideration of the powers we give them they are supposed to serve the people as public utilities in providing a circulating medium. That is their first duty to the people. We give them power to receive deposits from poor people who are not in a position to invest their money profitably in other channels, and we surround these banks with laws which are to make them a safe depository for the public. Then we give the banks power to loan at a high rate of interest money they have received from the investors at a very low rate of interest. And here I wish to say that the government have joined hands with the banks in making them a financial monopoly to the detriment of the poor people, because the only place where the poor people can invest their money is in the government savings bank. A few years ago, at the instance and upon the pressure of the banks, the rate of interest paid by the government was reduced to three per cent in order to enable the banks to compel the people to invest their money with them at three per cent. Why did the government compel the poor people to lend their money to the banks at three per cent—I say compel them, because these people are not in a position to invest their money with safety anywhere else. On the other hand, the government allow the banks to loan out that same money at a rate of interest, as my hon. friend has said, even as high as 25 per cent in some cases, and there is no law to control them. There are two clauses in the Banking Act under which it is supposed that may be done, and one is entirely misleading. Clause 61 says :

> Banks may stipulate for, take, receive and exact any rate of interest or discount, not exceeding 7 per cent per annum, but no higher rate of interest shall be recoverable by the bank.

Now that would seem to be a law, the violation of which would imply punishment, but does it ? What does clause 52 say :

> No promissory note, bill of exchange or other security shall be void, usurious or tainted with usury as regards such bank.

In other words, on a note, bill of exchange or other security they may charge any rate of interest they like, and it is not tainted with usury.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Do not the provincial laws protect them ?

Mr. SPROULE. No, a province has no right to pass a usury law, that can only be done by the Dominion parliament. I say that the government has joined with the banks to force people to put their money in the banks at 3 per cent, because there is no other safe place where they can put it, and then you allow the bank to loan that same money at 25 per cent. The poor man only receives 3 per cent interest, but what is the rich man allowed to receive who owns stocks in these banks? According to the 'Canada Gazette,' giving a statement of the last dividends distributed by the banks, the Bank of Montreal distributed 10 per cent; the Bank of New Brunswick, 12 per cent; the Bank of Quebec, 7 per cent; the Bank of Nova Scotia, 12 per cent; Molsons' Bank, 10 per cent; the Bank of Toronto, 10 per cent. I might go over the list, and they run all the way from 12 per cent down to 6 per cent, I think one or two below. Now is that fair to the general community? In my judgment it is not. I think it is a great injustice to the poorer people. Then, again, why should the government join with the banks to make them a monopoly in controlling the financial resources of the country? Why should the government not offer the poor man four or five per cent for his money and then they could get all the money they needed to carry on the affairs of the country? Why should not the government pay the poor man 4 or 5 per cent instead, of paying the Bank of England 5 per cent for money on their overdrawn account? Why should that be? If the government paid the poor man 4 or 4½ per cent to-day they would have all the money they required for the needs of the country, even to the renewing of maturing loans, and they would be paying a high rate of interest to the poor man instead of paying to the bankers and capitalists of England 4, 5 and 6 per cent. That is bad policy, and it is an injustice to the poor people of this country. It is bad policy for this government. It is no encouragement to industry, economy and frugality. We give the banks these great powers. We give them power to stamp a piece of paper and sell it for money; to take a piece of paper, four and a-half inches wide and eight inches long, stamp it and sell it for $100, and the day it goes out of their possession, no matter in what part of the world it goes, it is earning interest for them. What other individual in the country do we give such powers to? In my judgment, the government should issue the money themselves, sell it to the banks and receive some return for the money that we give them the power to issue by way of circulation. They put out a hundred-dollar bill which does not cost them five cents, and they get that $100 out at interest as soon as the bill is sold. If the bill is torn up, or destroyed, or lost, it is $100 in their coffers for ever. They have the benefit of it. We give them this power in order that they may serve the people. For every dollar of paid-up capital that they have we give them power to issue another dollar, and they are thus enabled to stamp their bills and extend their circulation for different purposes. Do they supply the needs of the people? I ask, if during last summer, they supplied the needs of the people? Ask anybody in any industrial line operating in Canada if the banks supplied the ordinary commercial needs of the country with the necessary circulating medium to carry on business. Not at all; the best men in the country were crippled and curbed in their operations. I was talking to a man in Winnipeg. The banks begged this man only a short time before to give his account to them. He was a man engaged largely in trade, but he did not use the banks because he was tolerably well off, and he did not choose to do business through them. There were two or three banks running after this man offering to give him any limit of credit that he desired. At last he was induced to do business through one of these banks. He was only there a few months and he had a limit of credit of $40,000 or $50,000. He wanted to extend his business a little more through the Northwest and British Columbia, and he wanted his limit of credit extended some $200,000 more. The company with which he was connected was perefctly sound, engaged in a commercial line and doing a splendid business. When he went to the bank and asked for an extension of his limit of credit the manager said: We cannot extend it; on the contrary, we would like to have it reduced to $50,000 and in a little while to reduce it still further. He said: You have been begging to get my account, and you were willing to give me a limit of credit up to $75,000 or $100,000 if I gave it to you. Now you want to reduce it. Therefore, he took the account out of the bank and went on and did his business in his own way. That is the way commercial people are treated by these corporations that are given these great powers in order that they may provide a circulating medium and have it available for the commerce of the country. See how the grain buyers of the Northwest were treated when they tried to buy the farmers' grain last fall. There was no money available, no matter what kind of security they offered, and for some unknown reason the banks curtailed their business, so that these men as well as the farmers, were hampered in their operations. I was up there for several weeks, and, to say the

least, the outlook was anything but hopeful; it was gloomy, because of the unwise conduct of the banks. Still, I frankly confess that I think they did some good by curtailing the loans which were going into real estate and other unproductive lines. The trade of the country was paralized because the money of the country was not available. It was not for that purpose that we gave the banks power to carry on their operations. They are expected, in duty bound, to serve the people, just as a railway corporation, a telegraph company, a tlephone company or any other of the great utilities of life that we give powers to, are expected to serve the people. They invite and receive capital and then afterwards they loan it out. They are to provide the circulating medium called money and make it available for the needs of the people. Many years ago I had occasion to say something in regard to the banks. I got a rather amusing retort from the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I said that if we gave a corporation the right to represent one of the utilities of life they should, in the highest sense of the word, do so. If you go to a railway it has to carry your freight or it has to carry yourself. If you go to a telephone company it is obliged to send your message and not to discriminate in favour of one or against the other. All these utilities of life are comparatively on the same line; but if you go to a bank, unless you can give it gilt-edged security, you can do no business with that bank. No utility is a utility that does not serve the great bulk of the people; and if the banks only serve a small percentage of the people, they are not fulfilling the functions for which we gave them their powers. We gave them these powers in order that they might serve the great bulk of the people. They say: We have no right to loan money to any one unless he can give us gilt-edged security. The hon. Minister of Finance said: I am afraid that the hon. member for East Grey, like myself, will always be a little hampered in his operations if he has not means enough behind him to get all the money he wants. I was going to say that it was a very wity retort, but I think, on it was a very witty retort, but I think, on deal in it. I was not speaking from personal experience, but I was speaking of what I know of the service given to the people of the country by one of the utilities to which we have given these powers so that it can serve the people. Whether I am right or whether I am wrong, I have always entertained the view that the banks, so long as we gave them the power to control the financial resources of our country, and not only the power to issue money, but the power to do with people as they like, the power to control the commercial operations of the country and the power to provide the circulating medium, should provide that circulating medium for the great bulk of the people. Why should they be willing to give it to the man who has $500,000 or $1,000,000 in stocks and bonds and refuse it to the farmer who has his hundred acres of land, which is probably worth $4,000, perhaps against which there is not a dollar in the world, and who has his stock and buildings? Yet he cannot go to the bank and borrow $25 to serve his needs, while this other man can get his $10,000 or $50,000 if he likes. A corporation to which we give the power to supply this circulating medium should supply it in some way or other so that it would be available for the needs of the great bulk of the people. Do the banks do so? Taking the people of Canada as a whole, the banks of the country do not serve over ten per cent of them, and in the rural districts they do not serve five per cent. I cited a case in this House only a few days ago which I may repeat here, so that it may be connected with the argument I am making; I spoke of a farmer of my acquaintance who owned 200 acres of land with a good brick house, fine barns and stables, large stock and everything else, who did not owe $200 in the world. He went to the bank and was refused a loan of $25 for two months without an endorser. Is that what the banks are for? In such a case a man has to go to the private banks which are not allowed even to call themselves banks, and pay 8 per cent, 10 per cent, or 12 per cent. But these private banks are of more use to him than the chartered banks because he gets the advance on his own note, which serves his purpose for the time being. He gets it for any reasonable period he likes and it is renewable at the end of that term if needed with out endorsation. The banks in acting in this way are not fiulfilling the purpose for which they were incorporated. Most people have not any large amount of stocks or other gilt-edged securities, but they are honest members of the community, who pay their debts and are as important factors in the life of the nation as the millionaire. They are doing the drudgery of life. If they save money they can get only 3 per cent from the banks, but if they wish to borrow money from the banks, they cannot get it unless they furnish security. The banks should in some way be available to these citizens in at least small amounts so long as they are honest, industrious, frugal and in the habit of paying their way. So long as the banks do not supply a circulating medium to the people of the country they are not fulfilling their purpose, and force many people to go to the private banks, or to usurious brokers or to the individuals loaning money as they do in all our large cities at usurious rates of interest, from 10 per cent to 60 per cent or even 100 per cent per annum.

We give the banks power to stamp notes and circulate them, putting out dollar for dollar for all their capital; but yet

they say you have no right to inspect us. Every public utilitty should be inspected, and surely it should not be impossible to devise some system of inspection of banks that would give a better guarantee than we have to-day. It should not be more difficult than to inspect insurance or railway companies.

Some years ago I joined with the Hon. Peter White in an effort to amend the Banking Act in several lines. One suggestion was to compel the banks to hand over to the state unclaimed balances lying in their hands for more than a certain time. That is, where an account had been kept in a bank, say by a man for his son or daughter to be given to the child on its attaining maturity, and by the accident of life that man should be taken away and no claimants should appear for the money, then it should be escheated to the Crown. Why should the bank have that money? Is it theirs? Members from Ontario will remember the discussion over the Mercer Escheats Bill there. Mr. Mercer died, leaving land, money, and goods and the property was escheated to the Crown because there were no heirs. Should not the same principle apply to money in the bank as to real property? However, the corporations were too strong and we could not get it.

We also desired to compel the banks to publish a statement of the money thus held in their hands unclaimed. They would not do it and we held up the Bill for nearly three weeks. Sir John Macdonald said to us once: You cannot get the House to consent to your proposed amendment, but the banks are willing to go half way and publish every five years a statement of the unclaimed balances in their hands, but they will not give them up. He explained that as they commenced to publish them this system would of necessity bring out a report every year, because the five years would be maturing each year and a new return would be necessary. We accepted this compromise although it was only a half way measure. What was the result? I have in mind a partner of my own who had been doing business for years in one of the banks. His account was closed, but afterwards, starting business for himself, he did business for years and years in that bank, and although visiting the bank every week or two, not a word was said to him about an unclaimed balance standing in his name; he first knew of it when the report of unclaimed balances was published. He then drew out the amount, which it is true was small, only some $27 or $28, but it was his money, not theirs. Why should they keep that from him? They had kept the account and kept it incorrectly; when they audited the account they saw the mistake, but still retained the money although he frequently visited the bank. I contend that these balances if unclaimed for a certain length of time should be turned over to the state periodically because they are not the property of the banks. In that respect we ought to amend the Bank Act. I agree entirely with the hon. member for Cornwall that banks ought to be subject to regular government inspection and scrutiny, and be surrounded by the same safeguards as any other public utility. Parliament ought to pass a law for that purpose, whether the banks like it or dislike it. There ought to be more stringent regulations in regard to circulation. If there were, we would not have had such occurrences as we had in the case of the Ville Marie Bank.

Mr. FIELDING. The law has been amended since that.

Mr. SPROULE. It has been, but it is not respected. We ought to provide that the government shall issue the money stamp and sell it to the banks. I see no reason why the banks should be allowed to stamp paper and call it money and get the full benefit of it. I think provision ought to be made in regard to the percentages of capital reserve which may be loaned to any one borrower. Provision ought to be made to restrict the loans of banks on stocks and other securities of that kind. Provision ought to be made to restrict the amount a bank may loan to its directors, because they can manipulate its resources in such ways as to loan to themselves to almost an unlimited extent, frequently bringing disaster to the bank and to those who invest their money in it or have its bills. We ought to limit the rate of interest on discounts which the banks may contract for, and we ought to revise the powers of the Bankers' Association. All moneys held by banks after a certain time, for which there is no claimant, should be passed over to the state. These moneys are not honestly theirs, and they have no more right to keep them than I would have to keep money loaned to me by another man if he died without any heirs. I would have to give the money up, but the banks can keep what they have. I think we ought to take power to issue bills and supply them to banks; we would then have them under better control than we have at the present time. I make these observations because I regard it as my duty to do so, not because I have any feeling against the banks. It is as pleasant a task for me to criticise the banks as it would be to criticise a loan company, a railway company, a telephone company, a telegraph company or any other great corporation that supply the utilities of life. I regard the one with no more fear than I regard the other, not one whit; and I would consider myself as wanting in moral courage or in regard for my duty

if I refrained from criticising the banks or any other corporations of the country when I thought they did wrong or that the laws should control them to a greater extent than they do at present.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON (Yukon). I would like to make a few observations on the question which has been brought up by my hon. friend from Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Pringle). In common with the other speakers, I have great faith in the banking system of Canada, born of the fact that it has stood the test, first in 1893, when we had a universal panic, and again last year, when we had even a greater panic. But recent happenings in our banking world have shown that banks are very human organizations, after all, and are liable to go wrong as in the Sovereign Bank failure and the Ontario Bank failure. In the case of the Sovereign Bank, I am informed that the shareholders will be called upon to pay a portion at least of the double liability. The history of the Ontario Bank's failure is so recent that it is hardly necessary to go into it; but it was, to say the least, not creditable to ourselves nor to our system. I have every belief that if we had had an independent audit system during these years, some of these failures might have been averted. I do not see why any legitimate banking institution should reasonably object to an independent audit made by a government officer. As my hon. friend from Cornwall has told us, Mr. H. C. McLeod, the general manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, advocates such a system. We have it for institutions which manage great trust funds, and I think we should have it for our banks. With regard to the investment of funds, I think it is a pretty well accepted canon in banking that a bank to be successful must keep its funds in as nearly a liquid state as possible. The recent failures of some very large banking houses and trust companies in the United States have been due to the fact that they did not discriminate between a mortgage and a bill of exchange. The nearest to a liquid state a bank's assets are kept, the more stable it will be—and the more useful, as my hon. friend from Hamilton suggests. That being the case, I do not think it wise for us to limit the field of investment. If you take up the stock list of the New York stock market, you will observe that there is not a very large list of Canadian stocks listed on the New York stock exchange. That being the case, money advanced on these stocks is not easily realizable in Canada. New York is the nearest place where money can be loaned in large quantities on call loans at a fairly large rate of interest, and that is why our banks send so much of their money there. But in the case of the Sovereign Bank of Canada, they violated that rule by investing a large portion of their funds in a railway in Alaska—a railway I never heard of until I came to Ottawa. No doubt it existed, no doubt a certain portion was built, and no doubt it had an ocean terminus, but what its Yukon inland terminus was, I have not the faintest idea. It would have to cross a mountain range and several long stretches of barren country before it could get into the town of Fairbanks, some 400 or 500 miles, and even when it arrived there, would not have enough freight to support it. I give that as a sample of a bank investing its money in assets, to say the least, not of a liquid nature. In fact they were rather congealed. They were liquid until the railway reached Alaska and suddenly became congealed.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. It went into liquidation, did it not?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes. My hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) has pointed out that in 1880 we had forty-one banks in Canada. According to the returns published by the government, up to December 31, 1907, we had thirty-five. Since then the Sovereign Bank has failed, and there are six new banks applying for incorporation. But according to this statement, there were thirty-five, and one has failed since, leaving thirty-four. So that there were forty-one in 1880 and thirty-four to-day. My hon. friend referred to the fact that in forty-three years, 17½ per cent of the state banks in the United States have failed as against 5 per cent of the inspected banks, which I must say, is a good argument. He also pointed out that 25 per cent of our banks failed. That, I think, is due to the fact that we have encouraged the branch system to such a large extent. There are to-day thirty-four banks in Canada, but they have an enormous number of branches from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The largest of our banks are following out an amalgamation policy which, I do not consider, is for the future welfare of this country. My hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) mentioned the Canadian Bank of Commerce. Let me give you three instances of that bank buying out other banks. It went down to British Columbia and bought the British Columbia Bank; it went to Prince Edward Island and bought out the Merchants Bank, and it went to Halifax and purchased the Halifax Banking Company. What is the accommodation to-day in these three centres? Formerly the people there had their local banks, and the merchants could go to their local banks, where their standing and character were well known, and get loans. But now that is changed. The managers in Prince Edward Island, Halifax and British Columbia are sent from the east. They do not know as much of the local business as did the staff of the old banks, and before they will advance a loan to any local man, they have to telegraph to Toronto and ask the head of the Bank of Commerce there whether they shall advance the money or not.

That is an absolute fact. I have a friend who for years banked with the Halifax Banking Company. His credit was absolutely sound, but in the month of November, when he went to ask for a small loan —a request that would never have been criticised a moment had the old company been doing business at Halifax—the new manager said: Well, I cannot give you this money right now. My friend asked why. Because, said the local manager, I have to telegraph to Toronto and ask the directors there whether I shall advance the money to you or not. That same thing is occurring in these other places I have mentioned. That is where the government should step in and see that this amalgamating process is not carried too far. I have no desire to lessen the stability of our system. Have our banking system as stable as possible, but on the other hand do not let it get into the hands of a few great corporations.

I have just glanced over the monthly bank statement published by the government and have totalled up the banks doing business in Canada, which have a paid-up capital of over $3,000,000 each. There are thirty-four banks in Canada altogether. These banks have paid-up capital of $92,995,482 and a rest account of $70,991,232, making a total of paid-up capital and rest of $163,796,714. Of these there are fourteen banks that control $130,000,000. Fourteen out of the thirty-five control $130,000,000 out of the $163,000,000. Of these fourteen banks the capital is $71,754,347 and the rest $58,310,866, or a total of $130,070,213. And these are the banks which to-day compose the Bankers' Association of Canada—that powerful corporation which my hon. friend mentioned a few moments ago.

My hon. friend referred to the rate of interest and incidentally mentioned the rate in the Yukon. Money is of course dear in all new countries. It is necessary, because of the kind of securities offered in these new countries, that the people there shall pay a large rate of interest, and usually they are willing to do that because of the value of money. But I have yet to know of any country or any section of this country except the Yukon where money costs 2 per cent per month or 24 per cent per annum on absolutely gild-edged security. That for years was the rate in the banks of the Yukon, notably the Canadian Bank of Commerce. To-day, ten or twelve years after that bank was established there, the rate is 18 per cent on ordinary security and 12 per cent on gilt-edged security. Of course it was impossible for the country to progress under the exhorbitant rate of 24 per cent, and the lawsuit to which my hon. friend referred was the outcome of that rate.

My hon. friend referred to the circulation of the banks. The total circulation of the banks of Canada at the end of September—that is their notes in circulation—was $77,504,398. On this amount the banks pay absolutely not one cent for the privilege of stamping the paper and making it money, as my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said. I do not think it would be well to restrict this, but I do think that the state should receive from the very valuable privilege they give these banks some return.

In looking up the matter, I found a lawbook in the library, the statutes of Canada, 31 Vict., chapter 11. I find that, in 1867, we taxed the circulation of the banks. The law says with relation to these banks that they shall——

—pay to the Receiver General a duty at the rate of one per centum per annum, on the average amount by which the bank notes therein mentioned as in circulation during the period for which statement is made have exceeded the average amount of the gold and silver coin or bullion which such bank has had on hand during the same period.

So you see taxation of circulation is not a new doctrine. If we were to do what we did in 1867, what amount should this taxation be levied on? The circulation of our banks is $77,504,398. They have deposited with the government against that circulation, as an insurance fund, $4,255,670, leaving $73,248,728. Take off the coin and specie which the bank allows, $25,119,474, and we have left as what might be considered as a legitimate source of revenue, $48,139,254. I do not think it would be wise to tax all that, but I do believe it would be a sound and legitimate proposition that these larger banks, whose circulation reaches into the millions—the Bank of Montreal, for instance, has in circulation $11,961,000, a colossal amount; the Canadian Bank of Commerce, $8,777,000; the Merchants' Bank of Canada, nearly $5,000,000—I say that these larger banks, which the state has fostered, which have prospered because of the banking laws we have passed for them, now that they have reached maturity and are piling up surplus, capital and rest, might reasonably be asked to contribute a share of those profits in the way of taxation on circulation, which is a valuable privilege which the government gives. I would oppose the idea that the circulation of young banks be taxed; for I think that banking is like most other lines of business, and the more competition you have the better, so long as it on a sound business basis. Why should not we interfere with the Bankers' Association? I do not see why we should regard it as a bogey. It is an association of men who are custodians and trustees of this great system of finance. We are having insurance companies before the Banking and Commerce Committee to give an account of their stewardship, and we are going to enact certain laws for the control of that business; we are going to say just when they shall be inspected and by whom. Why should not we do that with the banks,

because they also are custodians of the funds of the people?

I wish to say one more word in closing, which, while not exactly relating to the resolution of my hon. friend, does have a very important bearing on our currency system. The sooner we can make our gold coins in Ottawa, at the Royal Mint, the better for Canada. I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will, as soon as may be, erect a refinery at the mint, so that the gold shall be minted into coin and the coin circulated throughout the country. I have a feeling that this Bankers' Association is not very desirous that gold shall be minted in Canada, for for every five-dollar gold piece you get circulated there is one five-dollar note retired. It remains to be seen how much of this gold, when it is minted, will be absorbed. But we have the mint, we have the gold; and it seems to me that it is reasonable to ask that coins be made as soon as possible.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). I think that the members of the House are indebted to the three professional gentlemen who have taken the pains to study this question and who have given us their matured observations on this very important subject. The few remarks that I shall make are not intended as antagonistic to the observations of my hon. friend from Stormont (Mr. Pringle), many of which were interesting, some novel and some instructive. I rise rather to present the practical side of the case. My hon. friend from Stormont, and I think my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), will not contradict me when I say that they exhibited, very forcibly, as their manner is, the popular side of this question. And sometimes the popular side does not convey the whole truth. Perhaps people who have had practical acquaintance with the banking side of the question may be able to offer observations which would to some extent modify the extreme views expressed the other way. My hon. friend from Stormont gave a category of the causes which had led to the stringency of money. Perhaps he did not give all the causes. He said that wars had taken place in which there was a large expenditure of money. But the main cause of the stringency of money, both in the United States and Canada, was the expansion of commercial enterprise, the construction of material works and the absorption of large amounts of capital in the payment for railways, canals, steamships and other enterprises absorbing the fluctuating and floating capital of the country. It is quite true that money fluctuates—that is, that the apparent quantity of money varies, and that the rates of interest and the ease with which money is transmitted from hand to hand vary at different times. Five or six years ago, I believe, some well instructed bankers thought that money would long continue to be in excess and the rate of interest very low. I believe that some conservative bankers even invested considerable sums of money in consolidated stocks at a low rate of interest, because they could not exactly decide how much the rate of interest should be reduced. But according to circumstances, some of which were related by my hon. friend from Stormont and others, the amount of circulating capital was reduced and the necessity of business exceeded the supply of money. I think my hon. friend from Stormont gave us the complaint of some of the western and smaller banks and their customers, farmers and others, that they did not receive a sufficient quantity of money to carry on their business and meet their notes, because of the larger banks, more to the eastward, I suppose, not giving accommodation to these banks, in consequence of which the smaller banks were not able to give accommodation to their customers. The complaint came, I presume, from the customers of the smaller banks and from the smaller banks themselves. My hon. friend from Stormont (Mr. Pringle) went on to say that the western banks complained in this way, and that there was an advantage in the United States from the fact that the smaller banks were able to contribute more, and that the larger banks did not restrict them so much as in Canada. Mr. Henry Clews, of New York, wrote a letter, in which he stated that the stringency of money did not arise from the loans and business done in large cities, and especially in New York, but it arose from the fact that the smaller banks in the western states, and in the country generally, undertook to do more business than their capital warranted, and their demand was upon the New York banks for accommodation and for money upon the security of their stocks. Now, when we consider, we see that the larger banks in the great cities had responded to the commercial needs and the commercial necessities, and that it was not their fault that the money stringency occurred, but simply as a matter of prudence in restricting the operations of the western banks.

My hon. friend from Stormont went on to show the advantage of state banks over what might be called national or general banks. I think history does not bear him out in that respect as regards the United States. We all know that the banking system of the United States was inaugurated by Alexander Hamilton about the time the constitution was formed, and if we go back to about the term of General Jackson in 1833, we find he took all the money out of the bank of the United States and loaned it to the state banks. Their money was speedily absorbed, principally in western land speculations, and in the increasing commerce of that day, until about 1837 all the banks of the United States, and particularly the state and smaller banks were

involved in bankruptcy, and a great commercial stringency took place in the United States about the year 1837. If anybody cared to refer to it, and if he would refer to a speech made in 1837 in Niblo's Garden, New York, by Daniel Webster, and to the speeches and arguments in Congress about that time over the Sub-treasury Bill and the financial conduct of General Jackson, he would find a complete refutation of the theory advanced by the hon. member for Stormont, and of the history which he gave of money matters in the United States. I have not time at present to give those extracts, but I remember having read them less than forty years ago. They can doubtless be found in the Library.

My hon. friend from Stormont and my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) reiterated the opinion that the big banks, so-called, are in the habit of crowding the small banks and taking advantage of the latter's insufficient funds to minimize their business and restrict them in the freedom to make loans and discounts which they otherwise might have. As my hon. friend from Stormont held up the Bank of Nova Scotia as an exemplar bank on several accounts, I will take the liberty of referring him to the fact that no bank in the Dominion of Canada has pursued that course with more tenacity than the Bank of Nova Scotia. The Bank of Nova Scotia also has removed its headquarters from the city of Halifax to Toronto. As bankers naturally follow the trend of the demand for money, and where most interest is obtainable, the Bank of Nova Scotia pursued the demand for money wherever it could be pursued. They have conveyed sums of money from the east to the west. I believe in the account of their assets it will be found that they have advanced as much money to the United States as any other bank in Canada in proportion to its resources. But how did the Bank of Nova Scotia act? When the stringency came on the manager of the bank took great credit to himself for having increased his assets. What does that mean? He has increased his specie, he had diminished his discounts, he had called in some of his loans. Now was that a course of conduct that was commendable? Another bank has been attacked in rather strong terms by my hon. friend, I did not hear that it had pursued the same course. I heard on the contrary that it was rather generous in its discount, I heard that it stood by the commercial men, and had not drawn in its money, nor crippled any of the enterprises in which it was engaged. I may say that the conduct of some of the banks with which I am more familiar was the exact opposite of the conduct of the Bank of Nova Scotia. When that stringency came on, the directors made a resolve that they would take the public into their confidence, they restricted no man who could offer proper security, they stood behind their customers in all their legitimate wants, they charged to old customers no more than six per cent, and to new customers who had been thrown out of the Bank of Commerce and by the Bank of Nova Scotia and other model banks, they charged no more than seven per cent as a maximum. So far as the general argument goes, there is not time on the present occasion, neither do I think, without a prolonged debate could we enter into the minute details of the principles of banking as exemplified by the various institutions which have been paraded and have been denounced. It would require more time than is allowed in this debate to decide on various abstruse principles to debate them, and the course of the government with regard to banks.

As the hon. member for Stormont has suggested some notable improvements in the system of banking and in the Bank Act, let us run over those suggestions in detail and see how they would work. In the first place, the Bank of Nova Scotia has been highly commended, first on the declaration by the manager that he would approve of government inspection, and secondly on the fact that he had imported into the good old realm of Nova Scotia two Scotch experts to examine the assets and business of the Bank of Nova Scotia, and he prided himself expressly upon the fact that these gentlemen had come from Edinburgh. Well, now, there have been Scotch bankers before. There was Mr. Paterson who started the Bank of England; and there was John Law, who embarked in financial undertakings in France, a most eminent Scotch financier, I think. If inspectors of banks are required, there are just as goods accountants in Canada as can be found in Scotland from the Solway Firth to John O'Groat's house. But how would this work? I pity the bank that cannot trust its own officials. I say that if there is a bank who suggests that there should be some other species of inspection than by the appointed and paid inspector of the bank, look out for the manager of that bank. The inspector is paid specially for that purpose, he goes to the branches of the bank, he investigates the details of each one, he goes into their notes, he counts the money in every branch, he inquires into the character of those to whom money is loaned, and he makes a report of that, or ought to do so. He brings it to the bank, he reads that seriatim, confides all the necessary information to the directors, if they perform their duty.

If that is done there is no character of inspection that can take its place in any well managed institution. A man is set apart for that purpose. It is his object and duty to spy upon the officials of the bank and if there is any irregularity on the part of any one he goes to the fountain head and reports it to the president and directors. Then

they will take prompt steps to remedy the difficulty whatever it may be. How would a government inspector act? Would one government inspector have the time to go to every branch bank, count all the money, look at every note, inquire into the circumstances of every customer, look at the endorser as well as at the maker of the note and perform all the other duties that would be connected with his office? If the government inspector were to go to the bank to inquire into its capital what is to prevent funds being telegraphed ahead from some branch bank and thus make the money go around the whole circle? You would have, to make it absolutely secure without the possibility of loss, to have a simultaneous inspection of every agency of each bank. Then there would be no possibility of funds being transferred; then there would be no possibility of assets not being there and there would be no possibility of money not being on hand when required. Unless that were to be accomplished by the appointment of government inspectors the whole thing would be as great a farce as the importation of two Scotch terriers to be put in every bank. What does this involve? It involves the appointment of twenty government inspectors, if not forty, at high salaries, and the work would possibly not be as well accomplished by these gentlemen as by trained experts brought up in the bank with the welfare of the bank at heart and working with the full knowledge and co-operation of those in authority to ferret out any transaction that called for investigation in any branch of the bank.

In the government return which is published, the hon. gentleman said, that there was shown an excess of money sent by the banks to the United States and other foreign countries. In the bank returns are included all the bills of exchange forwarded by the banks to foreign countries. Therefore the belief that a large amount of money is annually sent out of the country to the United States and elsewhere is a fallacy. From the gross amount has to be deducted all foreign bills of exchange which are forwarded by the banks.

The second topic upon which my hon. friend remarked was that of loans to directors. In a well regulated bank—I do not know what they do in Toronto and other centres—there is a regulation that there shall be no more money loaned to any director than to any other customer of the bank and that it shall be loaned in the very same way. Banks are very anxious to get men with large business interests in because they bring business with them. If a director had $100,000 worth of notes, if he were doing business through the bank, he might appear to have loans to that amount when as a matter of fact he would not have one dollar. In the business which a man brings into the bank you have the wealth and status of the individual himself, and the money which is notable in the return of loans to bank directors is, in all likelihood, customers' paper brought from all over the country, so that the amount of money loaned to bank directors is infinitesimal in proportion to their wealth and resources. Again, there may be a limitation upon the loans to directors, but if you have a board of capable, honest men they will limit the amount of loans to themselves. You could not fix any definite amount. A large bank with $12,000,000 of capital might be able to loan ten per cent to a director or to one concern or enterprise. Ten per cent in a small bank would be an insignificant amount and no accommodation at all. The reason why small banks are declining is that they are not adequate to the business enterprises of the country. The expansion of business and the large amounts which are invested in undertakings require banks with large capital. The small banks are not adequate to such business. That has had a tendency towards amalgamation. If the amalgamation is carried out properly, if the original design, intention and methods of business are adhered to, if the larger banks afford accommodation to the community which the smaller banks serve such an amalgamation is desirable. For that reason bankers are approving of such amalgamations even though the number of banks may be less than the number of smaller banks that were crippled in their resources and operations from the fact that they had not enough capital to sustain the operations when they were once embarked upon. When there is a prospect of loss there is considerable difficulty in maintaining the enterprise and nothing is more fatal to a bank, or to the commercial community, or the public at large, than banks with inadequate resources to meet the demands of business. The difficulty with those banks that have been mentioned, the cause of their overthrow, their loss or misfortune, has been that their managers speculated. The managers took the funds. When the manager gets to such dimension that his head outruns the proportion of his body and when he thinks he owns the bank and the public there is grave trouble not far off. Another step is that the manager gets so big that he appoints creatures of his own as directors; he gets them under his control; he dictates to them his policy and they hardly know that their lives are there own. We know how offensive it is to have a magnate who relies simply upon his purse power, who thinks that he is the bank to whom all must bow down and who, when he is supposed to put his watch dogs on as directors, simply puts on those who really are his puppets whom he is able to elect and to control, and when a bank gets into that condition it is on the rocks. The On-

tario bank has been mentioned. It is unfortunate that most all these banks that have succumbed are in Toronto, or in Ontario, and I must confess that the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Pringle) has a more practical acquaintance with the conduct of banks in that vicinity than I have, because I know very little about them. All he has said about the conduct of the banks of that province, about extorting usurious interest from the farmers, is no doubt due to the fact that from the circumstances they were compelled to adopt these methods. I believe that the Ontario Bank was wrecked by the manager speculating with the funds of the bank in New York. There was not a sufficient or a proper oversight on the part of the president and the directors. I believe that the case is in court. It is disputed whether the president and directors were cognizant of what the manager was doing. But the bank was not wrecked by money loaned to the directors; it was not wrecked by loans which legitimately are made by the management, but it was wrecked because the manager took the funds to New York and speculated with them. That has not always been condemned in Canada. Some years ago a gentleman who is regarded as a great financier took a considerable portion of the funds of the Bank of Montreal, went to New York during a period of financial stringency when money was at a high rate of interest, he succeeded, the bank received a large accession to its reserve by his manipulation and I do not know whether he was knighted soon after or not. In one case the benighted manager of the Ontario Bank was condemned and put in prison and on the other hand I believe the knighted manager of the Bank of Montreal occupies a castle in Scotland or somewhere. Circumstances alter cases.

A great duty also rests on the shareholders and it should be exercised by them. The shareholders go into a meeting of a bank or public institution like a flock of sheep. If the manager or president of a bank frowns on them they hardly dare to open their mouths. A statement is read out or printed and put before them: Take it or leave it—and if any one opens his mouth he feels like Oliver Twist when he asked for more. They tell him that it is not in the interest of the bank that any such disclosures should be made, that they know what is necessary to be published and that the dividend will be paid when the proper time comes. The shareholders should look to their own interest and to the interest of their fellow shareholders and should inquire into everything that seems to need explanation or to be suspicious. If the shareholders of banks did their duty at the annual meeting, there would be fewer failures. It may be popular and fashionable to blame managers and directors and presidents or other officials but the blame in the first

Mr. W. ROCHE.

place lies in the incapacity of the shareholders, and sometimes their cowardice in not backing up those who know where there is some circumstance in which the bank is at fault and assisting them to elicit full information. They allow him to be bull-dozed and put out of court because they do not support him in their inquiries. When I was much younger than I am now, I attended a bank meeting. There were some things that did not please me, and I asked a question. The gentlemen who sat around me began to look at me through their glasses; the manager replied in an off-hand and cavalier way and there was a little controversy. I was a little rash in doing it and probably had I been as old as I am now, I would not have done it. Still it was a misuse of the power of the shareholders and a similar misuse has led the managers of banks into any excesses they may have committed and has put banking on a different foundation from what it was in the good old days.

Another point on which my friend spoke, and spoke very well, was that circulation might be kept within proper legal limitations. He did not say how he would limit that, or what proportion the circulation should bear to the capital. Further on he gave some details on that point but did not decide that proportion. Our bankers wish to know what is the due proportion between circulation and the amount of capital. We know there is a remedy after the over-circulation has been in excess but what would that remedy be? The present system is to fine a bank which is over-circulated. The bank may become over-circulated through inadvertence. When the returns are received from a number of branches it may be found that the total circulation is over the limit. If that is correctly reported to the government the amount is known and the bank is fined in proportion to the amount of excess circulation. I know that managers are most anxious to keep their circulation within the prescribed and legal limit. There is no subject which gives more anxiety to bankers than that, to observe the law and prevent the government imposing any fines. They are anxious not to pass that indication of security and safety, for if a bank does so the fact is promptly pounced on by other banks and held up to show that such and such a bank is outrunning its reserves, that it may be crippled, and before long the bank gets into Queer Street. The hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Pringle) gave some instances of the banking system in England and other general matters. I shall not go on to argue upon his theory of the government issuing currency. In the United States that system was declared to be disastrous and mischievous; it was declared that banks should not be a department of the government. The exercise of the power of is-

suing currency we know was attended by great loss in the United States. In consequence of war, or unforeseen contingencies, great changes may arise, and we know that American currency depreciated 50 per cent during the war. The best financier in the United States declared that the government issue of money should be restricted, that there should not be an unlimited issue of currency to meet all the requirements of the country; but as this is a subject which is extremely recondite and involves many arguments pro and con, I shall not take up any more time in referring to that branch of the subject.

How are you to remedy excessive circulation? The way in which it restores itself is by limitation and by adjustment with some other locality. The first object of the bankers is to place it on a sound foundation. It is to the interest of the bank that as promptly as possible it should secure a favourable balance, that the circulation shall not exceed the legal amount and that is the best security in the world the desire that the government may not trammel them by legal action; and an effort is made in all branches to limit the circulation.

On the other hand the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Pringle) and the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) have complained that banks have not enough money for their customers, that their circulation is up to the limit, they have not further license to extend and they must restrict their loans to some old customers and shut out new ones. What remedy can be suggested for that? The only remedy suggested is to suspend the charter of the bank.

Mr. SPROULE. One would be in times like that that they should not have so much of their money out on call loans on Wall Street.

Mr. W. ROCHE. My hon. friend will see that there are the shareholders. The shareholders require interest, they do not put their capital in for fun. They do not establish or conduct Utopian banks such as my friend suggests, where every one who wants to borrow money can get it whether he has any security of his own or not.

Mr. SPROULE. When banks are given charters and power to issue money and provide circulating medium, is it not for the people of this country and not for the investment of foreign countries? When we find in a time of stringency such as last summer, that there is $63,000,000 or $65,000,000 on call in Wall Street, it suggests the thought that that amount circulated in Canada would mean an ample supply for this country.

Mr. W. ROCHE. You know that some years ago capital was in excess; the banks were seeking investment and they will always tend towards the demand centre where the interest is greatest; they will send the money to New York, to the West or wherever it earns most interest. Their shareholders must be paid. The consequence is that money is fluctuating, sometimes there is an excess of money on hand when, as they say, money is a drug, and then cases of stringency arise suddenly. If money were kept for these eventualities, the paying power of money would be very much reduced, and in the places where money was required for circulation and business enterprise, there would be no sufficient quantity of it. It is by adjusting the bare spots to the full spots that banks make money, and by using a circulating medium in the business enterprise of the country.

Mr. PRINGLE. Would the hon. gentleman then say that the banks would be justified in having $63,000,000 on loan in Wall street provided they could get a little higher rate of interest, rather than in using that money for the purpose of moving the crops in Canada?

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). If it were known positively that the $63,000,000 were required for moving the crops of this country at a certain time, and if the amount of interest paid for that would be equal to the amount paid in the other case, I think that any patriotic bank in Canada would lend the money in Canada. But the banks could not know that $63,000,000 would be required to move the crops any more than the American banks knew what would be required in the west. The demands came on them suddenly. The ressources of the smaller banks were absorbed, and they had to draw on the great banks. The great banks have to provide for the demands made on them by the branches, and in order to discriminate with regard to the amount required, a large amount of reserve must be kept. But the difficulty confronting a bank is to know how and when and where the money would be required. For that reason its officers have to use their foresight and their trained faculties, and so reserve and apply the money that it will produce the best results to the customers and to the bank. I do not rise as a defender of the banks, but only to give some counterpart of the statement and some views on the other side. The banks have a patriotic regard to the interests and wants of the country, and are disposed to serve them. The complaint has been made that the banks have a large amount of money invested in banking premises. They must have buildings which will advertise their business, which will afford adequate accommodation for their clerks and for all the apparatus necessary for carrying on the business, which will be commensurate with the wealth and reputation of the cities in which they do business, and which will be creditable in archi-

tectural proportions. I believe the banks have invested more money in buildings than the returns show, because they have all adopted the policy of writing down their real estate. I think the banks in the west have permission to lend money on the security of real estate, under certain restrictions. In the eastern provinces, I believe, no greater rate is asked than 6 or 7 per cent. If usurious rates of interest are charged, that is not the case in the eastern provinces. I yield to the practical knowledge of my hon. friend from East Grey and my hon. friend from Cornwall with regard to the rates exacted from the farmers and others; but in our eastern banks good commercial paper is taken universally at 6 per cent, though new customers in times of stringency are charged 7 per cent, but no higher. My hon. friend from East Grey went a little further afield than the usually restricted area of banking, and took up the public needs, claiming that the public are allowed only 3 per cent on deposits, while they are charged 12 per cent on loans by the western banks, and the banks have paid dividends of 10 or 12 per cent. My hon. friend should remember that it is not from the capital of the bank direct that all the money is made. The money accumulated by the banks is frequently from balances acquired in years long past. A bank has to pay an expensive manager, a large staff of clerks, the cost of expensive buildings, taxes, losses, and legal expenses; so that the difference between 3 per cent and 6 per cent is not all profit. The hon. member for East Grey says that the banks should supply the people of the country with money. I call that a Utopian idea, that a bank should lend to any one that comes in. My hon. friend did not use those words, but his meaning was that a bank should not refuse to loan to any individual.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps I was misunderstood by the hon. member. That was not the impression I desired to convey. What I desired to convey was this, that the great bulk of humanity who were known to be honest, industrious, frugal and to pay their way, ought to be able to get some limit of credit, however small, even if they had not the best security in the world, because one of the duties of a bank is to provide a circulating medium for the great bulk of the people. A man's standing and character is very often his capital.

Mr. W. ROCHE. My hon. friend may be conversant with the practice of the banks of the west; but what familiarity I have with the conduct of banks convinces me that the character of an individual who obtains a loan or a discount is scrutinized and the character of his security is examined, and I do not know that a bank which has the resources even refuses to a man of good character, with fair security, such an adequate loan as is proportionate to his circumstances and his legitimate demands.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend can not be familiar with conditions in country places, or he would not reach that conclusion, because I can tell him that the best farmer in our part of the country cannot go into a standard bank and borrow money unless he has a substantial endorser, although the standing of the farmer is as good as that of the Bank of Montreal. His business is stable, his land will not run away, it is not under mortgage, his buildings are up and he has all the guaranty necessary.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. Some banks are sceptical, and they have not the advantage of the advice of my hon. friend, nor do they hold his broad views. They look to the security and to the returns. If a man is honest and has the reputation of paying, I do not know that a banker would not give him what would be an adequate loan. But there are many impecunious fellows who have long names and short credit. They require to be watched. If you go on philanthropic grounds and the rights of man and give money whenever called upon there will be more banks in default. Bankers have to take an honest, business way and look to where they put their money. They must have regard for the interests of their shareholders and the public as well, and have to discountenance impecunious people and sharp practitioners who want to take the resources of others without giving much return.

Mr. SPROULE. I am talking of the honest and industrial man who is out of debt, who is in good circumstances, who has a good farm and buildings and stock. The manager will tell him that the bank does not loan any money except on endorsed notes. But why is it this man can go to a private bank and get any reasonable amount he likes on his own note? That is why private banks spring up everywhere and are found so useful. The individual who is known to be honest and industrious and has some standing, can get at these private banks a small amount on his note without any endorsation.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. The banks are not only the trustees of their shareholders and depositors, but of the dead as well. There are estates which own shares in banks, and the directors and managers have to exercise an excessive amount of care to prevent people who have their living involved in the standing of the bank from being absolutely ruined. If they were too profuse in any way with the resources of the bank, a great deal of misery to these people would result.

Mr. SPROULE. They should not forget the first object for which we give them charters and power.

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). I do not wish to make lengthy remarks on this important subject which has been brought before us by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle), but as it is of peculiar interest to our western people, I feel it my duty to read a resolution which was passed by the Grain Growers' Association of Manitoba. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the able arguments made by my hon. friend. His address has been both interesting and instructive, and no doubt will have a good effect. The resolution I desire to read was passed at the annual convention of the Grain Growers' Association of Manitoba, held in Brandon on the 17th January last:

Whereas during the recent financial stringency the western farmers sustained great loss in the sale of their wheat being compelled to take very much less for it than prices in foreign markets warranted, and

Whereas this condition was caused by the unwillingness or inability of the banks to furnish the usual lines of credit to meet the requirements of exchange, and

Whereas the business of the country is conducted on a system of credit which increases the facility with which manufacture, production and exchange are carried on, many millions beyond the small percentage of money used, and the amount of money upon which our whole business structure is based, and

Whereas the carrying on of manufacture, production and exchange depends on the extension of bank credits to them at certain seasons, and

Whereas these banks themselves acquire the means of granting those credits largely from the money of their depositors, and whereas in loaning their deposits the banks rely on the probability that only a certain part of the deposits will be called for by the depositors at any one time, and whereas any disturbance in financial circles or business enterprises which creates a want of confidence in our business structure or moneyed institutions, results in these institutions calling in their loans and increasing their reserves in order to prepare for the worst, and in depositors withdrawing their money from the banks to hoard it until the trouble is over, thereby withdrawing a large amount of money from circulation at the very time when it is most needed, thus demoralizing industry and causing hardship and inconvenience,

Therefore, as manufacture, production and exchange, the business of our country is largely conducted on credit based on confidence, we, the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, in convention assembled, would strongly urge the Dominion government to so amend the present Bank Act, as will tend to promote confidence at all times in our moneyed institutions, and consequently in legitimate business enterprises, and would respectfully suggest as a partial means to this end, that provision be made in the Bank Act for a depositors' security fund, to be raised by a small tax paid by the banks upon all deposits, somewhat similar to the bank note redemption fund. The government to stand behind this fund, guaranteeing all deposits. The government would be perfectly safe as it would have the fund, the assets of the banks, and the double liability of the shareholders as security. The fact of the government being behind the banks would prevent a withdrawal and hoarding of deposits, and would enable the banks to keep all available funds in circulation to promote the legitimate business enterprises of the country.

This resolution gives the opinion of the western people. Last year, when we had a rather ticklish crop to handle, a crop that was damaged somewhat by the early frost, our western farmers found great difficulty in obtaining the advances they had been accustomed to get in previous years. In previous years a farmer could go to a bank and get all the money he required for temporary purposes on a warehouse certificate or a bill of lading, but last year the circumstances and conditions were entirely different. I know of farmers who went to a bank and made the propositions they had made in previous years, but could not get a dollar. The resolution I have just read explains the opinion of the farmers who have given this matter much consideration. They have discussed it from every standpoint, and when they met in convention in Brandon the resolution I have read was the outcome of their deliberations on this very important subject. I hope that the Minister of Finance will be able to work out some system that will be in the interest of the western farmers. I am sure that the suggestions that have been made by my hon. friend from Stormont will assist the Minister of Finance in working out improvements in the Bank Act, so that the best interests of the western people may be met in this particular.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). We have established in Canada the practice of revising or reviewing our Bank Act once in ten years. That does not necessarily mean that in no case during the interim should any amendment be made, but I think I may fairly say that it does mean and should mean that we should not make changes during the interim except in cases of emergency. It may be that before the session closes I shall have to invite the attention of the House to some special matter where the Act might need amending. But I certainly would object to enter in this present year upon that wide revision which is suggested by the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Pringle). The bank charters will all expire in the year 1911, on the 1st of July. Probably in the session two years hence we shall have to revise or review the Act, gathering up whatever we may from the experience from the past ten years, and gathering whatever we may from the suggestions which have been offered by hon. gentlemen to-night, and then amend the Act in the light of all our knowledge. But in the meantime I would suggest that only in some urgent matter should we enter

upon a change. I think the House will agree with me when I say that if there is any part of our legislation as respects which we should be careful to exercise a wholesome conservatism, it is in legislation respecting our banking and currency. These are difficult and intricate questions at all times, and while it is well, especially in a case like this in which there is much public interest, to discuss the matter here and bring out various suggestions, I hope the House will agree with me that it would not be wise to press this motion to a division. I trust my hon. friend from Stormont will feel that he has accomplished his purpose in directing public attention to this interesting and important subject, and that after all the members who may desire have expressed their opinions, he will feel justified in withdrawing his motion. In all matters touching our banking I think we do well to be careful, and not be hasty to adopt changes which even at the first presentation may seem to be in themselves plausible and reasonable.

I desire to approach these questions with an open mind. I do not desire to feel that we have a perfect Bank Act. Our Bank Act is the matured judgment of many wise and able men who have preceded us in this House, and that is one reason why we should treat it with great consideration, and not be in a hurry to change it, or change it at all unless for strong and urgent reasons. I approach the question with an open mind. I do not wish at present to come to any definite conclusion in the matters that have been mentioned. I do not hesitate to say, however, that upon several questions mentioned by my hon. friend, I find myself quite unable to agree with him. Perhaps the most important question which he discussed was that of government inspection. I confess, without pretending to give a final judgment, that my inclination is strongly against the views he has presented on that subject. I am afraid he has confused two subjects which ought to be separate; he has talked in the same sentence, almost, of government inspection and independent audit, and he has treated the two things as one. Without intending to do so, he has conveyed the impression that what he is asking us to do by his resolution as respects government inspection is simply to follow the example of Great Britain, and to provide the system which exists there. In that he is mistaken. He did not wish to convey that impression I am sure. There is no government inspection in Great Britain. If we talk of independent audit, that is an entirely different question. They have a system of audit, and that system is as open to the shareholders of any bank in Canada as it is to the shareholders of any bank in England. The audit that takes place in England is an audit provided by the shareholders; and if any bank in Canada desires to establish that kind of audit there is nothing in our present banking law to prevent it. My hon. friend illustrated that when he mentioned that one of our great banking institutions has of itself adopted the English system, and has brought out chartered accountants from the old country to examine and report upon the affairs of the bank. The fact that one bank has done that shows that there is nothing in our banking law to prevent it. Other banks no doubt will appreciate the value of that example, and they may all have an independent audit, so-called, without any change in the Bank Act.

Now I am disinclined to favour government inspection for several reasons. In the first place, I think it is unnecessary; there is no condition of affairs in Canada that calls for it. In the second place, I do not think it is practicable, for reasons which I shall endeavour to give. In the third place, I think it would be delusive and misleading and would create in the public mind an impression that there had been an audit and examination which could be entirely depended upon; and finally, I think it would impose upon the government of Canada an obligation as respects the character and standing of the banks which it is not desirable that the government should assume.

Now my hon. friend went back for a period of nearly half a century in order to strike averages between the experience of the banking institutions of the United States and those of Canada. I think that is hardly fair. We have made some progress in our bank legislation during that time. If my hon. friend wants to make comparisons, instead of going back 43 years, I think he might take the experience of the past few months when we had a very severe financial stringency, not only in Canada, but still more in the United States, and to a considerable degree throughout the commercial world. There is no government inspection in England, but the English banks came through that period of stringency successfully. I cannot recall any British bank which failed during the recent financial stringency. The banks of Canada have no government inspection, but there was no bank failure in Canada, in the proper sense of the word, during this period of stringency. Across the line they have bank inspection, and in a very large way, and what is the result? Instead of showing that firm standing which Canadian banks have shown, a number of American banks have gone to pieces and depositors have lost heavily. I think a comparison of the experience in the United States and the experience in Canada during the last few months, or the last few years, is a fairer comparison than one going back for half a century. If we look to the history of Can-

adian banking in recent years and to the history of banking in the United States, we shall come to the conclusion that the system of government inspection in the republic fails to bring about the great benefit that my hon. friend is of opinion would follow the adoption of that system by us.

My hon. friend has opened a very large question when he proposes that we abandon the system of Canadian branch banks and adopted the American system of local banks. Undoubtedly there is a local advantage in having a local bank; undoubtedly you may get a local interest. The bank receives the capital of the community, and the bank will be likely to associate itself with the development of that particular locality. We will grant that, but there is another side of the question. My hon. friend has referred particularly to the west. I venture to think that if we had no branch banking system the accommodation in the west during the past few months, insufficient and unsatisfactory as it has been, would have been very much less. In many of the towns of the west to-day where there is a very small population, they have one, or two, even three in some instances, bank branches. They do give in their way as much accommodation as possible. I am not here to apologize for the banks as to whether they gave as much as they ought to have given during the recent period. However, it is possible there is a good reason for the banks not giving accommodation. If they did not have the money they could not give the accommodation. At a time when there was a financial conflagration across the line, it was the part of wisdom in our banks to set their house in order, to look over their accounts, and be ready for emergencies. That means that the banks had to strengthen their reserves, even though they had to deny their customers accommodation which they would gladly have given them. It would be more profitable to the bank to lend its money to customers out west, even at more modest rates than those mentioned, than to keep it locked up in their vaults. They had to keep it locked up thus increasing their reserves, in the interest of safety. It is better by all means that some local interest should suffer, that some good customer, some grain buyer or honest farmer, should be denied a temporary accommodation than that the bank should run beyond reasonable limits; for then, in case of financial storm, our banks would be wrecked as were those across the line. There is something to be said for the course of the banks in that respect. The value of the branch system is that it gathers up money in communities where the demand for money is not great and transfers money to communities where the need is great. The older portions of Canada, probably in ordinary times, have more money than they need. Under the local bank system that money would be largely kept there and would seek employment where perhaps there was no employment for it. Under the branch bank system that money is taken from the community which does not need it, and is transferred to other new and growing communities where the activity is greater and money is more in demand. I think that this system has helped to develop our new lands in the west. The east may possibly have reason to complain that the deposits gathered from the older settlements have been taken out west, but I think that, from that point of view, the west has been the gainer and not the loser. While the branch bank system is not free from defects, I think it has resulted in giving to our new settlements the banking accommodation which they could not possibly have received under any other system.

I have said that inspection has not been a great success in the United States. Yet it might be a success in the United States and not adapted to our conditions in Canada. The branch bank system which we have creates conditions which seem to me to make inspection practically impossible. There are 1,884 branch banks in the Dominion of Canada. One bank, not the largest in its capital, but the largest in the diversity and distribution of its business, has not less than 162 branches. Now, I should be glad if somebody can explain to me how that bank could be inspected by any officer, government or otherwise, under any method which would guarantee the accounts, the resources, the assets of that bank. If we go on the assumption that some bank manager, who wishes to be dishonest, is using the money of the bank for his own ends, gambling in the stock market or anywhere else, it would be easy for him to have the bank inspected in Montreal or Toronto on a given day and the cash and securities counted, and, ten days later, the same cash and securities could be counted again in the bank's office in Winnipeg or Vancouver. Where a bank's business is widely distributed, as in a case of this kind—and while that is a notable case, nearly all our banks have many branches—it seems to me practically impossible to carry out any system of inspection to bring about the results which my hon. friend desires. Realizing that that criticism could be offered, the hon. gentleman says that at least the head office could be inspected. What value would there be in that? If the manager at the head office were desirous of playing pranks with the funds of the bank, and if he knew that the head office was going to be inspected, you may be sure that shady transactions would take place, not at the head office which could be inspected, but at the branch offices which could not be inspected. It seems to me, for these reasons, that bank inspection by the govern-

ment is not so easy as my hon. friend suggests.

There are three interests to be considered in connection with banking affairs. They are all important, but all have not equal claims upon our consideration.

First, there is the interest of the noteholder. If the banks are to be employed to assist in furnishing the circulating medium it is of the utmost importance that the people who receive the notes should have confidence in them, and that, to that end, these notes should be made as secure as possible. Our present banking system seems to secure the notes almost beyond peradventure. We have no loss of notes from the failure of a bank for many years, and practically—though there is no perfection in human affairs—we have security against any noteholder losing a dollar. In fact, the note of a bank that has failed is worth more than the note of a solvent bank. For the notes of a solvent bank do not bear interest, but the moment a bank closes its doors its notes begin to bear interest. Under the revision of the Banking Act, made under my predecessor, I think in 1891, an insurance or guarantee fund was created whereby a percentage of the circulation of every bank is deposited with the government, these deposits becoming a fund for the security of the notes of all the banks. Not a dollar has ever been drawn from that fund, and I trust that ten years hence, when another minister may come to revise the Bank Act, he may have the same story to tell. I think it a wise and excellent provision. It has given great confidence to the circulation of our notes. Practically those notes are secure.

The next interest to be considered is that of the depositor. Now, the depositors are pretty well secured. Experience has shown that under the system of double liability, while shareholders suffer, depositors are well protected. It is many years since a depositor has lost a dollar, and I think the chances are strong that, under the Bank Act, neither noteholders nor depositors can suffer loss. My hon. friend from Stormont said that nearly all our banks were strong and successful. He seemed to make a qualification and made references to one of the banks which I regretted, because I am afraid that those references were calculated to do harm. But I have no hesitation in saying that every bank in Canada to-day gives to the people the most absolute assurance that, as respects its noteholders and depositors, it is sound. I do not think that one need offer any qualification in making that statement.

The third interest is that of the shareholder, and it is the shareholder who in most cases has suffered. Now, I do not say we are not concerned about the shareholders. But I say that his interest is a different one from that of the depositor, and a materially different one from that of the noteholder. The shareholder is the bank; the shareholder is the trader. If he starts up a shop in which to do business, hoping to make a profit, he must take the risks, and if it turns out that in doing business things go wrong, either by his own neglect or by the fault of the managers—that is the directors—why, that is what may happen to a man in any line of business. Surely if he is content to take the profit from the franchise given him, he must face the risk also. I do not say that we should be indifferent to the shareholder's interest. But I point out that he has not the same claim upon our consideration as the noteholder and the depositor. I may repeat that the shareholder is simply the shopkeeper, the trader, the man who does business, and it is for him to see to it that his business is in the hands of competent men, and, as any storekeeper would have to bear the loss from the mismanagement of a foreman, a clerk, a book-keeper or a treasurer, so the man engaged in selling money to the community must take his risk, and if he neglects his business, if he fails to appoint competent men, or if the men he appoints do not do their duty and loss comes to him, we may regret it, but it is only such a misfortune as every man who goes into trade must risk.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) seems to be forgetting one important thing for which the banks were made. How about the user of the bank, the man who requires the circulating medium ?

Mr. FIELDING. The man who uses the notes? I referred to him first. He represents the public at large. Now, with regard to circulation, my hon. friend (Mr. Pringle) mentions that we need better regulations on this subject. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) referred to that, and mentioned as an instance the case of the Banque Ville Marie where there was a failure and an excess of circulation. I interrupted the hon. gentleman to remind him that that was a number of years ago and that it was in consequence of our experience of that time that the change was made in the Banking Act, so that we now have quite stringent regulations with regard to circulation. These regulations are carried out by the Canadian Bankers' Association and they are carried out most efficiently. I am sorry to find that some hon. gentlemen talk of the Canadian Bankers' Association as if they were a great bugbear, as if there were some great evil. As far as I know the Canadian Bankers' Association have taken a very important place in connection with our banking affairs and I cannot recall any case in which the Canadian Bankers' Association have

taken any step that has not been in accordance with the principles of sound banking and sound business. I know of no grievance whatever against the Bankers' Association. We have penalties and heavy penalties against a bank for over-circulating. We had these in the Act some years ago, but since that time, as a result of our experience, an arrangement has been made with the Bankers' Association by which they appoint an inspector whose duty it is to guard against over-circulation and they have made regulations which I think are as efficient as any regulations which could be made by the government. The officer of the Bankers' Association goes to the establishments in Canada in which bank notes are printed. He takes account of every note that is printed in his establishments. He then goes to every bank and he requires from the manager of that bank an account as to the manner in which these notes have been disposed of. He follows a note from the time it leaves the printing office in Montreal or Ottawa until, the note, having served its day and generation, is destroyed in the presence of officers appointed by the Canadian Bankers' Association. I do not know that any regulation could be made by the government in regard to circulation that would be more efficient than the regulations which have been made by the Canadian Bankers' Association.

Mr. BARKER. They get a monthly statement from every bank.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. In regard to the matter of loans to directors, that is a question, which, I think, might very well be left to the shareholders themselves. They are the most interested, because they know they are responsible for all of the affairs of the bank. They know that when they put in their hundred dollars or more per share they are assuming a responsibility for another hundred dollars. The hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Pringle) says that he knows that there is a regulation that the shareholders may make by-laws in that respect, but he says that the shareholders will not make by-laws. Well, if the shareholders will not make by-laws the fair presumption is that they do not think that such by-laws are necessary. Therefore, it appears to me that the matter might very properly be left for the banks themselves to deal with as at present. My hon. friend spoke of the banks as favoured institutions which receive a franchise from the government which enable them to make a great deal of money. There is some truth in that. But before he closed he told us that it was very difficult to get people to subscribe for stock in banks now, because of the laws which exist on that subject. I find it difficult to reconcile the two statements of my hon. friend. If the banks have such great advantages everybody should be in a hurry to get in to share the benefits, but if it is true that it is difficult to get people to subscribe for bank shares, I think the proper explanation is that they have regard to the great responsibility which a bank shareholder has to-day, and the greater responsibility and fear that a bank director has, especially after what has happened recently, and that has tended to make bank stock a little less attractive to people than it was a few years ago.

One other question to which my hon. friend referred and one which has received a great deal of attention in the country is the question of call loans in New York. There is no question in connection with banking affairs which has been more discussed, particularly in the last few months, than the one to which I refer. It has been treated in the press widely as an evil. We are told that large sums of money have been sent out of Canada and invested in call loans in New York. The matter has been discussd by the president of the Canadian Bankers' Association, Mr. Clouston, manager of the Bank of Montreal, in a recent address to his shareholders and I would prefer to have him state the matter rather than state it myself. Mr. Clouston says:

I wish to allude briefly to some criticism which has recently been made in the press respecting the practice of Canadian banks in keeping a portion of their reserves in other countries. The aggregate of call and current loans by the banks elsewhere than in Canada, approximating at times $100,000,000 has been cited as evidence that these institutions are not serving the needs of Canadian borrowers as freely as they might were all this money loaned in this country. In the first place let me point out that a year ago, when these loans abroad, in England, the United States and other countries amounted to $96,000,000, the banks had deposits made with their foreign branches of $55,000,000; so that the actual net amount of foreign loans was only some $41,000,000.

That is a very important point of notice, because a great many speakers and writers on this subject take the amount which appears in the returns of loans abroad; they forget to take into account the very considerable sums which the Canadian banks receive from depositors abroad.

Every dollar of this money is loaned on call at short date, upon the most ample security. It constitutes a part of the reserves of Canadian banks. If to-morrow we were to call in the whole of our loans of this class, which are at all times immediately available, the mercantile public of Canada would derive absolutely no benefit from the action. Being a portion of our reserves, the choice given the bank is between retaining the money unproductive in its vaults, or lending it at call upon interest in foreign financial centres. We adopt the latter alternative, as being in the

interest not alone of the shareholders, but of the commercial community of Canada.

Let me illustrate this by a concrete case. A year ago the banks had $96,000,000 loaned abroad; to-day these loans amount to $73,200,000, a reduction of $23,000,000.

In the same period current loans in Canada have been increased upwards of $5,000,000; that is to say, as occasion warranted, the banks have drawn upon their reserves abroad to meet requirements at home, and have carried on the process with as much facility as if the reserves had been stored in their own vaults. Assume that these call loans on readily realizable securities protected by ample margins, had been in the same markets in Canada, and that the money was required for commercial purposes, does any one suppose that the sudden calling in of the loans would not have been attended by most baneful effects? In making such loans here we would probably have enhanced local stock market value unduly, to be followed by a sharp collapse and serious losses upon their sudden withdrawal. The employment by Canadian banks of a portion of their reserves in call loans abroad is not a new policy. It has prevailed from the beginning of our banking, and is in the interest alike of bank shareholders and bank depositors.

Now, the criticism is sometimes offered that that is a mere excuse. It is said that although the bankers state that this money is abroad and that they can bring it home whenever we want it for our own purposes the fact is that we cannot bring it home, it is tied up, we cannot get it and that therefore the argument of the bankers is incorrect. Mr. Clouston deals with that in the concluding paragraph:

I wish also to correct another erroneous impression which appears to have crept into the public mind, and that is, that in consequence of the financial condition in the United States our loans are tied up and the money cannot be brought into Canada. I have no hesitation in saying that there has been no time during the present crisis when we could not realize all our call loans in the United States and transfer the proceeds to England, whence we could easily import gold here if it should be considered advisable. But as we know how liquid and available they are, we continue to retain all that is not needed here, both as part of our reserves and as a valuable aid to our international exchanges.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how that can be reconciled with the statement made in New York that they had arranged to pay call loans, not in cash, but by issuing clearing house receipts.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Clouston says that they could arrange to have those loans transferred to England and have the gold brought from England.

Mr. PRINGLE. If it were so easy to get these $73,000,000 back why did the banks come to this government and ask them for an advance to assist in the moving of the crops?

Mr. FIELDING. As a matter of fact, the banks did not come to this government asking us to assist them in the movement of the crop. That will come up later; but since the question has been asked me, I may say that the banks did not come in the way he describes. But Mr. Clouston points out that if the banks had had that money in their vaults in Toronto and Montreal they could not have loaned it to the commercial public in Canada. That point is important. He says that those liquid assets in New York, these call loans, are treated practically as part of their cash reserve. If they were loaned out in Canada and then were suddenly required, and the banks called them in, would it not create a great disturbance to our business affairs? The calling in of that vast sum of money in Canada might be the means of creating financial disturbance. The calling in of that money in New York might cause some financial disturbance, but would not disturb us in Canada. If the statement of the bankers is correct, that these moneys are intended to form part of their reserve, and it is a choice between holding them idle in the vaults in Montreal and Toronto and using them as described, then their use in New York is no damage to the business of Canada. It does not take out money that could be employed, but enables the banks to earn interest on money that would otherwise be locked up in their vaults.

That is the argument of the bankers, and, as a reasonable man, it seems to me to be correct. This attack that is made on the Canadian banks for the business they do abroad leads to but one conclusion, that we should confine the operations of our banks to Canada and say they shall not do any business abroad. It seems to me that every time a Canadian bank establishes a branch in a foreign country and puts up its signboard with the word 'Canada,' that is one of the best advertisements possible for the trade and commerce of Canada; and instead of trying to restrict banks in that respect I should be glad if they would go abroad and to the extent of their resources do business in other countries as well as in Canada. We want the trade of other countries as well as of our own, and I certainly think, in view of the explanation the bankers have given of their position, that very much that has been said in respect to the placing of call loans in New York is the result of misunderstanding, and that when the facts come to be clearly known it will be seen that the investment of these moneys is not in injury to the trade and commerce of Canada but helps the banks while at the same time it does no harm to our business.

I only desire to say in conclusion that I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Pringle) will feel he has accomplished a purpose in inviting a discussion of this very important subject. The discussion has been full of sug-

gestions to us all. Although I have given my impressions on one or two questions, I can assure my hon. friend that I shall approach all questions of this character with an open mind. We may have to make some change in the banking law, not possibly on the lines of the suggestions made, this year. Be that as it may, the time will come in a couple of years when a general review of the Banking Act must take place, and I hope my friend will wait until then for the further consideration of the suggestions he has offered.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am very glad indeed to see the generally reasonable and able manner in which this question has been discussed. I am glad my friend (Mr. Pringle) has brought up the question. It is true we have had a tradition in this country—and on the whole I think the tradition is one that we had better adhere to—that once every decade it is necessary to revise our position with reference to the Banking Act and to the regulations controlling our banks. I would be sorry to see the Banking Act of the country a matter of public discussion or discussion in the House every year or two, with a possible amendment each year. We have taken a conservative and a very wise course in making periodical revisions, but rather settling down to the idea of making these every ten years. My hon. friend (Mr. Pringle) has done a good thing in starting a discussion on this matter for two reasons. In the first place, a good deal of discussion has arisen in the country itself. Men are giving more thought and bestowing more discussion on banking matters from year to year. They will continue to do this as our business increases and as the relations between all these different interests and the banks come to be more diversified and more close and in many respects more pressing. It would be too bad if, after the bestowing of this amount of thought and discussion upon this subject in the country, we, the representatives of the people in a parliament which has the final disposition of the matter of legislation with regard to banks, should not also do our part towards an intelligent discussion and appreciation of many things concerned in the relation of banks to the general business of the country. Banking is in some respects a technical business, in other respects it is something which touches the plain common business of almost every man in the country, and is doing so more and more. By bestowing a little thought and attention on the Banking Act in all its diversified aspects a little before the time we make the decennial revision, we gain. So I am glad we have undertaken in a very temperate manner a discussion of some questions which are troubling the country and which will demand solution at the hands of this House when we come to make the revision a year or two hence.

The Finance Minister and I often agree and often do not altogether agree; I have listened with a great deal of pleasure tonight to his statement on the different points brought up and in the main I agree with the position he has taken and the conclusions he has come to. I would like to see, if possible, a better audit or inspection of the Canadian banks. When we come to think of the basis upon which banks are found, not being separate and single institutions but having diversified interest and extended branches, the problem that arises is how to reconcile two things. First, you must make your inspection or audit, whatever you please to call it, so thorough that it will be actually reliable, for in proportion as a government undertakes to supervise, inspect and audit a public institution, to that extent the people who have dealings with that institution tend to rely more upon the government and less upon other methods of getting at that very desirable end; and it would be nothing less than a disaster if an inefficient result should after all be obtained by what, on the face of it, seems to be a perfect system, or at least the best system, of government inspection. That would be a disaster because it would tend to prevent the people themselves who run the business, who are the shareholders of the banks, from giving as much of their personal attention towards their own business as they ought to give. That is one of the difficult things when you talk of government inspection and of a government undertaking to come to a conclusion and lay it before the people as to the state of the banks of the country which shall be reliable and upon which they shall found their trust. On the other hand, I know the difficulties that are met when we ask to let the shareholders of banks manage their own business. The shareholders of a bank are widely scattered and it is absolutely impossible for them to attend in any large force the annual meetings of the bank.

In practice the shareholders who get together are usually the men in the locality where the head office is and where the meeting is held, and consequently there is not the same intelligent influence exerted upon the directors by their shareholders that there is in a smaller business with less scattered stockholders. But as to a choice between the two, so far as I can see at present, I would press strongly that the shareholders should be left to look after their own business, for the government, unless it can find some thoroughly perfect method of making an inspection which shall be thorough and which shall carry to the people not only the face of security, but the absolute essence of security, would find it a pretty difficult and dangerous thing to undertake. With reference to the reserves and call loans, that is another matter with which I agree very largely with the Minister of Finance. These reserves are to be kept

somewhere. We may keep them in the vaults where they will gain nothing, or we may keep them where they will be equally safe and be producing something for the shareholders of the bank, and, therefore, for the general business interests of the country. There is great force, I think, in what Mr. Clouston says; in fact, I think he puts in an absolutely convincing manner the advantage of keeping a portion of the reserves of the country in a great mart of securities like the city of New York, or if you could be near it, like the city of London, rather than to run the risk of those reserves being engaged in and liable to be withdrawn suddenly from the security mart in this country, where, if they are so withdrawn, disaster is very likely to follow. But these are very large questions, and we cannot follow them very far at this late hour of the evening. When I read the resolution of my hon. friend from Cornwall, 'that in the opinion of this House it is an opportune time to consider the advisability of revising and amending the Bank Act,' with the lines upon which he thinks that consideration should be given, I cannot see very much reason to vote against it or to disagree with it. It is always advisable for the members of this House to fix their minds upon the advisability of amending or revising an Act, especially one that is within a year and a half or two years of the time when, according to our usage and practice, it probably will be revised, when our bank charters expire, and we must have legislation to put them in force for the succeeding term of ten years. For that reason I do not see quite why the Finance Minister should object to the passage of the resolution. The Finance Minister says he is considering the advisability of making some amendments this year. If he does, I hope they will be few, because I think we should have infrequent revisions of the Bank Act, if possible not oftener than every ten years. It would be pedantic to say that no circumstances could arise to make it necessary to make the revision at other periods, but unless some good reason can be given for this, I would like to see the old practice kept up. On the other hand, if the resolution is passed, I do not know that my hon. friend would have attained more than he has attained, which has been to very effectively call the attention of the House to this matter and have these various points discussed, as they have been by himself and others, very thoroughly, very moderately and I believe with good effect both in the House and in the country. The first step in the discussion of a large subject is not by any means the finality of it. It does good to allow the ideas that come out in the first discussion to rest and mellow in our minds for a while and thereby bear a fuller fruit. I do not see any great objection to passing the resolution, neither do I see that those who have it at heart would gain more by passing it, because they have done what they have set out to do—fix the mind of the House and the country on the very important points they have discussed.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I have a large amount of very useful information to impart to the House on the question so ably introduced by the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont, but as I do not want to encourage the House to get into the habit of having all night sittings, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the business for to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. The French treaty and several Bills on the Order Paper, and after that Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. Which Supply?

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is expected that the Minister of the Interior will take up some of his estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12 midnight.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 3, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE (Strathcona) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 114) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act.

Mr. FOSTER. We ought to have a little explanation.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. This Bill proposes to amend section 119 of chapter 85 of the revised statutes of 1906, under the paragraph entitled 'oats.' As most of the members of the House are aware, this last season has entailed on the farmers in certain districts of the west considerable hardship, owing to the peculiar reading of particular sections of the Act. There has been a frost in that country which has injured, to some extent, a great deal of the oats. But as all the grades comprised under this section of the Act are to be sound, when any kernels of the grain are found to be affected by frost they are classified as rejected. Then it is found that in a great many cases carloads of grain have been

called rejected when only a few kernels were affected. The rejected material has been graded a great deal lower than the lower grades of the so-called sound oats, although great quantities of these so-called rejected oats will weigh as high as 40 or 42 pounds to the bushel, whereas the lower grades of oats under this section will weigh as low, according to the standardization given here, as 34 and 32 pounds. An appeal was made, after the rejected material had become depreciated in value, to the standardization board to arrange that the so-called injured grain which was suitable for feed could be graded, and it was found that by section 119 of this Act oats were excluded from a temporary classification by the standard board. I will read the portion referred to, section 119, chapter 85:

Should the climatic or other conditions result in the production of a considerable proportion of grain, other than oats, not capable of being included in the classification provided for in this part, the grain standards board for the division should be convened for the selection of the commercial grades and samples whenever the chairman of the said board is notified by the chief inspector or five members of the said board, that such a course is necessary.

The phrase 'other than oats' precludes the possibility of oats being treated in this way. The Department of Trade and Commerce under which the grading of grain comes, were appealed to, and their reply was that they were unable to act, and that only an amendment to this Act would bring about the desired result. The question then arose whether it was advisable to eliminate the phrase 'other than oats' in section 119, or provide a grading which could be utilized any year in which it would be necessary, that is, have a permanent grade for feed oats, or simply have this phrase eliminated. On that point the advice of various farmers' associations in the new provinces was sought. I have letters in my possession at the present time which will go to show that the farmers do not have the greatest confidence in the standardization of temporary grades by the Grain Standard Board. What the farmers are asking for in that country is a permanent grade for these injured oats. When the Royal Grain Commission was in Alberta the evidence given before it was largely arranged by the Alberta Farmers' Association, and the president of that association asked at that time, in conjunction with others, that there be an amendment eliminating the phrase in section 119. He writes me on February 8 of this year as follows :—

Since writing you before re the grading of oats. I may say that we have had a meeting and I have read a letter from Mr. Horn, the chief inspector, and I am now of the opinion that instead of asking for additional power to be given the Grain Standard Board, we should have asked for a straight amendment to the Act.

I shall discuss this matter further at a later date, but I wish to make a few remarks regarding the Bill as it will appear when it is printed. In addition to what I have stated with reference to providing a grade for feed and injured oats, there has been a special request from Alberta to have the highest grade of oats raised, that in the highest grade of oats the weight be raised as high as 42 pounds to the bushel and that this grade be known as Alberta Extra No. 1. The whole nomenclature with reference to grades, as it appears in section 137 will, under this Bill, be changed. If I insert at the request of the Alberta people, Extra No. 1 Alberta, 42 pounds to the bushel, you will have also Manitoba and Alberta extra grades and various other grades that will be extremely confusing. I have therefore, in the Bill, repealed the whole section and reinserted it under a new nomenclature —reinserted all as western oats with exactly the same grading as you will find in the present Act, but, under a different name and under a different numbering, the first number being Extra No. 1 western oats with a minimum of 42 pounds to the bushel. In addition I have added three grades under the term of feed grades. There is Extra No. 1, 37 pounds to the bushel, No. 1 Feed, 34 pounds to the bushel, both of which are clean and free from other seed, and sound except as to frost. There is also grade No. 3 oats, the minimum being 32 pounds to the bushel. There are in all then submitted eight grades; five of them are sound and three of them are feed grades and sound except as to frost. I will take the matter up more fully later on.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## ASH WEDNESDAY ADJOURNMENT.

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

That when this House adjourns this day it stand adjourned until Thursday, March 5.

Motion agreed to.

## CONSTRUCTION OF DRY DOCKS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved :

That on Thursday next the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the repeal of chapter 116 of the Revised Statutes, 'An Act to encourage the construction of dry docks,' and that in substitution therefor it be provided that as an aid to the construction of any dry dock, approved as to location and capacity by the Governor in Council, a subsidy of three per centum per annum of the cost of such dry dock be paid out of Consolidated Revenue Fund, for twenty years

after the completion of the work, to any incorporated company, approved by the Governor in Council, which shall enter into an agreement with His Majesty to construct the same with all necessary equipments, machinery and plants, the cost on which subsidy is to be calculated to be determined by the Governor in Council, from the plans and specifications and reports thereon before any agreement for construction is entered into, the Governor in Council being satisfied that such dry dock is needed in the public interest; and the total subsidy payable per annum not to exceed forty-five thousand dollars.

2. Resolved, that for the enlargement and extension of any dry dock subsidized under chapter 17 of the Acts of 1882, 'An Act to encourage the construction of dry docks by granting assistance on certain conditions to companies constructing them,' and any amendment thereof, a subsidy of three per centum per annum of the cost of such enlargement and extension be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, for twenty years after the completion of such enlargement and extension, to any incorporated company approved by the Governor in Council, which shall enter into an agreement with His Majesty to enlarge and extend any such existing dry dock, and to furnish the same with all necessary equipments, machinery and plants, the cost on which subsidy is to be calculated to be determined by the Governor in Council from the plans and specifications and reports thereon before an agreement for enlargement is entered into, the Governor in Council being satisfied that such enlargement and extension is needed in the public interest; and the total subsidy payable per annum in respect thereof not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars.

3. Resolved, that the work of construction or enlargement be done under the supervision of the Department of Public Works.

4. Resolved, that the Governor in Council be empowered, after a subsidy becomes payable, if such dry dock is not in a state of efficiency and repair, to take possession of the same, and expend out of Consolidated Revenue Fund, a sufficient sum to repair the same, and thereafter operate such dock until the cost of such repairs, after payment of operating expenses and maintenance, is received by the Crown.

5. Resolved, that the tariff of tolls and rates for the use of the dock prescribed by the company, shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and that the company shall make an annual statement to the Governor in Council of the operations of the company with a statement of receipts and expenditures in detail.

He said: I have to state that the purposes of this resolution have been made known to His Excellency the Governor General and that he recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

## REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he can give the House any information as to when we may expect the Civil Service report.

Mr. FIELDING. Since the last inquiry was made I communicated with Mr. Courtney and I received a note in reply stating that the matter is engaging their close attention. He hoped to have the report ready very shortly although I do not think he mentioned a particular date.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—BUDGET SPEECH.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance whether he has come to any conclusion as to when the budget speech will be delivered.

Mr. FIELDING. I have regarded the French treaty, dealing as it does with fiscal matters, as practically a part of the budget and I intimated to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) some time ago that as soon as that was disposed of I would make an announcement at an early date respecting the budget. If the final stage of the French treaty is reached to-day, before the end of the week I hope to be able to make an announcement as to the date of the budget. It will probably take place very shortly.

## ROYAL GRAIN COMMISSION.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) whether he is now able to give an answer to the question I asked yesterday as to the printing of the evidence taken before the Royal Grain Commission.

Mr. FISHER. I have not been able to get an answer to the hon. gentleman's question but I will find out on Thursday.

## YUKON TERRITORY—THE FINNIE-PERRON CASE.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior if he has any information regarding the Finnie-Perron case.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The papers in this case were moved for some time ago, they have been in course of preparation and they will very shortly be brought down. The case grew out of a complaint against Mr. Finnie, a clerk in the Gold Commissioner's office there, the basis of the complaint being that by registering an incomplete document he gave priority to a certain right in regard to a certain property. The complaint was made by a Mr. Perron. It was dealt with by the Gold Commissioner and the Gold Commissioner found there was no ground for the complaint. Mr. Perron repeated his complaint and a Royal Commission was issued to Judge Craig, a very lengthy investigation was held with the result that Judge Craig found that the document was properly

registered, that it was registered by Mr. Finnie after consultation with the assistant Gold Commisioner, that this fact was within the knowledge of the complainant, that the complainant had failed to establish his allegations and that there was no ground of complaint against Mr. Finnie.

## LAND ALIENATED FOR COLONIZATION PURPOSES.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked the Minister of Interior a question the other day in regard to a return which was ordered some time ago as to the amount of land set apart or alienated for colonization purposes. He informed me that he thought he would be able to give the information in a day or two. Has he any further information to give with respect to this matter ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am sorry that I have overlooked the question but I will promise my hon. friend that I will be able to give him the information on the next sitting day.

## THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 57) respecting a certain convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I have a few words to say on the motion for the third reading of this Bill. I unfortunately was unavoidably absent when the Bill was previously discussed, and as there are one or two important matters which have not, I think, been mentioned by other speakers, I feel justified in calling attention to them for a few moments. It seems to me that the French treaty submitted to us for approval has been very well received on this side of the House. During the debate on the address at the opening of parliament I commended the action of the government for bringing its influence to bear to establish better commercial relations with France, and I have heard my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), who represents an important commercial division, also commend the treaty. Now, if a treaty with a friendly nation is laid before us for approval, while we approve the principle of negotiating with that nation, it is, I believe, our duty in reference to that nation and to the proper discharge of our own duties, to offer some remarks upon the treaty and to criticise it in a fair spirit if we should deem criticism necessary. In France this treaty was discussed by the Chamber of Deputies at length. Mr. Pichon, one of the plenipotentiaries charged with the negotiation of the treaty, himself offered some observations upon the treaty which I think one could call criticism. Is it the pretention of hon. gentlemen opposite that we should have allowed such an important act of administration as that to pass through parliament without offering any comments upon it whatever? And yet that seems to be the position taken by some people. I noticed it when at the very beginning of the session I moved for a committee to look into the details of the treaty. The idea seemed to horrify the Minister of Finance ; he seemed to think it was an outrage upon the liberty of the government to announce its fiscal policy in this House, and yet commercial treaties between Great Britain and other countries are examined every session by committees of the House of Commons in England. This very treaty itself will not pass through the French chamber without being submitted to a most crucial examination by a special committee, and in France it is considered a great honour to be chairman of any committee appointed to examine a treaty of this kind. Again, we all know that under the constitution of the United States no treaty passes the Congress without examination by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. During the last four or five years the Americans have concluded three conventions of a commercial nature with France, and all of them have had to pass that test. What do we in this parliament know about the details of this treaty with France? I venture to say that nothing has transpired here which would go to show that any member of the House, including the members of the government, has absolute knowledge of the different items mentioned in the treaty, and yet such knowledge could be very easily acquired if we had had an opportunity to examine competent witnesses before a committee. But some people have gone further, and they have contended that there has been an absolute hostility on this side of the House to this treaty ; a sinister plot to defeat the treaty or, at any rate—to quote an expression which has been used—weak revenge on the two gentlemen who largely participated in the negotiation of the treaty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. Does my right hon. friend say 'hear, hear'?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought so.

Mr. MONK. That seems to me a very extraordinary position to take. In this morning's 'Le Canada' of Montreal, the organ of my right hon. friend in that city, it discusses the incidents of last week—in which, I regret to say, some supporters of the government endeavoured to block the business of this parliament—and 'Le Canada' says :

All the honour of this struggle belongs to honesty and merit; all that is unworthy falls back on the accusers, impudent, mendacious, and clowns of the Tory camp to which Messrs. Monk and Bergeron have not hesitated to ally themselves. And if one were asking

finally what was the object of the opposition in all this unworthy comedy there is but one and that is the one which was murmured on all sides—so satisfactory, so splendid have been the effects produced by the new French treaty that the opposition has endeavoured to spoil the merit which belongs to Hon. Mr. Brodeur. These tactics have totally failed. The hon. Mr. Brodeur preserves with his colleague Mr. Fielding——

I notice that in all these criticisms my hon. friend the Minister of Finance occupies a very secondary position.

—all the honour of this treaty which they concluded alone with a foreign government, establishing thus an historic date in the history of our fiscal liberty and the recent struggle has only increased this honour.

Another gentleman, writing in the organ of my right hon. friend at Quebec——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I seem to have a good many organs.

Mr. MONK. This gentleman goes a little further, and in the 'Le Soleil' of last Friday he says:

Hon. Mr. Brodeur has taken a great part in the negotiations of the Franco-Canadian treaty. He brought back from Paris an extremely advantageous and popular measure. He must be crushed. That is why the opposition has so violently attacked him. It will all be in vain, it will destroy itself. The members of the district and of the province formed a hollow square around the hon. Mr. Brodeur and sustained him.

Mr. FOSTER. Very hollow.

Mr. MONK. I quote this to show what kind of stuff is served out to a certain public, and which goes on uncontradicted. I will not refer to the attacks made upon myself, because I do not think my personality is of much importance, but I have been personally very severely attacked, and I don't know why. Is it for having commended the treaty? Is it for having stated that it was most satisfactory to know that the treaty of 1893 was going to be amended in order that we should have perhaps more extended relations with France? In an article again in the organ of my right hon. friend, 'Le Canada' of Montreal, on the 10th of January, I am accused in a very conspicuous way of 'being a traitor to my own province and to France, and of lacking that Latin element in my mental constitution which it is my misfortune to lack, but which makes me most unacceptable to the people of my province.' The article finishes by stating that I am more to be pitied than to be blamed; that it is a mental defect regrettable in anybody who happens to live in the province of Quebec. I must say that I wonder what is the matter with people who thus appreciate, not only my conduct, but the conduct of all those who sit on this side of the House. I am not a doctor nor a zoologist, but it seems to me there is something the matter with the mental condition of those who, in discussing the manner in which we have criticised this treaty, lend themselves to such absurd comments.

In view of these repeated attacks and of these statements which are, I regret to say, uncontradicted and which have been made for months in my own province, I was induced to look up the attitude which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister took when the treaty of 1893 was brought down to the House. I looked up the very extensive printed correspondence preceding the conclusion of that treaty, which as the House will remember, was made in Paris by Sir Charles Tupper in 1893. The correspondence, in my estimation, does the very greatest credit to Sir Charles Tupper. It shows that he was extremely anxious to conclude that treaty on account of the peculiar relations existing between old France and the people of Quebec and it indicates an extreme solicitude as to all the conditions of that treaty. I do not wish to quote from that correspondence as it is too long, but it indicates clearly that in the conclusion of that treaty he was left absolutely free by the British government, that he negotiated it and concluded it himself. But what was the attitude of my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), what was his Latin mental condition when the treaty was brought down to this House. I was surprised to find that he opposed it hammer and tongs from the very beginning. He found it a ridiculous treaty and supported amendments having for their object the defeat of the treaty. I do not wish to quote the speeches of my right hon. friend on that occasion, but certainly if any man who criticises the present treaty can be accused of hostility to France and of lacking mental stamina, my right hon. friend on that occasion was not exempt from that accusation. He pooh-poohed that treaty when it was first brought down and all through the discussion. I shall not quote all that he said on that occasion, but let me just give a sample. At page 5650 of the 'Hansard' of 1894, when the treaty was brought down for ratification, he said:

For twenty years and more, we have been endeavouring to negotiate such a treaty, and after twenty years we are in the presence of this treaty which the hon. gentleman, at one time—I will not say in a moment of weakness, but of expansive frankness—characterized as 'the little French treaty.' After twenty years of effort, the mountain has produced this mouse, and certainly a little treaty it is. If you look at it what do you find? You find that after twenty years of effort on the part of our diplomats to induce the French nation to give us something like reciprocal trade, they have obtained from the French government their consent to sell under certain conditions in this country: wines, soaps, nuts, almonds, plums and prunes. There is nothing else in the treaty on the part of France. After twenty years of effort that is all we have to show, and it took the govern-

ment something like eighteen months to make up their minds as to whether or not they would ratify that 'little French treaty.' The right hon. gentleman has taken exception to the charge that his government has been vacillating in the matter. Well, sir, let us say: they have not been vacillating, but we will say: that for eighteen months they have been considering whether they would ratify that 'little French treaty' or not. One whole session passed away; four months of another session passed away, and after eighteen months of consideration they have at last made up their minds to ask for ratification. The right hon. gentleman said they were not vaccillating but that they were considering. They were considering for instance whether or not the expression:

'Poissons conservés au naturel,' and 'Homards et langoustes conservés au naturel,' have been properly translated into English, and after giving this matter due consideration they have come to the conclusion that indeed the translation was right. But, sir, the right hon. gentleman is mistaken. He does not give to himself or to his government the credit to which they are entitled. It is not this session only that the government found out what is the true meaning of 'Poissons conservés au naturel,' and 'Homards et langoustes conservés au naturel.' We had it last year. We then had the interpretation which the hon. gentleman said we only had this year.

The rest is very much in the same style, not one word from my right hon. friend to say that he considered it an advantage that we were thus negotiating for the first time a treaty with the country of origin of many of us, of most of us in Quebec—not one word to commend the efforts made by Sir Charles Tupper, as shown by his correspondence, to give the treaty the largest scope possible, everything condemnatory of the treaty. There is not one word of that warm feeling in which these gentlemen who write in the papers of my right hon. friend find I was lacking but general condemnation. Finally, after all this condemnation and all the attacks upon the government of the day and upon Sir Charles Tupper in particular, silently and quietly, my right hon. friend voted for the treaty and when the two eminent negotiators who negotiated this treaty were in Paris, the very first demand they made was upon the French plenipotentiaries was what? The continuation of that treaty of 1893, which the French immediately refused. It seems to me fair at this stage, at this third reading of the Bill, to point out the attitude of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. There have been no amendments, no factious opposition of any kind whatever, but some freedom of speech, some observations. If we had not said a word on this side of the House we would have been attacked as treating unworthily this very instrument which we are asked to ratify. We have offered some comments. I heard what was said by my hon. friend from St. Antoine division of Montreal (Mr. Ames) with respect to some articles, but for my own part, leaving aside the absurd, ridiculous, jingo exaggerations to which I have referred as appearing in certain papers, I would subscribe to the opinion expressed upon this treaty by the Montreal 'Herald.' I do not suppose anybody will suspect that organ of hostility to this government. With some qualifications, I think it spoke properly of the treaty. What did it say?:

The treaty with France represents an honest effort and probably a successful one, to expand the opportunities of men engaged in several branches of Canadian trade—some of them important now, many of them promising to become more important as the years pass. We have everything to gain, nothing to lose, by its operation.

Well, and good. Still one can point out what Mr. Pichon declared, when commenting on the treaty before the French Chamber, namely, that perhaps if we had had a less plentiful list of articles and more concessions of a more solid character we could do more business. Surely there is no harm in quoting such a very high economic authority throughout Europe as Mr. Stephen Pichon. Let me quote his words, and I quote his language in English, but anybody who will read his speech on that subject in French and who knows how supple is the language used by high French diplomatists will readily realize the truth of what I have just said, namely, that Mr. Pichon considers that what is really valuable in the treaty to France is the special list. In other words, he did maintain and experience will show—because in commercial conventions it is only experience which can show their value, experience will show that Mr. Pichon, and I may modestly say myself, on this occasion were right—that the special list was really the valuable one. Speaking of the ninety-eight articles on which the French obtained concessions he said:

If we had limited ourselves to these, the advantages we would have drawn from this new convention would have been very insufficient. Therefore we have made special efforts to obtain certain special favours in order to develope our commerce on special articles of our own production. Canada having consented on twelve articles, the most important of our exportation to notable reductions in its intermediate tariff, it is from the consolidation of these reductions, we have by our third list derived real and substantial advantages.

On the general concessions, which placed a number of French articles in the intermediate tariff, he seems to have placed very little reliance for any great benefit to France. It is on the special list that he relies, and in my opinion though our general list reads well and although it may show to the public something which appears at first sight considerable, it is regrettable that we do not consider the advisability of having less numerous concessions, but concessions which would be of a

more substantial character. In this regard I think our French negotiators acted more wisely than our own.

What finally are the great advantages which we derive from our own list? I have seen it frequently stated in the newspapers in my own province since the return of these gentlemen that this treaty is a great boon to our agriculturists. I shall not take up the time of the House reading these newspaper articles. They are most amusing. They say that from now forward the French people are going to feed on our potatoes and that we are going to furnish them with wheat, flour, vegetables and live and dead meats. Is there anything in this contention? I do not think so. I think the agriculturist has been carefully safeguarded by the French negotiators, and I do not blame them. Mr. Pichon, foreseeing that if he made any serious concessions on agricultural articles, he would be be met with frank opposition in the French Chamber the moment he exposed the French treaty, immediately met the point by saying that as regards agriculture there was no need for any alarm. He stated this beforehand so as to forestall any criticism. France is the greatest agricultural nation in Europe. She exports an immense quantity of agricultural produce. She is a protectionist nation upon agriculture as well as other lines, and the very last concession she would be expected to make would be a concession in her tariff on agriculture. Mr. Pichon, the French plenipotentiary and also a member of the French cabinet, states that in limine, at the very beginning of the discussion :

> We have consented to no alteration of the duties on our minimum tariff, and it is interesting to remind the chamber that for the most part, on agricultural products and particularly cereals, we have but one tariff. On those articles we have taken no engagement to benefit the Dominion. Any reduction in the tariff, as well as these reductions which appear to be granted can only become effective if our own tariff be reduced.

If you take the trouble to look through the list of agricultural products you will find there is very little in that list indeed. Had we had a committee to look in the matter we would have obtained evidence on that point. I do not blame our own representatives. The difficulty was one which could not be overcome. But is there any object in deceiving the people? Are we going to do any business with France in horses with a duty of $30 per horse against us? Take cheese, butter, chickens, live or dead meats, you will find the same difficulty. It would be a mistake, I think, on my part at this stage to take up these articles one by one as hon. members can do it themselves by looking up the tariff. There is no possible commerce that can be developed with France in these products. The idea that the French people will live on our potatoes and vegetables is ludicrous. Why, they export enormous quantities of these products to England and all the neighbouring countries. If you take up grain, the matter is still less doubtful. Wheat, barley, oats and every cereal is on their maximum tariff. There is no minimum tariff with regard to these. It is only in case they should reduce their tariff—an eventuality which is most improbable—that we can benefit in any way. Consult anybody in Montreal who has experience in exportation of agricultural and dairy products and he will tell you without hesitation that there is very little, if any, business to be done with France in these articles.

I will not quote the articles of the government organs in the province of Quebec which have hailed this treaty as an immense boon and a great benefit to our agricultural classes. I say that it is sufficient to look at the tariff and to know something of the conditions prevailing, to arrive at the conclusion that we cannot develop any trade in that line with France. If you look at lumber, it is a somewhat intricate matter and more complicated. There are a number of lumber articles mentioned in the treaty. I could take them up one by one, but I do not wish to do so at this stage of the Bill. But let any man who wishes to investigate that question take this convention as regards lumber and ask any man concerned with the lumber business in the city of Montreal, or in any of our great centres, and he will tell you there is very little in it. We have never done very much business in lumber with France. There was a little business in the more expensive lumber, such, for instance, as oak, when wooden-shipbuilding was carried on in France. But all that has disappeared, and what lumber they have not in France—and they have a great deal of it—they import from the Baltic. We cannot compete with the Baltic lumber with such a tariff and the freight rates. It would only be some accident that would give us opportunity to send lumber to France in any quantity. I was not present when the Bill was read the second time, but I believe it was stated by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Zimmerman) that we were going to develop a very large business with France in agricultural implements. Is there any justification for that? I do not think there is. Why should the Americans come to Canada, as was said here by my hon. friend, and manufacture agricultural implements to send them to France? I do not look for any such move on the part of our American friends. They have been concluding treaties with France, several of them, within the last four or five years. They had a commercial treaty in 1898; they had one in 1902, and they concluded one in January last. With this facility of concluding treaties with France—I will not go into

the details of these treaties; I do not know, as a matter of fact, I confess, how agricultural implements stand on these three conventions, but that might be investigated—does any hon. member believe that the Americans, if they desire to export agricultural implements to France, will take this roundabout way to develop that trade? Not at all. If they are not in a position to carry on the trade at present, what will they do? They will make a new convention with France and save themselves the trouble of coming through Canada to do business with the French nation. There is no doubt about that. So, I conceive no very great hopes of Canadian trade with France in agricultural implements. A number of the other articles upon this list are absolutely unnecessary. Any member of the House who reads the list must see that there is no business to be done in these things. Are we going to do any business with France in the skins of Asiatic mouflons, for instance, or the furs of certain animals that are not found in this country? Are we going to trade in pineapples with France? And brandy—I find brandy on the list of articles which we may export to France under this treaty. I do not suppose that anybody thinks we are going to carry coals to Newcastle or brandy to France where the article is produced in the first instance. I say—without wish to throw any discredit upon the treaty, but it is only repeating what I said from the first—that, while, particularly under the circumstances, it was a good thing that we should conclude a treaty with France, and I hope we shall make many more, yet we should have aimed at having a shorter list and more substantial advantages. Because I say—and the proof is in Mr. Pichon's speech—that, finding, with regard to the ninety-eight articles he had placed on his list, there was really no substantial advantage, he brought all the force of himself and his colleagues to bear upon the special list where really there are substantial advantages for the French nation. I am glad of it. We could, it seems to me, do a considerable business with wood pulp. They make a great deal of paper in France and consume a very large quantity of wood pulp. I think that if we had a fair opportunity with the article we could produce here and of such a kind as is desired by the French manufacturers, we might develop at once a large trade with France. There are other articles, it seems to me, we might send in large quantities to that country; nickel matte for instance, asbestos; and, it seems to me—though I do not pretend to be specially qualified to speak on the subject—steel and iron in crude form, such as ingots and billets. In some descriptions of ores we could do a good business—cobalt and cobalt oxide and others. Without detaining the House longer on that point particularly, I merely say that I regret we have not aimed more directly at having a special list where the advantages would have been immediate, would have been evident and in which we could have developed a very considerable trade with the French nation.

Now, Sir, one word as regards that part of the treaty which concerns direct shipments. That seems to be involved in some obscurity to which I desire to call the attention of the House for one moment. This is covered by article 8 of the treaty. Speaking generally, I infer from that article, that, in order to benefit by the conditions of the treaty, we must ship directly from one of our own ports to a French port. Let me quote article 8 as regards these shipments:—

To enjoy the benefits of the afore-mentioned tariff advantages. Canadian products shall be conveyed without transhipment from a Canadian port or from a port of a country enjoying the French minimum tariff to a port in France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China.

Why have we placed that restriction? That is my first question. It seems to me that the object of this treaty is to develop and multiply our communications and trade exchanges with France. It seems to me we should have given every facility to the shipper. The object of the treaty is not to increase the importance of our ports so much as to increase the exchange. Why, then, restrict the shipper in his mode of shipment? There will only be one line of steamers and one company conveying our trade to France. We are, therefore, according to the profession of the government, restricted to that line. We must ship directly from Canadian ports to France. This restriction was asked for by our own plenipotentiaries. The French representatives did not ask for that, strange to say, for they, as a rule, are jealous of the direction of trade. In this instance they did not ask it, it was asked for us. But are we by that clause bound to ship directly from Canada? Can we not ship through the United States? As I read the treaty I think we can and if we can, if under the terms of the treaty we can ship by Portland, Boston and New York, what becomes of the argument of the government? That clause says that you must ship 'from a Canadian port or from a port of a country enjoying the French minimum tariff.' The United States enjoys the French minimum tariff, therefore, why can we not ship from a United States port? That is the question to which I have mainly sought a solution, and I hope the government will explain the objection before this discussion closes. The Americans are under the minimum tariff.

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to certain goods ?

Mr. MONK. In Kelly's Customs Tariffs of the world, the United States are given as being under the French minimum tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. Only for a limited number of things.

Mr. MONK. I do not think there is any country on the French minimum tariff for all things.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, Great Britain and Germany.

Mr. MONK. I doubt it.

Mr. BRODEUR. They do not enjoy the old French minimum tariff.

Mr. MONK. Neither do we.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then the clause does not apply.

Mr. MONK. Perhaps it does not, but that is a question. As I said, according to Kelly's Customs Tariffs of the World, the United States are enjoying the French minimum tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. That cannot be possible, I mean to say as to the whole minimum tariff. Undoubtedly there are some items. The hon. gentleman stated that the United States had the French minimum tariff.

Mr. MONK. So they have.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, I differ from my hon. friend.

Mr. MONK. I will quote another authority on that point.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not a debatable matter at all, my hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. MONK. Is Canada on the French minimum tariff ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, we have some items.

Mr. MONK. We are mentioned in this book as being on it.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not correct.

Mr. MONK. I have pointed out the objection. The treaty does not say that we can export through a country that is on the French minimum tariff for all goods ; but it is sufficient to be on the French minimum tariff. The United States, under this French convention of 1898, 1902, and 1908, are on the French minimum tariff for a number of articles. I understand the contention of the government to be that you must be on the French minimum tariff for all articles.

Mr. FIELDING. The words of the treaty are 'enjoying the French minimum tariff' not a part of it. Some one might say that he had the pleasure of enjoying my hon. friend's friendship, and some one else might qualify that by saying, Well, only in a few things. If you are enjoying a minimum tariff, it means enjoying the whole of it.

Mr. MONK. There is no word in that section 8 of shipping through the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. Then if my hon. friend's contention is correct, they have the right to ship through the United States, and there is not that restriction which he is condemning.

Mr. MONK. I desire to be enlightened by my hon. friend on that subject. The article says that you shall ship either directly from here or through a country enjoying the French minimum tariff. I say the United States enjoys the French minimum tariff, not altogether, any more than we do. I say that we enjoy the French minimum tariff, and that is the interpretation which appears to be given in this book.

Mr. FIELDING. If that is correct, then we can ship through that country, and then the criticism of my hon. friend falls. We do not agree with his interpretation, but if it is correct, then it defeats his own argument.

Mr. MONK. If I am wrong I regret it, because I think that at the present stage what we wish is to put the treaty to the very best test, and in order to do that we must facilitate instead of circumscribing our means of communication. As regards shipments from France, as I understand this article, you may ship through England but without transhipment.

Mr. FIELDING. Goods coming into Canada ?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. You can ship from England without transhipment. You can send French goods to England, tranship there, or store them there, and ultimately send them from England to Canada without transhipment, and if the identity of the goods is proven, they fall within the condition of the treaty.

Mr. MONK. It may be my hon. friend's interpretation is right, but it appears a little doubtful under the terms of the article. However, I think it would have been better, as the French did not demand that restriction, that we should not have insisted upon it. Where it is possible to ship directly, no doubt rates could have been made favourable, but by confining our exporters to direct shipments, you put an entrave in the way of commercial relations which it is the principal object of the treaty to develop.

Now just one word more. There has been another set of contentions put forward in connection with this treaty. It has been claimed that under the terms of this treaty, particularly in the press of my own pro-

vince, that we have taken a great step forward, that we have established our absolute independence and autonomy in treaty making. It was also claimed that this extraordinary liberty which we had obtained and exercised for the first time in the case of this treaty, had been obtained for us by my right hon. friend and his colleagues at the last colonial conference. They went to that conference, and boldly and vigorously claimed for Canada the right to negotiate her treaties in her own name ; they obtained that right and immediately applied it by the conclusion of this French treaty in Paris. It was also claimed that we had by this treaty at last succeeded in establishing our right to have our own consular service abroad, entirely independent of the consular service of Great Britain ; that we had also this year revendicated our right in that respect, and had put them in practice, by the conclusion of this treaty. Now it is evident that in the heat of political controversy extreme pretensions may be put forward in newspapers and at public meetings. We are prepared with our experience in politics to make every allowance for that ; but where these allegations are continually put forward day after day, week after week, and month after month, uncontradicted as they are, necessarily the public to whom they are addressed must finally give a certain amount of belief to them. Is it right and proper to allow the people to be deceived, and in the proper place and at the proper time, is it not right to state things as they really are ? I do not believe in taking up everything that is said in the heat of a political contest, but in circumstances such as these where it is a question of the status of a nation, and where it is claimed that new rights have been acquired, I say it is proper to set things right. Nobody in this House at the present time, not my right hon. friend, not the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, not my hon. friend who is so easily made indignant, the hon. Minister of Finance, would advance these propositions. They would not do so here. Well, it seems to be right at this stage to state matters as they really are. There never has been any foundation whatever for such allegations. When the Minister of Marine and Fisheries returned from France we incurred a very considerable expense in receiving him. We sent down—I said here a flotilla of steamers to meet him. We did. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries contradicted me but it is so. Government steamers went down to meet him far into the gulf and then, when he approached his native heath——

Mr. BRODEUR. Is my hon. friend serious in making that statement ?

Mr. MONK. I will quote authority.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would like to hear it; it is very extraordinary.

Mr. MONK. Since my hon. friend puts what I say in question, I will review some of the things that occurred when he returned merely for the purpose of setting matters right. My hon. friend does not deny that the 'Lady Grey' went down to meet him at Rimouski.

Mr. BRODEUR. I deny it.

Mr. MONK. He is reported in 'Le Canada' of the 2nd of October as coming up the river on that steamer.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, from Quebec.

Mr. MONK. Oh, it was from Quebec ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I must apologize to my hon. friend, I thought it was from Rimouski. It was from Quebec ! Does my hon. friend deny that four steamers went down from Montreal with many people on board who probably of course took their launches with them ?—I think not. Will he deny that these government steamers went down to meet him ? I have their names. The 'Frontenac,' the 'Beloeil' and the 'Shamrock,' laden with a great many friends and admirers went down to meet this great Tallyrand who was arriving from France, and I say that we incurred considerable expense in that connection. The time has arrived when we should not do these things, when we should not use government property, government money and government steamers for that purpose. We are becoming too important a nation for that. We have to expend money in receiving strangers of mark and in that way making an outward show, which at our present stage, we must take the consequences of, but to use government money in banquets, and excursions on steamboats for political purposes should be discouraged. The money of the people must be expended on more serious objects. Why was all this so organized ? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not doubt it. Will we say it, must we say it, it is because the deus ex machina in that matter was the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) ; he was the one who organized the great demonstration for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Why ? I regret to say that there are divisions among hon. gentlemen opposite and that it becomes necessary, in order to assert with some degree of display, the supremacy of one of these hon. ministers from Quebec you must bring down government steamers, hail him upon his arrival here and make a great show to throw other people, not on this side of the House, in the shade. Hence it is that we have to put our hands in our pockets and pay money to make a triumphant exhibition where otherwise that would not be dreamed of. When Mr. Kasson returned from France after concluding the treaty of 1898, when these gentlemen re-

turned from France in 1902 and later in 1907 when these commercial conventions were concluded there were no government steamers because then the underhand necessities had not arisen. Well, Sir, leaving that aside I have shown that there was a display of our fleet on that occasion. I have hinted—merely hinted, and I will go further into that question if necessary, at what occasioned that display. Let us hear what the Minister of Marine said when he returned. I must say first that he was surprised at the reception. He did not know that all this had been organized, but as the addresses multiplied, as from place to place, wharfs were reached, under the skilful superintendence of the Solicitor General, he warmed to the subject. He became like King George who thought he had commanded at the Battle of Waterloo and he claimed all the credit for having made the treaty leaving the hon. Minister of Finance in the shade, for having concluded it not in the name of England, not in the name of the Minister of Finance but in his own name, he having gone over to Paris for that purpose. He is reported in 'Le Canada,' I will quote as frugally as possible. After referring to the colonial conference he says:

> I will only tell you this that faithful to the traditions of the Liberal party Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues at the conference demanded the more perfect recognition of our autonomy.

Further on, when he got to his own home, feeling emboldened, he used even stronger expressions in answer to the long and mellifluous address which was presented to him by Dr. Choquette. It is worth reading.

Mr. BRODEUR. Read it.

Mr. MONK. Read it? Does the hon. gentleman think that I am an obstructionist like himself? He claimed that the treaty had been concluded under extraordinary circumstances, that he had gone to England and obtained this right to conclude treaties in our own name, that he had put it into execution right away in our own mother country, France. He had not gone anywhere else but he had gone there and using the right which he had wrested from the authorities in England he had obtained the treaty. I do not think that is a fair statement; at any rate it is not the truth. My hon. friend did not say that here? Did my hon. friend say that here? No. He read the order in council passed at the Court of St. James naming him plenipotentiary with his hon. colleague (Mr. Fielding) and he said, it is true, but in very moderate language, that Canada had concluded this treaty in her own name, but when he was down in the country parts he spoke with more audacity and much more fervour. Does my hon. friend believe that there has been any change whatever in the mode by which we make our commercial arrangements and that the speech made here by our hon. friend from the Yukon (Mr. Thompson) the other day is absolutely without foundation? No, no. He knows and my right hon. friend the First Minister knows—oh, he knows very well—but with Mephistophelian policy he allows all these things to be stated around him and in the papers that the French treaty is being made a racial question. He would not state it himself but he allows these things to go on. He should not allow it. There is no object in telling the people anything but the truth. We have concluded this treaty exactly as we have concluded every treaty in the last thirty years. I have brought here the document to give the enumeration. It would be imposing upon the time of the House to read it, but, I may say that the treaty of 1893 and this treaty were concluded exactly under the same procedure in every respect. The order in council was passed naming these two gentlemen plenipotentiaries. Why? Because they had to sign the treaty in company with Sir Francis Bertie. There would have been no occasion to pass this order in council naming him as plenipotentiary because he was a plenipotentiary already and he signed the treaty first and these two gentlemen after him. In whose name? In the same name as all treaties that have been concluded since the Treaty of Washington, some time, I think in the early seventies.

There was the same procedure regarding etiquette and everything else; these gentlemen arrived in Paris with letters from the Foreign Office to Sir Francis Bertie, were introduced by the British ambassador to the French negotiators and they set to work together. In the same way Sir Charles Tupper brought a letter from the Foreign Office to Lord Dufferin through whom he was introduced to the French negotiators and they set to work and concluded a treaty. Sir Charles Tupper in the correspondence points out that the Canadian negotiator was left to do all the business because he knew all about it. The conclusion of this last treaty with France was surrounded by the same conditions which have surrounded the negotiating of such treaties since Canada has become a great autonomous dependency of the British empire. Why does not the government state these facts; why not tell the truth? Why do they say they have obtained extraordinary privileges when such is not the case? At the imperial conference the Minister of Marine spoke a few words on matters connected with his department, but he raised no question as to our status in the negotiation of treaties. And my right hon. friend, neither in the conference of 1902 nor in the last imperial conference, did he raise any question about this matter, but

when he was asked by Mr. Chamberlain or by Lord Elgin, I forget which: Are you perfectly satisfied with the relations existing at present between the mother country and the dependencies, my right hon. friend answered that he was.

Mr. FOSTER. He said so here.

Mr. MONK. Yes, he has said so in this parliament. But now the government tell the people that a great change has taken place and that something extraordinary has occurred. It is even stated, and I could quote authority for it in an address delivered to this new King George, that this was the first treaty we had ever concluded with France. Why deceive the people in this manner? It is the second treaty we have concluded with France, and we on this side of the House hope it will not be the last. From the very first, instead of contending against the treaty we have applauded it, but as representatives in a deliberative assembly and discharging our duty to the people we have offered some criticism. I venture to say that Frenchmen in France would be ashamed of us if we did not fulfil the role assigned to us as independent representatives of the people. I say that this treaty has been better received, that it has been received in a broader and kinder spirit than did my right hon. friend and his friends when in opposition receive the treaty of 1893. We on this side of the House have not modelled ourselves upon their conduct; we offered fair comment. I thought it proper at this stage to call the attention of the House and of the country to our attitude in this matter.

Mr. ADAM ZIMMERMAN (West Hamilton). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has thrown some doubt on the accuracy of the statement I made in the House on the 21st of February in reference to the development in the Canadian agricultural implement industry which this treaty was likely to bring about. I shall give my hon. friend citations from the Hamilton newspapers which took up the statement I made in the House and interviewed the representatives of the International Harvester Company at Hamilton with reference to them. The 'Spectator,' the Conservative newspaper, publishes the following:

While it may not mean the doubling of the Hamilton plant at once, it will mean big extensions here in some departments. The United States factories ship 9,000 harvesters and 15,000 mowers to France each year. The rough value of these is about $1,500,000. The works here now employ about 1,800 men, and if the treaty is put into effect, the force will be almost doubled.

Speaking of the matter this morning, the superintendent of the Harvester Company said that it was a little early yet to say anything definite. It was quite true that if the treaty as at present framed became an actuality, the Hamilton works would get all the big French trade. It would not mean the doubling of the works here, but large extensions would be necessary. He said that the works here, though now under short hours in some departments, would soon have to get into full swing again. The demand for next season might be a little higher than usual, but he thought the Canadian trade would keep up. A few more treaties like that, as far as agricultural implements are concerned, and the plant here would have to be vastly increased.

The International Harvester people are arranging with the rail and ocean transportation companies for a rate from Hamilton to St. John and thence to France, equal to that now enjoyed on the shipments from United States ports. The International Harvester Company does two-thirds of the total export trade in agricultural implements done from the United States to France.

The Hamilton 'Times' of the same date, in publishing an interview with the officials of the International Harvester Company, says:

We are not in a position to say just now what it will mean to us, 'The Times' was told, but it is working out, and we expect to capture for the Hamilton works a large trade that we have never before enjoyed, and which will necessitate extension of the works and give employment to a largely increased staff. It will take time to work out but the prospects are very bright.

The Hamilton 'Herald,' the independent paper, says:

The announcement made in parliament yesterday by Adam Zimmerman, M. P., that Canada's new treaty with France would result in the International Harvester Company increasing the output of its Hamilton factory, was confirmed this morning by the local office of the company. The United States now exports to France agricultural machinery to the value of nearly $3,000,000 every year. Of this the International Harvester Company ships from $1,500,000 to $2,000,000, or nearly two-thirds of the whole amount.

In future the International company will manufacture in Hamilton all its products for the French market. It not only expects to hold its trade, amounting to $2,000,000, but to capture practically the whole French trade now enjoyed by firms across the border, and to shut out all its American competitors. If its hopes are realized, the local factory will be called upon to turn out $3,000,000 more stuff a year, and it is expected that this amount will soon be largely increased.

By the terms of the treaty, the International company's local branch, like all Canadian factories, will get a preference over the United States in the matter of duty on binders shipped to France of from $7 to $9 a machine. There is also a preference of from $5 to $6 on mowing machines.

The company now employs some 1,800 hands in its factory here, and expects to employ nearly double that number. While the new treaty may lead to immense additions to the plant, it is likely that the principal effect will be to keep the present plant working to its full capacity all the year round, with

probably a good deal of overtime. The company has 135 acres here, and about 40 acres are occupied. The plant has never been worked to its full capacity.

The new arrangements may lead other American concerns to establish Canadian branches.

I think that is all it is necessary for me to say now with regard to this treaty. These quotations from the Hamilton newspapers fortify the statement I made in this House on the 21st of February.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I intended on the third reading of the Bill to offer a few remarks concerning a feature of this treaty which has raised a good deal of discussion, and I am very glad my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has thought fit to reopen the question. There seems to be considerable difference of opinion between the two sides of the House as to whether this treaty has been negotiated in the same manner and under the same condition as other similar treaties, and particularly the treaty of 1893 with France. It is probably advisable for me to state the conditions under which treaties affecting Canada alone have been negotiated in the past or the manner in which our negotiations or trade matters with foreign countries have been conducted. Since confederation Canada has been engaged in negotiating eight or nine of these treaties, three of which might be considered to be treaties affecting the political relations between Canada and foreign countries, as for example the treaty of Washington in 1871, which while it concerned our commercial relations was to some extent a political treaty. Then we have the treaty of 1887, negotiated in Washington. I do not know whether we should treat this treaty as being a commercial treaty, but it does not make any difference because the situation is the same. In those two treaties, in the treaty of 1871, as in the treaty of 1888, the treaty negotiated by Mr. Chamberlain, the negotiations were carried on in the first case by three or four British plenipotentiaries and Sir John Macdonald who was also a plenipotentiary appointed by the imperial government. In 1888, Sir Charles Tupper was appointed a plenipotentiary and carried out the negotiations in conjunction with Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Sackville West.

Then we have the negotiations of 1897, associated with the High Joint Commission, which were carried out by a British plenipotentiary and Canadian representatives. We must admit, however, that in this last case, as in the ones of 1871 and 1888, it was not what we might call a commercial treaty alone, because there were also negotiations covering the political relations between Canada and the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. What does my hon. friend mean by political relations?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether the distinction I make is absolutely correct, but I would divide our treaties into two groups; commercial treaties, that is to say treaties affecting exclusively the commercial relations between our country and another as in the case of the treaty with France of 1893, and political treaties, that is, those affecting such matters as the boundaries or political relations of the two countries, in other words treaties which do not relate purely and simply to their commercial relations. This will at least show what I mean by a commercial treaty.

The first negotiations for an exclusive commercial treaty conducted on behalf of Canada after confederation were carried out in 1874 by Hon. George Brown and Sir Edward Thornton, British ambassador at Washington, as plenipotentiary and by a plenipotentiary who was a Canadian. For what reason was that done in this way? We find in the 'Life of George Brown,' that on the 17th of March, 1874, an order in council was passed by the British government appointing Sir Edward Thornton and Mr. George Brown as joint plenipotentiaries to negotiate a treaty of fisheries, commerce and navigation with the government of the United States. The reason for adopting this mode of representation is given in the book from which I have just quoted, at page 226:

> This mode of representation was insisted upon by the Mackenzie government, in view of the unsatisfactory result of the negotiations of 1871, when Sir John Macdonald, as one commissioner out of six, made a gallant but unsuccessful fight for the rights of Canada.

Every one remembers the unhappy situation in which Sir John was placed when he came to negotiate the treaty of 1871. In his biography written by Mr. Joseph Pope, Sir John is quoted at page 94 as saying:

> In our separate caucuses my colleagues were continually pressing me to yield; in fact I had no backer and I was obliged to stand out, and I am afraid, to make myself extremely disagreeable to them.

At page 96 we find:

> The British commissioners had a meeting after the adjournment and I found they were in favour of ceding the fisheries for ten years, with two years' notice, that is to say for twelve years, certain, in exchange for coal, salt, fish and lumber.

At page 105 he is still more definite when he says:

> I must say that I am greatly disappointed at the course taken by the British commissioners. They seem to have only one thing on their minds—that is to go home to England with a treaty in their pockets, settling everything, no matter at what cost to Canada.

So it is no wonder, with these letters which were at that time confidential but which later became public letters, that when

in 1874 the Mackenzie government were discussing the opening of new negotiations with the United States they urged upon the British authorities that the Canadian representatives should be at least on the same footing as the British representatives, and we see that as the result of their representations, Mr. George Brown and Sir Edward Thornton were both appointed as British plenipotentiaries to negotiate that treaty. It was the first time that a commercial treaty was negotiated because, I do not consider the Treaty of Washington of 1871 as being an exclusively commercial treaty as there were also some political questions to be settled in that treaty. Thus the first negotiations for a commercial treaty with the United States occurred in 1874, the British plenipotentiaries being Mr. George Brown and Sir Edward Thornton.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the political questions to be settled in 1871?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Alabama question.

Mr. FOSTER. Any other?

Mr. BRODEUR. And the Fenian raid. It was not absolutely what we might consider a commercial arrangement as was the one made in 1874.

The next step taken in connection with negotiations of our treaties was in 1878, when the Macdonald government undertook to negotiate a treaty with France, sent Sir A. T. Galt to England and asked the British government to appoint him plenipotentiary with the British ambassador to carry out the negotiations for a treaty with France. These papers are to be found in the blue-books and it is not necessary to quote them here; but as it is just as well that these historical questions should be settled definitely I may cite the documents by which the Canadian government represented to the British authorities the advisability of having the negotiations carried out by a Canadian representative and by a British representative.

The answer from the British government was to the effect that the negotiations had to be carried on by the British representative alone.

Mr. MONK. Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman to point out what the difference was between the manner of negotiating the present treaty and the treaty of 1893?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. There is no difference of opinion as to what was done in 1879, because the order in council of the Canadian government and the answer which came from the British government are embodied in the speech made the other day by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. In 1878 we tried to get from England the right to negotiate a treaty in concert with the British ambassador and were refused. We were told that the negotiations would have to be carried on exclusively by the British ambassador. The reference will be found in the documents laid before the House in 1880 and also in the speech delivered the other day by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. Later on some negotiations were carried on with Spain by Sir A. T. Galt, and Sir A. T. Galt was appointed plenipotentiary to carry on these negotiations—not alone, but with the British ambassador.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman correct in that? Is that the whole of the matter? Or is there not in that same letter of advice the statement by the foreign office to the colonial office, and through it to Canada, that Sir Charles Tupper, with reference to the Spanish negotiations, would be appointed co-plenipotentiary with Sir Robert Morier, but that he would probably carry on the negotiations himself, and that is what really took place?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend must remember that these instructions were never carried out. Previously to that, Sir Alexander Galt had gone to Spain to carry on some negotiations. He was not successful, and the reason for his non-success he gave in a letter which he wrote to Sir Charles Tupper and which is quoted by Sir Charles Tupper in 'Hansard' in 1887. In that letter Sir Alexander Galt advised that in the future negotiations should be carried on exclusively by Canadian representatives.

Mr. FOSTER. Which was assented to by Great Britain.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it was not until the last treaty.

Mr. MONK. How was it assented to in the last treaty?

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall quote the instructions given to the British ambassador on this point.

Mr. MONK. I ask this because Sir Charles Tupper says that the same instructions were given in each case.

Mr. BRODEUR. They were not.

Mr. MONK. He says so.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am trying to give the history of these negotiations, and it is just as well we should proceed step by step or negotiation by negotiation. That will make the case clearer.

Mr. MONK. Provided it is correct.

Mr. BRODEUR. No doubt it is. Coming to the negotiations which took place between the Spanish government and Sir Robert Morier and Sir A. T. Galt, the latter, in a letter which he addressed to Sir Charles Tupper when Sir Charles Tupper took charge of the High Commissioner's

office in London, said he had been seriously handicapped by the fact that negotiations were not carried on exclusively by himself and that the presence of the British ambassador had been a cause of difficulty. That letter is to be found in the debates of 1887 in a speech delivered by Sir Charles Tupper, page 396 of the 'Hansard' of that year.

Coming to the negotiations carried out later on by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) with the Washington authorities. I do not think they were formal negotiations but some negotiations were carried on with the American authorities concerning commercial arrangements, and they were carried on by the British as well as the Canadian representatives. Coming to the treaty of 1893, there is great difference of opinion as to whether that treaty was negotiated exclusively by Sir Charles Tupper, the Canadian representative, or if some British representatives were associated with him. In the discussion some time ago, I asserted that the negotiations had been carried on by the representatives of both Great Britain and Canada, and I think it was asserted by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that they were carried on by Sir Charles Tupper exclusively, and my hon. friend quoted a letter of Sir Charles Tupper which is to be found on page 47 of the documents laid before the House. Here is what Sir Charles Tupper says:

I cannot conclude this communication without saying that while the negotiations have been carried on entirely by myself on the part of Canada and by M. Gabriel Hanotaux, Minister Plenipotentiary and Director of Consulates and of Commercial Affairs in the Foreign Office, M. G. Pallin, Councillor of State, Director General of Customs and M. E. Roume, Director of Foreign Commerce in the Department of Commerce and Industry, on the part of France, I have received the most cordial support and assistance from the Colonial and Foreign Offices in London and from His Excellency the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava. My obligations are especially great to Sir Joseph Crowe, First Secretary and Special Commercial Attaché of the Embassy, who has given me the benefit of his valuable advice and wide experience in such questions and who has constantly associated with me in my intercourse with the French negotiators.

So we have the assertion made by Sir Charles Tupper that the negotiations were carried on exclusively by himself, but that statement is controverted by a report made by Lord Dufferin himself. Lord Dufferin, in his report to Lord Roseberry, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, says:

I think it is incumbent upon me to call Your Lordship's attention to the skill displayed by Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Joseph Crowe in the long and difficult negotiations which they have carried on with the delegates of the French government.

Mr. BRODEUR.

This statement is confirmed by Sir Edward Grey, who was Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and also by the Marquis of Ripon, who was Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister read these confirmations?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. Sir Edward Grey says:

With reference to the previous correspondence on the subject of negotiations with France in regard to Canadian trade, I am directed by the Earl of Roseberry to request that you will inform the Marquis of Ripon that those negotiations have been brought to a successful conclusion, copies in print of the agreement signed and the notes exchanged, on the 6th instant, will shortly be forwarded to you. In the meantime, I transmit a copy of a despatch from Lord Dufferin expressing his sense of the able manner in which the negotiations were conducted by Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Joseph Crowe.

This statement is confirmed in the despatch of the Marquis of Ripon:

I have the honour to transmit to you, for the information of Your Lordship's government, a copy of a letter from the Foreign Office inclosing a despatch from the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava, reporting the successful termination of the negotiations with France in regard to Canadian trade, and expressing his sense of the able manner in which these negotiations were conducted by Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Joseph Crowe.

Mr. MONK. That seems to be contradicted by Sir Charles Tupper himself in his letter of 6th February.

Mr. BRODEUR. I quoted Sir Charles Tupper's letter.

Mr. MONK. The letter of 6th February?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. MONK. In which Sir Charles Tupper says that he conducted the negotiations entirely by himself?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) answer this question—who were the plenipotentiaries appointed by the British government to conduct the negotiations for the treaty of 1893?

Mr. BRODEUR. Sir Charles Tupper and the Marquis of Dufferin.

Mr. FOSTER. The point I wanted to make—if the hon. minister will allow me—is to ask why he spends so much time trying to prove from the letters he has read that Sir Joseph Crowe and Sir Charles Tupper carried on these negotiations, when, at the same time, he says that the plenipotentiaries appointed to carry on the negotiations were the Marquis of Dufferin and Sir Charles Tupper. Assistance may have been given by others, but these were the two ne-

gotiators as plenipotentiaries, and the only two. Surely my hon. friend sees that point.

Mr. BRODEUR. In the first place, it is not absolutely necessary for the making of a treaty that the negotiations should be carried on by the plenipotentiaries. Take the treaty of 1893; these negotiations on the part of the French government were not carried on by the ministers or persons who signed the treaty. The treaty was signed by M. Develle, who was Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Mr. Siegfried, who was Minister of Commerce. These gentlemen did not attend to the negotiations, as the hon. gentlemaan will see by reading the different reports of Sir Charles Tupper. The negotiations were carried on by Mr. Hanotaux and the heads of the several departments. In our case most of the negotiations were carried on, not by the plenipotentiaries who signed the treaty, but by the officials of the different departments.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; but my hon. friend sees that, while that is absolutely so, these are not the plenipotentiaries. What the hon. minister is arguing, if anything, is a change in the status of Canada as to its powers to negotiate and to sign. The only persons so empowered in 1893 were Sir Charles Tupper and the Marquis of Dufferin; and the only persons empowered to negotiate and sign in 1907 were the two representatives of the government from Canada and Sir Francis Bertie. Now, Sir Charles Tupper directly states what he knew to have taken place. These were the plenipotentiaries; no matter how many attachés, clerks or under agents may have taken part in the negotiations, everything is subject to the last word as between the negotiators on each side. Now, if my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) will allow me one moment further, I would like to state a fact: I myself was in Paris while the negotiations for the treaty of 1893 were being carried on—I was there for a fortnight or more. Every day I met Sir Charles Tupper, went to the office with him. I went with him to the Marquis of Dufferin; and I know that the Marquis of Dufferin, after the preliminaries were over, busied himself with his own duties, and Sir Charles Tupper met, day after day, the plenipotentiaries and negotiators from the French side and carried on the negotiations. Sir Joseph Crowe was commercial attaché. His knowledge of commercial transactions, but more than all, his perfect knowledge of the French language, which was absolutely necessary to Sir Charles Tupper in the course of the negotiations, made him an invaluable man. But to say that he had anything to do with fixing Canada's status; why, what is the use of the hon. minister chopping words about it? Has the status been changed on the basis that alone it could be changed, as to who represented the countries as plenipotentiaries and what countries authorized them?

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will permit me to proceed, he will find that the papers I shall quote prove the statement I have made. I think he will find that the status, so far as commercial negotiations are concerned, have been changed during the negotiations of the last treaty. Now, the hon. gentleman states that, whether Sir Joseph Crowe carried on the negotiations as representative of the British Crown or not, he was not the plenipotentiary. That may be true to a certain extent, but if my hon. friend will be kind enough to listen to the documents I shall read, he will find that Sir Joseph Crowe was, to all intents and purposes, a plenipotentiary for the purpose of carrying on these negotiations.

Mr. FOSTER. Was he appointed plenipotentiary by the British government?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman read that appointment?

Mr. BRODEUR. Here are the documents to prove it. I am sorry to find that these documents were not brought down in 1893 with the other papers. I found on examining the papers in the Privy Council office, that documents of great importance and having a bearing on this question had not been brought down. I suppose they were forgotten. I refer to these in order to prove in the most conclusive way that Sir Joseph Crowe was, to all intents and purposes, a negotiator and plenipotentiary to carry on negotiations with the French government. I have here a letter of May 12, 1892, from Sir Charles Tupper to the Under Secretary of State for the Colonial Office, amongst the papers that have been laid on the Table in 1893. This letter has not been brought down, and, as I have no right to refer to a document that has not been brought down without laying it on the table. I will lay this letter on the table. Here are the important parts of the letter of Sir Charles Tupper bearing on the question of issue:

I have the honour to refer the Secretary of State to the report of a Committee of the Privy Council of Canada, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 16th instant, with regard to trade between the Dominion of Canada and France.

It is recommended in the minute in question that His Excellency the Governor General should cause a despatch to be sent to the Secretary of State setting forth the facts in connection with the existing commercial arrangements between the two countries, and requesting that I might be appointed a joint plenipotentiary with His Majesty's ambassador at Paris, with a view to discussing the matter fully with the French government in order, if possible, to arrange for an extension of the minimum tariff of France to imports from the

Dominion, having regard to the circumstances mentioned in the order in council.

I beg therefore to suggest that the Secretary of State will be so good as to move the Foreign Office to request the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava to take advantage of a favourable opportunity of inquiring of the French government whether they would be prepared to enter upon negotiations for the purpose I have mentioned, and the time that will be most convenient to them.

If the reply is favourable, I shall arrange to proceed to Paris as soon as the necessary formalities have been completed.

Now that letter of Sir Charles Tupper was referred to Lord Dufferin who was then British ambassador at Paris, and Lord Dufferin was asked to give his opinion on the suggestion made by Sir Charles Tupper. Here is his answer of the 24th of May, 1892:

Paris.

My Lord,—In acknowledging the receipt of Your Lordship's despatch No. 110 commercial of the 19th of May, respecting the proposition of the government of Canada, that the High Commissioner should be empowered with myself to negotiate a commercial arrangement between Canada and France, and asking my opinion on the matter. I have the honour to state that I see no reason why a communication embodying the wishes of the Canadian government should not be submitted to the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, with a fair expectation that the latter would be willing to enter upon an examination of the Canadian proposals. Though I am quite willing myself to assist the High Commissioner in the discharge of his tasks, so far as may be in my power, I would venture to suggest that Sir Joseph Crowe should also take part in the negotiations as he has done on previous occasions.

(Sgd.) DUFFERIN AND AVA.

Now what was the answer to that letter? That despatch of Lord Dufferin was submitted to the foreign office, then to the colonial office, and then to Sir Charles Tupper. Here is what Sir Charles Tupper says in a letter which he wrote to the colonial office on the 1st of June, 1892:

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of Mr. Wingfield's letter of the 31st ultimo, with reference to the proposed negotiations for a commercial arrangement between Canada and France. I have much pleasure in concurring in the suggestion that Sir Joseph Crowe should be associated with the Marquis of Dufferin and myself in the matter.

(Sgd.) CHARLES TUPPER.

Nothing can be more positive than that. Was not Sir Joseph Crowe, under these instructions of the foreign office, directed to carry out negotiations with France?

Mr. FOSTER. Was he the plenipotentiary?

Mr. BRODEUR. He was not appointed minister plenipotentiary, but was he not plenipotentiary for the purpose of carrying through the negotiations? He was not plenipotentiary to sign the treaty, but he was plenipotentiary to carry out the negotiations. There are two important parts in connection with the making of a treaty, there are the negotiations and there is the signing of the treaty. In this case, what I wish to impress upon the House is that the negotiations for the treaty of 1893 were not carried out exclusively by Canadian representatives. It was in 1907 that for the first time negotiations of a commercial nature were carried out exclusively by Canadian ministers. I lay these papers on the table for the information of members of this House. But that is not all. The question was discussed again, and I think my hon. friend took part in the conference of 1895 which was held in Canada, and in which Lord Jersey was the representative of the British government. A resolution passed at that conference was sent to the imperial government, or a report was made by Lord Jersey to the British government, and the British government sent a long despatch to the various colonies interested in this question. The Marquis of Ripon signed this despatch, which is dated June 20, 1895. Paragraph 7 of the despatch reads as follows:

To give the colonies power of negotiating treaties for themselves without reference to Her Majasety's government would be to give them an international status as separate and sovereign states, and would be equivalent to breaking up the empire into a number of independent states, a result which Her Majesty's government are satisfied would be injurious equally to the colonies and to the mother country, and would be desired by neither.

The negotiations then, being between Her Majesty and the sovereign of the foreign state, must be conducted by Her Majesty's representative, at the court of the foreign power, who would keep Her Majesty's government informed of the progress of the discussion, and seek instructions from them as necessity arose.

It could hardly be expected, however, that he would be sufficiently cognizant of the circumstances and wishes of the colony to enable him to conduct the negotiation satisfactorily alone, and it would be desirable generally, therefor, that he should have the assistance, either as a second plenipotentiary or in a subordinate capacity, as Her Majesty's government thinks the circumstances require, of a delegate appointed by the colonial government.

If, as a result of the negotiations, any arrangement is arrived at it must be approved by Her Majesty's government and by the colonial government, and also by the colonial legislature if it involves legislative action, before the ratifications can be exchanged.

It is enunciated very clearly there that the negotiations should be carried out by the British ambassador. That was the position taken in that despatch of 1895. Now what is the situation to-day? I have in my hand the instructions which were given on

the 4th of July, 1907, by Sir Edward Grey to the British ambassador, or his representative in Paris, concerning the negotiations for this treaty now under discussion. I may say that by command of His Excellency, and with the authorization of the imperial authorities I lay this despatch before parliament. It sets forth in the clearest manner the situation, and shows that now for the first time in Canadian history negotiations for a commercial treaty were carried out exclusively by Canadian representatives. Here is that despatch :

Foreign Office, July 4, 1907.

Sir,—In my telegram No. 10 commercial of the 23rd of May, I informed Sir F. Bertie that Sir Wilfrid Laurier desired to open negotiations for new commercial conventions with the French government, and I requested that His Excellency would endeavour to assist him in the attainment of his object.

You are doubtless cognizant of the Marquis of Ripon's despatch of June 28, 1895, to the Governors of the principal British colonies in which it was laid down that commercial negotiations of this nature being between His Majesty and the sovereign of the foreign state, should be conducted by His Majesty's representative at the court of the foreign power. A copy of this despatch is inclosed herewith.

I do not, however, think it necessary to adhere in the present case to the strict letter of this regulation, the object of which was to secure that negotiations should not be entered into and carried through by a colony unknown to and independently of His Majesty's government.

The selection of the negotiator is principally a matter of convenience and, in the present circumstances, it will obviously be more practical that the negotiations should be left to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and to the Canadian Minister of Finance or the Canadian ministers, who will doubtless keep you informed of their progress.

If the negotiations are brought to a conclusion at Paris, you should sign the agreement jointly with the Canadian negotiator, who would be given full powers for the purpose.

I am, with great truth and regard, sir,
Your most obedient humble servant,
E. GREY.

I think that disposes of the question. They do not want to adhere to the rule which had prevailed in the past that all negotiations should be carried out by the British ambassador and by Canadian representatives, as stated in the despatch of the Marquis of Ripon; but it is stated here that the negotiations are to be carried out by Canadian representatives, the foreign office being satisfied with the names suggested in that connection. That is the difference. I suppose that my hon. friend will not deny it. I am willing to lay on the table of the House this letter which my hon. friend may read as we are authorized by the British authorities to lay it on the table.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend argue that that changes the status of the government and gives them the right to conduct commercial negotiations and make treaties independently of Great Britain?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think it is a most important thing that these negotiations are to be carried on exclusively by the Canadian representatives. I have just quoted to my hon. friend a letter signed by Sir John Macdonald in 1871 in which he said that in spite of the fact that these negotiations affected mostly Canadian affairs he was hampered in his negotiations because the British representatives were anxious to make a treaty at no matter what cost to Canada. I was quoting a few moments ago the letter of Sir A. T. Galt, that he was hampered in his relations in 1882. I have the quotation in my hand, although I did not have it when I made my remark a few minutes ago. I will quote it to my hon. friend in order to show him how important it is, where our interests may differ from the interests of Great Britain, that these negotiations should be carried on exclusively by the Canadian representatives. Here is what Sir Charles Tupper said in this House in 1887. Speaking of the negotiations with Spain he said:

That treaty hon. gentlemen know Sir Alexander Galt was not able to carry to completion, and, when I had the honour of succeeding him in the office of High Commissioner, he left for my perusal and information a document in which he said that he found himself greatly hampered in discharging the duties imposed upon him by the government of Canada because he only stood in the position of a commercial commissioner and it was necessary that all his negotiations with the government of Spain should be filled through Her Majesty's minister at Madrid.

That shows in the most conclusive way the importance of carrying out these negotiations through Canadian representatives. Sir Charles Tupper participated in the negotiations of 1887 in Washington. Perhaps it would afford us some information if we were to inquire into the way in which these negotiations were carried out. He might let us know whether it is better that these negotiations should be carried out exclusively by the Canadian representatives rather than through British representatives. I might give an illustration taken from the negotiations of 1880 with France. Why did these negotiations fail ? Is it because the British representative was asking that razors and cutlery should be put on a French minimum tariff ? What was the object of asking for a reduction of duty on razors and cutlery? We had no cutlery establishments in Canada then. Why should we insist upon a reduced rate of duty ? It was done, probably, in the interest of Sheffield cutlery because any reduction which would have been given to Canada would also have been given to Great Britain, Great Britain enjoying the

minimum tariff, or the most reduced rate of duty. I will not say that the negotiations fell through entirely on that account, but that is one of the things which was asked from the French authorities and after that the negotiations fell through. There is nothing in the public records which will show why these negotiations fell through, but I must say that this request that was made of the French authorities was, to say the least, very extraordinary.

Mr. MONK. I see that in answering the address that was presented to him at Three Rivers the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries used this language—I am quoting from 'Le Canada' of October 7, 1907:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier obtained from England, thanks to his energy and his revendications, rights which we were entitled to claim, and in 1907 England concluded with Canada a treaty, thanks to which Canada could intervene. It was a considerable step forward towards freedom in negotiating the widest treaties of commerce and gave us the right to treat with France. England gave to us the absolute right to conclude these negotiations.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman explain what he meant by that?

Mr. BRODEUR. I don't know whether the report just read by my hon. friend of the speech which I made at Three Rivers is correct or not, but I see that it mixes up a little the question of the colonial conference and the question of the negotiation of treaties. The question of the negotiation of treaties did not come up in the colonial conference. But, since my hon. friend has called my attention to that, I might perhaps refer for a few minutes to the colonial conference. We obtained in the colonial conference concessions of the most important character. Let me mention this one, for example. My hon. friend knows very well that Canadian ministers with the exception of the Prime Minister, were not admitted to this conference except for the purpose of discussing questions affecting their departments. This conference was called upon the invitation of the Colonial Secretary, and Prime Ministers only were invited. It was a conference of the colonial office with the prime ministers of the different colonies. But there has been a change made. My hon. friend may have read the speech which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister made at the colonial conference.

Mr. MONK. I have read them all.

Mr. BRODEUR. He said that in future this conference should not be a conference of a department of the British government with the prime ministers of the different colonies, but that it should be a conference of governments with governments.

Mr. MONK. I did not see that any where.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. FOSTER. Did Sir Wilfrid Laurier use those words at the colonial or imperial conference first, or were they merely a repetition of words which had been used before in that conference by either Sir Campbell-Bannerman or Lord Elgin?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely so.

Mr. BRODEUR. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman did not go so far as my right hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that was just his speech.

Mr. BRODEUR. Sir Henry said that the conference was a conference of the British government with the prime ministers of the colonies, but my right hon. leader the Prime Minister of Canada stated that the conference should be a conference of governments with governments, not a conference of the British government or imperial government with the prime ministers of the colonies, but a conference of governments with governments.

Mr. MONK. I would like to see that very much.

Mr. BRODEUR. And that the participants in that conference should not be persons invited to it by the Colonial Office, but that they should be representatives of the different governments.

Mr. MONK. I would like to see all that.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, my hon. friend could not have read these speeches.

Mr. MONK. Yes, I have read them all.

Mr. BRODEUR. Let him read the speech of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the answer of the Canadian Prime Minister and he will find that the latter one asserted the right of Canada to select its own representatives and the right of Canada to be represented as a government, not on the invitation of anybody else, but that it should send representatives on behalf of the Canadian government. In other words, that in all these conferences the autonomous states of the empire should be put upon the same footing as the imperial government. That is the situation and that is the result of the representations which have been made by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. Let my hon. friend read the resolution which was adopted and he will find that what I say is correct. Perhaps he has not read it very carefully, but as I attended to all the drafting that took place perhaps I may be a little more familiar than my hon. friend is with it and appreciate better the weight which is to be attached to each word. It means for Canada that in future it will not be a conference of the colonial office with the Prime Minister of Canada,

but conferences between governments and governments.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the conferences of the future be any different, so far as we have any information to guide us, from the conference of 1907 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because the Canadian representatives (the colleagues of the Prime Minister whom he brings with him), who had no status in the former conferences will have a status in future conferences.

Mr. FOSTER. They had no status in the conference of 1907.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, we were admitted to the conference and had the right to take part in the discussions affecting our departments.

Mr. MONK. But you could not vote.

Mr. BRODEUR. We could not vote in past conferences and we could not discuss questions affecting other than our departments.

Mr. MONK. You cannot vote in the future.

Mr. FOSTER. Will Canada and the other colonies be in any different position in the next imperial conference, suppose no change is made between that time and this, will they not be in absolutely the same position in the future as they were in the past ?

Mr. MONK. Absolutely.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is the change I have just mentioned. If my hon. friend does not think it a step forward then I am afraid I cannot enlighten my hon. friend further. Probably my hon. friend has not read these reports very carefully.

Mr. FOSTER. I have read them very carefully.

Mr. MONK. I am beginning to think that my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) was not at the conference at all, because he is not stating the things as they took place ; I am beginning to think he was travelling around.

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend will read the reports carefully he will find there are the differences I have just mentioned. However, I am very glad to hear my hon. friend now state that he intends to vote in favour of the treaty.

Mr. MONK. I have not spoken against this treaty, as the right hon. the Prime Minister did against the treaty of 1893.

Mr. BRODEUR. The right hon. gentleman was perfectly justified in opposing the treaty of 1893 because it was a onesided treaty in favour of France and against Canada.

Mr. MONK. Then why did my hon. friend ask a continuation of it in 1907 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We never asked for a continuation of it.

Mr. MONK. It is written down in your own letter there.

Mr. BRODEUR. Let my hon. friend read the document which is signed by my colleague (Mr. Fielding) and myself, and which we handed to the French authorities. I read :

Translation.

Memorandum of Proposals on behalf of Canada for a new treaty between the French Republic and His Majesty, King Edward VII, as respects commercial relations between France and Canada.

V. The Treaty of 1893 to be terminated and a new treaty to be substituted.

Mr. MONK. Will my hon. friend read the beginning of that communication. What is the first article ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The first article reads :

1. The reduced rates of duty on certain articles of French origin provided by article 1 of the Treaty of the 6th of February, 1893, shall be continued.

Of course, there is no objection to the reduced rate of duty continuing but there were two serious objections to that treaty of 1893 to which I may call attention.

Mr. MONK. Will my hon. friend allow me to quote my authority for what I cited ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. MONK. The beginning of that communication, of which you quoted the latter part, reads :

1. The reduced rates of duty on certain articles of French origin provided by Article 1 of the Treaty of the 6th of February, 1903, shall be continued.

Mr. FIELDING. Surely. We did not want to give anything away.

Mr. MONK. And further down it says :

III. The reduced rates of duty on certain articles of Canadian origin provided by Article III of the Treaty of the 6th of February, 1903, shall be continued.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. Certainly.

Mr. MONK. If you continued the reduction on both sides, what were you doing ?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is forgetting two of the important features of that treaty of 1893. What does he think of the direct shipment clause and the most favoured nation treatment clauses in the treaty of 1893. In that treaty France was granted in Canada most favoured nation treatment, not only upon the few articles embodied in the treaty but upon all favours which Canada granted to any other foreign country.

On the other hand Canada did not receive from France the same treatment. France could give to any foreign nation the most favoured nation treatment and Canada was not allowed to enjoy it. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) think it would be right to continue that feature of the treaty of 1893 ?

Mr. MONK. It was not criticised in this House at that time.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend has not read 'Hansard' carefully.

Mr. FIELDING. Did we ask to continue it ?

Mr. MONK. In a modified form.

Mr. FIELDING. On the contrary we asked to strike it out.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does not my hon. friend think that this change between the treaty of 1893 and the treaty of 1907 is a most important change ?

Mr. MONK. I think the most important change of all was the right of concluding treaties in our own name which you have not explained yet.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to the direct shipment, did we ask the French government to continue the treaty in that respect ? Certainly not. In that direct shipment provision in the treaty of 1893 it was a stipulation in favour of France alone and there was no reciprocal privilege given to Canada. Under that clause in the treaty of 1893 in order that Canadian goods might enjoy the benefit of the minimum tariff in France we were obliged to ship them direct to France, whereas French goods imported into Canada were not subject to the same restriction. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) tell me that that was equal treatment to Canada. Then why should we give to France the privilege of the most favoured nation treatment when Canada had not the same privilege. Why should we allow France to restrict the importation of goods through a French port alone, when Canada did not have the same advantage on her side. In these respects, my hon. friends will find in the treaty we have negotiated that Canada and France have been put on terms of equality. Under this treaty the most favoured nation treatment applies to Canada as well as to France, and that is as it should be. Then again the inequality of treatment as regards direct shipments which we find in the treaty of 1893 has disappeared in the treaty of 1897, and Canada and France now stand on an even plane in that respect.

Mr. SPROULE. And when you come to establish a line of steamers to carry on that trade Canada pays all the subsidy.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are subsidizing a line of steamers to open up channels of trade with France. That is our own business and for our own advantage. My hon. friend knows that we are also subsidizing a line of steamers to China and Japan for a trade which is not so important as that which we are conducting with France.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the minister said that under this treaty Canada and France enjoyed equal privileges in every respect.

Mr. BRODEUR. The subsidy to a line of steamers between Canada and France is not mentioned in the treaty and the treaty has nothing to do with it. That is a matter which is entirely in the discretion of Canada. I will not discuss that question now, but let me ask my hon. friend: Does he not think it advisable that we should have a line of steamers with France in order to promote trade between the two countries?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting to that at all, but I say if it is an advantage to us it must be equally an advantage to France, and for the purpose of carrying on and developing this trade I cannot see any good reason why France should not share the cost of subsidizing that line.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is not in the treaty, it has absolutely nothing to do with the treaty and we have simply to decide whether the treaty as it is is a good one or whether it should be rejected. I have been extremely surprised to hear hon. gentlemen opposite criticise this treaty for several days. They were very willing to support the treaty of 1893, and I would ask if my hon. friend from East Grey, who voted for that treaty would undertake to say that this treaty is not more advantageous than the one of 1893.

Mr. SPROULE. I will frankly say that I have not examined it, nor could I, as it was presented, reach any intelligent conclusion or make any proper analysis of it with the information before the House. I would not speak one way or the other. I have not said anything against the treaty ; I have scarcely criticised it for the simple reason that I could not make an analysis of it that would justify me.

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall try to convert my hon. friend completely. He voted for the French treaty of 1893 which covered only a few articles and which contained some bad clauses, especially the favoured nation clause. Apart from the articles covered by that treaty we have increased considerably the number of articles on which we enjoy the benefit of the minimum tariff. Will my hon. friend object to that ?

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall quote one figure to my hon. friend to show how important this treaty is. We find in the figures that were before us when we negotiated the

treaty that for 1896 we exported from Canada goods to the value of $235,000,000. Out of this $235,000,000 we have obtained the French minimum tariff on goods which we exported to the extent of $212,000,000. Does my hon. friend think that is a bad feature? We have practically covered all the articles of export from Canada. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says that we should not have a long list like that, and suggests that we should have conferred it simply to a small list of articles.

Mr. MONK. I did not say that.

Mr. BRODEUR. A less number of articles.

Mr. MONK. With the certainty that we could deal in those articles.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will my hon. friend cite to me five articles of importance which we export to-day which are not included in this treaty. Our aim was to cover all the articles that we were exporting. My hon. friend says: But we do not export agricultural products to France. He is mistaken; let him examine the reports and he will find that we have exported cattle to France.

Mr. MONK. To a very small extent.

Mr. BRODEUR. At all events, we have exported cattle to France. We exported some years ago a good quantity of dead meat. We were doing a very good business with France in ham. There was not then any minimum tariff on that article and of course the Canadian exporters were on the same footing as the producers in the countries adjoining France, Hungary, Germany, Italy, Switzerland and Belgium. In 1903, a minimum tariff was imposed on ham and the result has been that some of these adjoining countries, which enjoyed the benefit of the minimum tariff, have captured the ham trade there, their hams have supplanted the Canadian hams. This shows conclusively that there is a great advantage in having provided that we will have the minimum tariff or the most reduced rate not only on the articles which are to-day on the minimum list, but also on the articles on which there is only one tariff, such as grain. Suppose that to-morrow a minimum tariff should be imposed on wheat. We have provided in the treaty that any reduction which will be given to any foreign country will have to be given to Canada, whether there is a minimum tariff on the article or not. If, to-morrow, France should impose a minimum tariff or a reduced tariff on wheat coming from Russia, France would have to give us the same treatment. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has stated that we do no business in cheese. There he is mistaken. The figures do not show this but I am credibly informed by importers in France that a large quantity of cheese was imported into France as English cheese, although it was Canadian cheese. My hon. friend also tried to poke some fun at us because we had put some fruits, like pineapples, and also brandy on the list. If my hon. friend will read the clauses in which these articles are mentioned, he will find that they are grouped with other articles of importance. Take pineapples for instance. It is true we do not produce pineapples, but this would include preserved pineapples and it must be remembered that by this clause we have the minimum tariff on apples and preserved fruits and we may do a large trade in apples.

Mr. MONK. I do not think we can do much trade with France in apples, preserved or otherwise.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is mistaken. Two years ago we exported a large quantity of apples. My hon. friend has not studied the situation carefully.

Mr. MONK. I did not conclude the treaty in the name of Canada as my hon. friend did.

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend will speak to one of the apple shipping companies in Montreal connected with the French service, he will find that we exported a large quantity of apples last year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may say for the information of the House that two years ago I was told in Paris that the whole crop of the village of St. Laurent, represented by my hon. friend, had been bought in Paris, and Canadian apples were sold at one franc.

Mr. MONK. I do not want to create any trouble between these two hon. gentlemen.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to brandy, my hon. friend will find that brandy is included in the same item in the French treaties as whisky and we export a great quantity of Canadian Club whisky to France. My hon. friend must have seen advertisements for Club whisky in many places in France. If my hon. friends object to our having included in clauses with articles in which we do a considerable business, articles in which we may not do much, what has he to say of the famous eels included in the treaty of 1893? Eels were then included by themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend go back on eels?

Mr. BRODEUR. They were not included with some other article.

Mr. FOSTER. They were not by themselves.

Mr. BRODEUR. They were by themselves, my hon. friend is mistaken. I will show him the treaty.

Mr. MONK. Fresh water fish, eels.

Mr. FOSTER. It took in all fresh water fish.

Mr. BRODEUR. No; only eels. My hon. friend will find that a description such as this in the French tariff means simply eels.

Mr. MONK. Eels are not considered as fish. They belong to the snake family.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are caught in Lake St. Peter. Is that not fresh water?

Mr. MONK. They are not considered as fish at all.

Mr. FOSTER. They are land animals caught in the water.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend comes from a country where they do not appreciate some differences. Coming to the question of direct shipment, my hon. friend is entirely mistaken in his interpretation. He claims that goods can be exported to Canada from France via the United States.

Mr. MONK. I understood that by article 8.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose that now my hon. friend gives up that argument.

Mr. MONK. We are to understand by that article that the country through which the goods are exported must get the benefit of the whole minimum tariff?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly.

Mr. MONK. That is not according to article 8.

Mr. BRODEUR. In the French treaties, what does the minimum tariff mean? Most of the treaties made by France are treaties in which they give the French minimum tariff generally.

Mr. MONK. We are enjoying the benefits of the minimum tariff.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, not entirely. We asked the benefit of the whole minimum tariff, but they could not give it, because, according to their tariff law, only those countries which give them the most reduced tariff can enjoy the full benefit of their minimum tariff. And as Canada gives the British empire a lower tariff than the intermediate, France could not give us the whole benefit of her minimum tariff.

Mr. MONK. That is a question.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think so at all. It is well understood that goods could not be shipped through the United States to France and enjoy the advantages of the treaty, and in like manner goods must be shipped to France from Canada direct or via Great Britain or British possessions in order to enjoy the minimum tariff. I do not think it is necessary that I should dwell longer on the treaty. I am glad to hear my hon. friend say that he intends to vote for it. I had some doubts, because his friends were severely criticising the treaty.

Mr. MONK. I stated in the debate on the address that I would vote for it.

Mr. BRODEUR. The treaty was discussed in the French chamber and adopted on the same day. Here it has taken several days, but we have no objection to the discussion, especially as light has come from it to our hon. friends opposite and they are going to vote for the treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. The light has come in a certain way. The latest telegram announces thirty-one Conservatives and thirteen Liberals elected in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. A. M. BEAUPARLANT (St. Hyacinthe). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, after the important speech just delivered by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), I wish to say but a few words on the question now before the House.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who spoke at the beginning of this sitting, first stated that the French treaty which we propose to ratify by this Bill, has been well received by his political friends. I am willing to admit that he was sincere, but, evidently, the hon. member did not look into all that was said by his political friends on this question. Had he done so, or had he taken a more active part in the discussion of this commercial treaty with France, surely he would have refrained from making such a statement. The speech delivered by the hon. leader of the opposition on this question does not show that the treaty has met with a very kind welcome on his part, and what he said, and what several of his followers, for instance, the hon. member for Brantford and the hon. member for Lincoln, also said, is far from corroborating the statement made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

No, our opponents refuse, apparently at least, to believe in the general advantage to be derived by Canada from the French treaty. They claim that France will be more benefited by it than we will. They admit, however, after glancing at the text, that 153 of Canada's products will be privileged in France, whereas only 110 of the French products will, in the same conditions, be privileged in Canada. But we have in our favour the number and the commercial enthusiasm, which an older country has not, at least in the same proportion, and so, according to sound logic and to all unprejudiced people, the chances are on our side. The policy of the United States, a country which naturally should be our market, has hardly encouraged our aspiration or our hopes since a pretty long time, and then the English market is not unlimited and our products do not happen to be the only ones that get there. There-

fore, a country which, as far as commerce is concerned, comes, like France does under the actual circumstances, and holds out to us the olive branch, should not judiciously be looked upon as being a contracting party too exclusively biased by his own interests.

After all, our friends opposite do not consider that they have been sent here especially to cheer at all that which happens to be done by the government or by its representatives. They think it their duty to do quite the reverse, and such being the case, I admit that they stick to their duty unceasingly and beyond all reproach. However, if this question is voted upon they must resign themselves once more to see several of their followers desert them and to remain unable, so do I think, at least, to compensate this loss even by one independent adhesion.

In addition to this, it is difficult to deny that public interest is served, when the interest of so many industries in different parts of the country is undoubtedly favoured by the treaty now under consideration, for, after all, public interest springs from the private interests united together. Let us look first at the agricultural interests. It seems to me impossible not to admit that these interests are favoured by the treaty, as far as the following products are concerned: on horses, according to age, a rebate of 25 to 33⅓ per cent; on other animals, a rebate of 33⅓ per cent; on fresh meats, 30 to 37½ per cent; salt meats, 40 to 50 per cent; on pure condensed milk, 50 per cent; on cheese, eggs, salt butter, 33⅓ per cent; on fodder, including hay, 33⅓ per cent; finally, on what and potatoes, the rebate being even 86⅔ per cent on this last article. In other words, the duty was 58 cents a bushel heretofore, while it is only 8 cents to-day, under the new treaty.

In fine, 153 agricultural or industrial products will be favoured with a rebate.

Several members have also enumerated the particular advantages which the treaty is bound to secure in their respective districts. The treaty has not been ratified yet, and even now, as my hon. friend from West Hamilton (Mr. Zimmerman) tells us, a particular activity is evidenced in the city of Hamilton in the meat canning industry and in the manufacture of farming implements, in order to make exports to France. Shops which had closed their doors are opening them to-day with hope, because of the new market where their products may now be sold.

At six o'clock House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

## THE HAMILTON RADIAL ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 25) respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I move in amendment:

That the said bill be not read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend Section 2 by striking out all of the said section, commencing with the word 'provided' in line 39 thereof, to the end thereof, and by substituting the following words: 'notwithstanding anything contained in the preamble or Section 1 of the Bill, or in the Railway Act, the said company, and its lines of railways shall be subject to the provisions of the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board Act, 1906, and amendments thereto, and to the Ontario Railway Act, 1906, and amendments thereto, and to the jurisdiction of the Ontario Municipal Railway Board and the Ontario Power Commission Act, and the Act respecting the same, Chapter 19 of the Statutes of Ontario and amendments thereto.

It is obvious at a glance what objects are sought to be accomplished by this amendment. In a word that object is to retain in the province of Ontario jurisdiction over this railway, in so far as it is under the Ontario Railway Act, in so far as it is under the Ontario Municipal Railway Board Act, and also in so far as it is under the Power Commission Act. Now, should this Bill pass, the people who are served or are to be served by this road will be deprived of rights which heretofore they have enjoyed under the various Acts I have cited. It is to turn back the hands of the clock, as it were, so that the people may continue to receive these benefits, that I move this amendment. Now the people in the territory through which this road and its branches run, number upwards of one million souls. That district is all the southwestern and much of the central portion of the province of Ontario. The rights of this one million of people are to be considered, according to my opinion, against the demands of the company. It seems to me that the discussion of this Bill in the committee, both during the present session and during last session, was confined largely to the rights of the railway. Hon. gentlemen who promoted and supported this Bill seemed to see with only one eye, and that eye was directed toward the company. The rights of the people, according to my way of thinking, were entirely overlooked. It must be remembered that this is not only a railway company, but also a power company. And, if the jurisdiction over the works of this company be taken from the province of Ontario and vested in the Dominion of Canada, then every company similarly situated in the province of Ontario will be entitled to the same treatment, and, no doubt, the precedent established by giving this company Dominion standing will be pleaded by these other companies whenever it suits their purpose to do so. Every

one who is conversant with the Acts of the province of Ontario to which I have referred —the Railway Act, the Railway Board Act and the Hydro-Electric Commission Act— knows that many valuable rights are preserved to the people under these Acts which they cannot possibly receive from the Dominion government, at least as it is at present constituted. Under the precedent it is proposed here to set, practically every small electric railway company in the province will be free to seek and obtain federal legislation. The very preamble of this Bill invites that, for it recites that by the crossing of this railway by the Grand Trunk Railway some ten years ago, this railway became a work for the general advantage of Canada. You are setting the seal of the Dominion parliament upon every railway that, at any time, has crossed or connected with any Dominion steam railway. Surely, this is unnecessary; it is going beyond the needs of this Bill and is holding out a signal which will attract every company that thinks it can benefit by federal incorporation. We shall have the province of Ontario made practically an incorporating body with no further powers. Under the British North America Act, the province has the power to incorporate railway companies within the province. This will be seen on referring to subsection 10 of section 92 of the British North America Act, which, among other exclusive powers given to the provinces, names 'local works and undertakings other than such as are of the following classes.' Then follows the exceptions. So, after these companies have been incorporated by the province, and, it may be, after they have come before the legislature year after year procuring extensions and favours, whenever it suits their interest, they can ask for Dominion incorporation, and, under the precedent of this measure, that incorporation cannot be denied them without injustice. So, as I say, you will have Ontario simply a charter granting body, a place of organization like the state of New Jersey, a state notorious throughout America generally as being simply an incorporating power. And you will have these companies becoming incorporated by the provincial parliament and thereafter passing under federal control. You will have this anomalous state of things: You will have the provincial Railway Act and the provincial railway commission dealing with these provincial railways, as they should deal with them under the full scope of the British North America Act, and then you will have these companies vanishing from the jurisdiction of the province. Ontario will have simply the power to incorporate and no more, because the companies will pass from local to federal jurisdiction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is an unusual application. This company was incorporated fifteen years ago by the province of Ontario.

Mr. MACDONELL.

Since that time it has applied for and received five special Acts of the Ontario legislature, conferring powers and, along with them, burdens and privileges. The time for the building of this road has been extended from time to time. The best evidence of that is the fact that the promoters of this Bill are now asking for the incorporation of a road not yet commenced. The greater part of this road, yes, five-sixths of this road asked for in this Bill, is not even commenced, although this company became incorporated some fifteen years ago.

Now, it has been said that this was not a company undertaking to do local work in that province, but that it intended to go far afield and connect with some other roads, that it would be a great forwarder of freight and passenger traffic, and would also cut the international boundary at two places. Now, my argument in the Railway Committee was this, that it was not sufficient for a company to come to this parliament and simply say: We intend to do so and so; we intend to build an interprovincial railway, or we intend to build a railway crossing the international boundary line; but they must also give some evidence of their bona fides, and their good faith, and their intention to do so, and that until they had given such evidence they should not complain if this parliament declined to recognize them as a railway for the general advantage of Canada. But the promoters of this Bill took the ground, the only ground which they attempted to discuss in the Railway Committee, that this railway was a work for the general advantage of Canada, and in fact had been so declared by the judgment of Mr. Justice Street in the year 1897. Now, it has been pointed out on two or three occasions at least since that time that this very company went to the Ontario legislature and obtained an extension of their powers. They made no pretense to recognize federal legislation as controlling them, they in no way claimed that they were under the Railway Act of Canada, and it is only now that they make this claim under this judgment to which I have referred in the Grand Trunk Railway Company vs. the Hamilton Radial Railway Company, by Mr. Justice Street, reported in 29 Ontario Reports, at page 143. Now, that judgment, which I think I have analyzed fairly, was simply confirming an order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, which ordered the Grand Trunk Company to submit to the crossing or intersection by this radial road of its line. Now, the judgment contains this statement:

The defendants then applied to the Railway Committee——

That is speaking of the steps that this company took.

The defendants then applied to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for an order

allowing them to cross the tracks of the Grand Trunk Railway Company which was opposed by the plaintiffs, but on March 3, 1897, the Commission made an order approving of the place and mode of crossing the plaintiffs railway as indicated by the defendants in their application, and prescribed certain conditions to be fulfilled in so doing, holding that under the provisions of the Railway Act, 51 Victoria, chapter 29 (D) the defendant's company in respect of the crossing were within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada

That was the language of the order in council ordering the Grand Trunk Company to submit to a crossing or intersection by this Hamilton Radial Company, and declaring that the defendant company, in respect of the crossing, was within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada; that is, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council said that, in so far as the crossing was concerned, this Hamilton Radial Railway came and was within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada. Mr. Justice Street, in the first paragraph of his judgment, says:

I am of opinion that the question raised here must be treated as absolutely determined by the order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council subject to the right of appeal to the Governor in Council.

Here we have the judgment of Mr. Justice Street simply confirming an order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, which stated that in so far as the crossing was concerned the defendants, that is the Hamilton Radial Company, were within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada. I think that is a fair construction to put upon that judgment. Remember that at the very time the judgment was given the Railway Act of 1888 was in force. I will cite section 177 of that Act to prove that there was no intention on the part of Judge Street, or of anybody else connected with this transaction, other than to consider it a crossing, for the purpose of a crossing only. Section 177 of the Railway Act says:

Every railway company incorporated by any Act of the legislature of any province which crosses, intersects, joins or unites with any railway within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, or which is crossed, intersected by, or joined or united with any such railway, shall in respect of such crossing, intersection, junction and union, and all matters preliminary or incident thereto be deemed to be, and be within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada and subject in respect thereof to the provisions of this Act.

Now, that is a clear statement that a railway crossing another main line of railway, and which is a Dominion line of railway, comes within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada. It is only in respect of such crossing, intersection, junction and union, only for this purpose, that the company is under Dominion jurisdiction. Now, one would think that was abundantly clear. The promoters of this Bill in the committee urged sections 306 and 307, but they relate to other times. This clause 177 is directly in point, it is a provision having special regard to provincial railways crossing Dominion railways, and governs the case. Now, if that were all, something might still be left to the promoters of this Bill. What do we find? We find that the present Railway Act amply governs the case. My argument is this, that even if this railway company ever became a work for the general advantage of Canada because of this crossing which took place in the year 1897, and because of this judgment that was rendered, still the effect of the Railway Act of 1903 is entirely to change the situation. Section 8 of the Act of 1903 is very distinct; its effect is to limit the jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament exclusively to the crossing, and that Act is retroactive. It not only refers to railways in the future, but expressly refers to railways then in existence. Now, section 8 is as follows, omitting those parts not relevant:

Every railway, steam or electric street railway or tramway, the construction or operation of which is authorized by special Act of the legislature of any province, and which connects with or crosses or may hereafter connect with or cross any railway within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, shall, although not declared by parliament to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, be subject to the provisions of this Act relating to,——

(a) The connection or crossing of one railway or tramway with or by another, so far as concerns the aforesaid connection or crossing.

So that we have the absurdity of the situation that because a street railway—such as the Toronto railway, the Hamilton railway, the Oshawa railway, the Ottawa railway and others—crosses a railway under Dominion jurisdiction it becomes a work for the general advantage of Canada. That was recognized and the Act of 1903 was passed, the effect of which in its own language is:

Every railway, steam or electric street railway, or tramway, the construction or operation of which is authorized by special Act of the legislature of any province, and which connects with or crosses or may hereafter connect with or cross any railway within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada——

It applies to railways which had existing connections and crossings and those which might be made hereafter.

—or may hereafter connect with or cross any railway within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, shall, although not declared by parliament to be work for the general advantage of Canada, be subject to the provisions of this Act relating to——

Any such crossing. That is so simple and plain that when this Bill was before the House last year, after the Railway Com-

mittee had got through with it, that ground was taken very strongly. The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), on that occasion, was in doubt—I think I am not quoting him unfairly when I say that he certainly was in very grave doubt—as to the effect of retroactive legislation upon this particular railway. He said that the Act of 1903 dethroned the prior general Dominion jurisdiction. That is one view that he expressed. He expressed the views pro and con, but that is one legal opinion that he canvassed in his own mind and gave the House the benefit of. I think it is abundantly clear that it dethroned prior legislation and brought this railway as well as other railways under it merely for the purpose of giving the Dominion parliament jurisdiction regarding crossings or intersections.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does my hon. friend really contend that under the British North America Act this parliament can, even by an Act, denude itself of the power once taken when a company or undertaking is declared to be for the general advantage of Canada?

Mr. MACDONELL. That is a point that I will not attempt to answer——

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, that is the whole point.

Mr. MACDONELL. —because the Minister of Justice could not answer it last year and because it in no way affects or relates to the present situation. What do we find? I will afterwards point out a few of the reasons why it is desirable to keep a work of this kind under the jurisdiction of the provincial parliament, but I desire now to say that the most obnoxious feature of this proposed legislation is that it is not one railway company which is asking for these Dominion powers, but that this Bill gives to this company power to amalgamate with half a dozen other electric railways. These railways that form part of this system will be amalgamated with this railway under the terms and conditions of the Railway Act. Every one of them will become vested with the same powers that this Hamilton Radial Railway Company becomes possessed of. So it will extend these conditions not only to the one railway which is asking for this unusual right, but it brings along seven others, brings them under this parliament, and I venture to say that very many of them would not be given Dominion legislation if they came singly and separately before this parliament. One or two of these might at the present time be given Dominion jurisdiction—I am not sure of that, but there are five or six of them that would not be. Yet we find that this company comes here with this group of railways and with this omnibus clause incorporating these seven companies in a work which is declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. There is no reason why the promoters of this Bill should not have their Bill and why they should not have a fair Bill. No one is trying to block or obstruct this measure, but they are asking powers that in no case are they entitled to receive, and they are taking from the people of Ontario powers that the people of Ontario are entitled to retain. Even if this is declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, granted that they are given that power, they still should be made subject to the jurisdiction of the Ontario railway legislation to which I have referred. It may be that these hon. gentlemen want, for financial reasons, to have this declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. Let that be so, let them have that declaration, but let it be put side by side with a recognition of provincial jurisdiction over this railway. We find that that is not an unusual thing. The Railway Act itself contemplates a divided jurisdiction. There is no doubt or difficulty about that. We find in section 9 of the Railway Act a very simple section 'provincial legislation regarding Sunday,' which I cite for the purpose of showing that it is in contemplation of the Railway Act to have a divided jurisdiction. It is possible under that provision that a work may be declared to be for the general advantage of Canada and at the same time retained under provincial jurisdiction for purely local and provincial purposes. That section says:

Notwithstanding anything in this Act, or any other Act, every railway, steam or electric street railway or tramway, situate wholly within one province of Canada, and declared by the parliament of Canada to be either wholly or in part a work for the general advantage of Canada——

That is what this parliament has been doing. Take for instance the Ottawa Street Railway, the Act in regard to which was passed as far back as 1892; we find that there is divided jurisdiction as shown by section 6 of chapter 53 of the Dominion statutes of 1892 incorporating that company. The undertaking was declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, but subject as follows:

But the operation of so much of the company's line of railway as may be within the province of Ontario by any new or additional powers conferred by this Act shall be subject to the statutes of Ontario in force from time to time in relation to street railways, and the operation of so much of the said line of railway as may be within the province of Quebec by any new or additional powers conferred by this Act, shall be subject to the statutes of Quebec in force from time to time in relation to street railways.

Here we have a railway declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada and yet retained under provincial control,

subject to the statutes of Ontario in so far as it is within the province of Ontario and in like manner subject to the statutes of Quebec in so far as it is in the province of Quebec. So that, we have the Dominion undertaking a work for the general advantage of Canada, declared to be subject not only to Ontario legislation regarding street railways, but also subject to Quebec legislation. We have not only two jurisdictions governing this particular railway, but we have three jurisdictions. Surely that is an example that is worthy of being imitated. No friction has occurred in Ottawa that did not result in a benefit to the people of the city. I am informed, and I believe it to be a fact, that the Ottawa Street Railway Company commenced to run freight cars through the city and that under this very provincial control which was retained over them, a stop was put to that, and the rights of the people of the municipality vindicated. Not only do we find this House granting power to this company under three jurisdictions, but this very session Bills have been passed by which companies have been placed under divided federal and provincial jurisdiction. Let me remind hon. gentlemen that it is not only railways that can be declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, because section 92 of the British North America Act, subsection 10, says that powers are reserved exclusively to the provinces over local works and undertakings except :

(c) Such works as though wholly situated in a province are before or after their execution declared by the parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada or for advantage of two or more of the provinces.

Therefore any local works and undertakings, and not railways alone, can be declared by this parliament to be for the general advantage of Canada. There are now two Bills before the House in which there are clauses preserving provincial rights. In the Act respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan, and British Columbia Railway Company, a company possessing very large powers under the Act, subsection 2 of section 3 says :

2. Nothing in this section shall exempt the company from complying with the provisions of any Act now or hereafter passed by the legislature of the province of British Columbia or of the legislature of the province of Alberta and applicable to the company, with respect to the supply, sale or other disposition of any surplus water, electric or other power, or electricity developed or generated and not required for the purposes of the company.

Sections 4 says :

4. Nothing in this Act shall authorize the company to construct or operate any telegraph or telephone lines or any lines for the purpose of distributing electricity for lighting, heating or motor purposes, or disposing surplus power generated by the company's works and not required for the undertaking of the company, upon, along or across any highway or public place, without first obtaining the consent, expressed by by-law, of the municipality having jurisdiction over such highway or public place, and upon terms to be agreed with such municipality.

Here we have clauses inserted in this charter protecting not only provincial rights but municipal rights as well. The company operates both in Alberta and in British Columbia, and although its works are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada they are made subject to legislation by the provinces of British Columbia and Alberta ; and not only that, but the rights of municipalities in which they operate are safeguarded. And yet in this Bill of the Hamilton Radial Railway Company we find that both the province and municipalities are entirely ignored. Then, an Act has been passed by this House this session to incorporate the Dominion Lumbering and Power Development Company, and although the undertakings of the company are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, section 17 of the Bill says that the undertakings of the company shall be subject to the provisions of any general Act now or hereafter to be passed by the legislatures of the province of Ontario or of Quebec providing, in the interest of public health or safety, for the control and regulation of the transmission, distributing, and supplying of electricity in any form. We therefore find that this parliament is incorporating at the present time a large number of these power development companies and that provision is inserted in their charters that provincial legislation shall apply to them. That is all that my amendment to the Hamilton Radial Bill asks for. I simply ask that the Ontario Railway Act and the Ontario Hydro-Electric Act shall apply to this company. Let me point out one or two respects in which the interests of the people of the province of Ontario are safeguarded by the existing railway legislation of that province, and, if provincial control is retained over this whole system of seven or eight railways which are now included in this Bill, the people of the province will reap the benefits which the existing provincial legislation confers on them. By the Ontario Railway Act, 1906, chapter 60, subsection 1, section 171, the following is provided :—

Fares to be taken by company on a railway operated by electricity for each passenger shall not exceed 5 cents for any distance not exceeding three miles, and in excess 2 cents per mile—under 10 years, 3 cents for three miles, and additional distance one-half fare.

The benefits of that section will be lost to the people of Ontario if this railway is declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada and if the provincial law does not apply to it. Subsection 2 says:

Section 171, subsection 2. Pupils under 17 years of age actually attending school, 8 tickets for 25 cents.

The above applies not only to street railways but to any railway operated by electricity.

Section 193 reads:

Section 193. No company or municipal corporation operating a street railway, tramway or electric railway shall operate on Sunday except to keep track clear of snow or ice, or works of necessity.

That provision in the Ontario Act is much fuller than the regulation regarding Sunday operations of railways in the Act passed by this parliament. Section 202 of the Ontario Railway Act declares:

Section 202. Any privilege granted by a corporation cannot be longer than 25 years.

The province of Ontario has very wisely legislated to protect municipalities being taken advantage of by railway companies. I think the policy of giving a railway company a perpetual franchise should be discouraged, and the province of Ontario has wisely passed a law that no municipal corporation can grant a franchise for longer than twenty-five years, so that the people in each municipality shall have an opportunity at least once every quarter of a century to reconsider their position if they wish to. In other words, they are not allowed to legislate in perpetuity, they cannot for all time to come bind themselves and those who come after them, by agreements in perpetuity.

Mr. CLARKE. Do you not think the township councils are quite competent to say how they shall deal with their own highways?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I do not; I think that in many cases they are but in many they are not. It is the cases in which they are not competent to look after their interest that this legislation is designed to protect.

Mr. CLARKE. They are all competent to look after their own interest.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I think not. There are many cases where, for obvious reasons, advantage can be taken of them. They are not in the habit of dealing with corporations and a corporation going through 30 or 40 municipalities, has skilled officials who become experts in dealing with municipalities, and in dealing with men who are new in the business, these officials very often induce the municipalities to enter into improvident agreements. The fact that the province of Ontario has crystallized this into legislation proves that at least it was wise in the opinion of the legislature of Ontario, and I think both sides of that legislature agreed to it.

Section 221 provides that all motormen must pass inspection by examiners as to their habits, physical ability, intelligence, &c. This applies to a street railway or a railway operated by electricity. Further provisions are made with regard to guard wires to protect the public from the electrically charged wires and also for protecting the public by fenders, brakes, &c. There are various provisions respecting the guarding of motormen and conductors in the execution of their work.

By section 256, the board may at all times enter on the right of way of any electric railway company and use that right of way for the erection of poles and the placing of wires upon the poles for the transmission of electrical or other power from any plant in Ontario to the works and plant of any municipal corporation.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any provision for the power company compensating the railway for the use of its right of way?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. No doubt that will be done.

Mr. CLARKE. There is nothing in the Act providing for that?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I do not find that.

Mr. CLARKE. Do you think that is fair?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I say that is a safeguard the province of Ontario has adopted.

Mr. CLARKE. It looks to me like confiscation.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. The legislature of Ontario has said that where a railway company has a right of way of this kind the board may enter upon it and may string wires upon it for the purpose of the transmission of electricity from any works or plants of the province of Ontario to any municipal corporation. That seems to be a very wise and reasonable power.

Then under the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board Act of 1906 we find this provision, by section 63. This section gives particulars of the power vested in the board to enforce municipal agreements, even to the extent of taking possession of the works and property of the company and directing the management, &c. In this respect municipal boards are given powers not so far extended to the Dominion Board of Railway Commissioners. In connection with that feature I commend to the Minister of Railways the remarks of Mr. Leitch chairman of the Railway Board of the Ontario Railway Commission when this feature of the Bill was being considered.

In a letter to the Prime Minister of the province of Ontario very recently during the time that this Bill was before the Railway Committee, he said in part:

There is no provision in the Dominion Railway Act for the enforcement of an agreement

between a railway and a municipality. There cannot be, because the enforcement of agreements is a civil right which is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the province. The Ontario Railway and Municipal Board Act, 1906, has the provision which the Dominion Railway Act has not and cannot have, giving the board power and jurisdiction to construe agreements between railways and municipalities and enforce them to the extent of taking possession of and running the railway.

With the proposed amendment to the Dominion Railway Act, a municipality will find it is in a position of having an agreement with the railway company, which it cannot enforce and which the company may break with impunity. In fact as soon as such an agreement is made the municipality will be powerless.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does my hon. friend really think that a road chartered by the Dominion is not under the authority of the Dominion to the extent that it can be made keep its contract with a municipality or with anybody else ?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. At present the Dominion Railway Commission or the Dominion government has no power such as the Ontario Board of Railway Commissioners has for the summary enforcement of the rights of municipalities. The only power that the Railway Commission has and that the municipality would have would be to apply to the courts and fight it out with the railway through protracted and expensive litigation.

Mr. Leitch continues :

The only remedy for this is for the Dominion parliament to provide that agreements between the railways and the municipalities should be subject to the jurisdiction of the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board. It may be said why not leave the enforcement of these agreements to the high courts? The answer to this is that the courts have no machinery to enforce these agreements. They might give damages, but giving damages is not an effective remedy. The fact is that no electric railway should be declared for the general advantage of Canada and taken away from local jurisdiction.

In conclusion he says :

The declaration of general advantage leads to peculiar results. A railway is incorporated by the provincial legislature. Immediately agreements have been entered into with the municipalities and the road is in operation for some time, on one pretense or another, the company gets a declaration from the Dominion of general advantage. This has not the effect of repealing the local legislation. It prevents further provincial legislation and it removes the road from the jurisdiction of the Ontario Railway Board. The consequence is that we have povincial legislation on the statute-books and agreements with the municipalities in full force but incapable of enforcement for the reason that the Dominion Act provides no machinery and the Ontario Railway Board has no power because the railway has been taken from under their jurisdiction by the declaration of general advantage.

Mr. GRAHAM. If by legislation or by fact it were shown that the Dominion had machinery to make railways keep their agreements, then that contention would fall to the ground.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. It would remove that objection very largely.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister's predepart of the Dominion to become a public cessor said last year that it was not the prosecutor, that it was not their duty to enforce the law.

Mr. GRAHAM. They are doing it every day in the commission.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. This company is not only a railway but a power company. It has large rights from this country for the generation of power. I understand it has the right to take power or water from the Welland canal or the old Welland canal at almost a nominal cost. The people of this country have built a waterway in the shape of the Welland canal, and this railway company has made an agreement with the government under which it obtains the use of a very large quantity of that water for the purpose of developing power very cheaply. This company is in the power business. By section 17 of its Act of incorporation, it has the right to create power for light, heating and railway purposes and may use that power for the purpose of its railway and sell the excess not required.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman say that this railway has the use of the waters of the Welland canal ?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not a separate company called the Cataract Power Company ?

Mr. MACDONELL. It is all one company.

Mr. CLARKE. No, it is an entirely different entity.

Mr. MACDONELL. Be that as it may, this company gets abundance of power from the Welland canal. I am not quarrelling with that, but simply mention it to show that it is a power company and should be subject to the regulations of the province of Ontario respecting power companies. It is proposed to amalgamate the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company with this company, and the former has also the powers of an electric company, so that the whole section served by these two companies will be free of Ontario jurisdiction. At present the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, under the Power Commission Act of 1907, has the power, wherever it finds that a company which is autho-

rized to sell and distribute electric power, is exacting unreasonable rates or in any other way taking advantage of a municipality, to take charge of and expropriate that company. Section 8 of that Act provides as follows:

The Lieutenant Governor in Council on the report of the commission may authorize entry and take the lands, machinery, &c., of any corporation or person developing electrical energy and use the same for the purposes of the Act.

Section 9. It shall proceed to expropriate in the manner provided by the Public Works Act.

Subsection 3 of section 16 provides:

The commission may with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council contract with a railway company or power or transmission company for use of its right of way and property for transmitting electrical power or energy.

There we find that the Hydro-Electric Commission has the power to expropriate and to practically regulate the rates and the treatment which the municipalities shall receive from a power company. But if this legislation be granted, all that right will pass from the province of Ontario, because, as I have pointed out, a work for the general advantage of Canada is not restricted to railways. It has been declared in a very similar case that where a work is declared for the general advantage of Canada, that takes it entirely out of provincial regulation and control. That was decided by the Privy Council in 1905 in the case of the City of Toronto versus the Bell Telephone Company. Because that company was declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, it had the right to take possession of the streets of Toronto without the consent of the city and do as it pleased with regard to the erection of poles and the stringing of wires. So that unless this Bill is safeguarded and the provincial legislation regarding power be made to apply to it, this company will be entirely freed from provincial jurisdiction, not only in respect of railways but in respect as well of its being a power company. In my humble judgment, the amendment is one that should commend itself to our best consideration. You are not only, by this Bill, taking away the rights of the province of Ontario but are accumulating an immense amount of work for this parliament which we cannot undertake to do successfully or at all. You will be accumulating a very large amount of detail which it is highly improper a committee of this House should be encumbered with. There are three classes of legislation: First, municipal legislation, consisting of the by-laws and regulations of municipalities; second, provincial legislation; and last of all, the federal legislation. The legislation that is closest to the people is the municipal and provincial legislation, and it is this we want to retain so that the people will have the benefit and the opportunity of controlling it. But if you pass this Bill in its present shape, you will take from the million people served by this railway all the rights preserved to them by the provincial Acts to which I have referred and which were passed designedly, after years of consideration, by the various political parties in the province of Ontario. If you take this railway, with the seven others it brings with it, from the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario, you will leave these companies to operate throughout the whole of that district without provincial control, and every other street railway or power company, no matter how small, will be warranted in coming to this parliament and asking for similar rights.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hour for Private Bills has now expired.

## THE FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

House resumed consideration of motion for the third reading of Bill (No. 57) respecting a certain convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT. (Translation.) When the House rose at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was giving an enumeration of certain industries which would benefit by the new French treaty. On the 21st February last I heard the hon. member for Hamilton make certain statements as to the impetus this treaty would give to several manufactures in the city he represents. I am pleased to find from the extracts he has read to us this afternoon, that several Hamilton newspapers share this opinion. Such a confirmation was not essential, as far as I am concerned, but it may be useful in the case of our friends to your left. I feel sure that similar industries at Smith's Falls and Toronto, and in the province of Quebec, at Terrebonne, and also, I am pleased to say, at St. Hyacinthe, will reap the same benefits.

My hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Beland) has noted with satisfaction that the rich asbestos mines to be found in his consituency and in the adjoining region, cannot fail to be worked with much greater activity under the operation of the new treaty.

I should add that the manner in which leather, boots and shoes, prepared lumber, organs, musical instruments and their accessories are to be treated in the French market, cannot fail to exercise a most favourable influence on the very important industries of the city of St. Hyacinthe, which I have the honour to represent in this House.

These industries will enjoy a considerable reduction in duty, 37½ per cent in the case of polished leather, 40 per cent on boots and shoes, 23½ per cent in the case

of organs and other musical instruments; 16⅔ per cent on manufactured hard lumber, 30 per cent on unmanufactured soft wood; 20 per cent on doors and sashes, etc.

Such a treaty favouring as it does industrial development in several parts of the country canot be termed anything else but an agreement drafted in the public interest.

Finally, French books will benefit by this agreement. They are now taxed 25 per cent on their entrance into this country. They will in future pay 15 per cent as do English books.

This was an important omission in the treaty of 1893. True the Canadian plenipotentiary of the period, Sir Charles Tupper, undertook to recommend to the Canadian government of which he was a member, a slight reduction of 5 per cent in the tariff on books, but the government of that day—of which certain members are still sitting here, for instance, the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart)—rejected the proposal, as will be seen on reference to pages 25, 26 and 37 of the 26th volume of the sessional papers of 1893.

This was an act of justice to the French portion of the population of this country, but the country at large will reap the benefit. It is unnecessary for me to speak here in praise of the French language, that language which, together with the English language, has been the medium through which, in modern times, useful knowledge, has been recorded and diffused.

Our English speaking friends have every right to be proud of their great writers and statesmen. He who is of French origin has an equal right to refer with pride to the great thinkers and philanthropists of France. We have to deal here, however, not with any question of national pride, but with a matter of public utility. The works of such men do not belong to their respective nations alone; mental effort, whether it emanates from France, England or America, is the common property of all men who desire to benefit thereby.

I would not affront members of this House or the men of this country by supposing that there lives any one among them who would not prefer to be able to speak two languages instead of one and three rather than two. French and English are certainly to-day the two languages most commonly used throughout the world. English is more generally spoken in America, but French is the more spoken on the continent of Europe.

The circumstances of the settlement of this country have led to the official recognition of both languages. If there be any amongst us who, from sentimental motives, would incline to reject one or the other, together with the institutions through which any one of them may be preserved, they should yet, for purposes of practical advantage and usefulness, acquiesce in a state of things which certainly produces beneficial results fully counterbalancing any drawbacks.

The same remarks apply to any immigration which the new treaty may attract towards Canada. French and Belgium settlers are in general, hardworking, industrious and thrifty. The success which they achieve here proves that they become desirable citizens.

Certain members have complained also that this new treaty was submitted in such a manner that it must be accepted or rejected in toto. They regret that they cannot amend it in certain details. But, Mr. Speaker, such a state of things is inevitable when one of the parties to an agreement is not represented when the deed is submitted for ratification. The French government is not represented here. Were we to amend the treaty it would have to be again submitted to the authorized representatives of the French government whose approval must of necessity be obtained. In other words, all would have to begin over again. This reminds me of the remarks made by Sir John Macdonald when, in 1865, he presented to the House for approval the resolutions of the Quebec conference, in which each province, through its special representatives, had laid down certain conditions. Sir John Macdonald's remarks are to be found at page 16 of the Confederation Debates of 1865:

In answer to the member for Carleton, the government desired to say that they presented the scheme as a whole, and would exert all the influence they could bring to bear in the way of argument to induce the House to adopt the scheme without alteration, and for the simple reason that the scheme was not one framed by the government of Canada, or by the government of Nova Scotia, but was in the nature of a treaty settled between the different colonies each clause of which had been fully discussed, and which had been agreed to by a system of mutual compromise. Of course it was competent to the House to vote against the Address as a whole, or to adopt amendments to it, but if they did so, it would be then for the government to consider whether they would press the scheme further on the attention of the House. It was obvious that unless the scheme was adopted as it had been settled between the different provinces, if they prosecuted it further they would have to commence *de novo*, and he had no hesitation in expressing his belief that if the scheme was not now adopted, in all its principal details, as presented to the House, we could not expect to get it passed this century. It had been only in consequence of a very happy concurrence of circumstances, which might not easily arise again, that the different provinces had been enabled to arrive at the conclusion now presented, and he should exceedingly regret in the interests of Canada and of the future of British North America, if anything should delay beyond this year the completion and conclusion of this great scheme. The resolutions on their face bore evidence of compromise; perhaps not one of the delegates from any of the provinces would

have propounded this scheme as a whole, but being impressed with a conviction that it was highly desirable, with a view to the maintenance of British power on this continent, that there should be confederation and a junction of all the provinces, the consideration of the details was entered upon in a spirit of compromise.

Another point has struck me in the course of this debate. Both parties in the House claim the honour of having obtained commercial autonomy for Canada. The full powers granted to the Canadian plenipotentiaries in 1907 by the Royal Commission of the 8th August, as well as the fact that the British Ambassador, Sir Francis Bertie, simply introduced them to the French government and only reappeared at the moment when the treaty was to be signed, gives the advantage to the plenipotentiaries of to-day, at least in my opinion, over those of 1893, who were assisted throughout by the British Ambassador. However I do not wish for the present to discuss the matter, but simply to point out an important fact which I am very glad to be able to point out, and it is this: that Canada, evidently gets a high value on commercial autonomy. Several members of the House have made statements on the subject. I will quote one from each side of the House. First of all we have the well supported statement of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, which reads as follows:

And this last year, for the first time in the history of Canada, negotiations for a commercial treaty were carried on exclusively by Canadian representatives of the government.

And then the statement of the leader of the opposition, in these words:

It was he (Sir Charles Tupper) who made that new departure which gives us to-day in Canada the right to negotiate our own commercial treaties, although every treaty is signed and must be signed in the name of the British Crown.

In fact Canada has progressed not only materially, but also in respect to diplomatic political conditions; and public opinion, which has certainly hailed with marked approval, the work of the hon. the ministers of Finance and of Marine and Fisheries, far from having been troubled by the debate which we have heard, adheres on the contrary yet more firmly and proudly to the fundamental idea expressed in this work.

House divided on the motion for the third reading of the Bill:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Ames,
Avery,
Aylesworth,
Barker,
Barr,
Beauparlant,
Beland,
Black,
Blain,
Bole,
Borden (Carleton),
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Boyer,
Broder,
Brodeur,
Bureau,
Caldwell,
Caron,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Christie,
Clare,
Clarke,
Cockshutt,
Copp,
Demers,
Devlin,
Dubeau,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Foster,
Galliher,
Gordon,
Graham,
Grant,
Guthrie,
Harty,
Henderson,
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Lake,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Law,
Logan,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
MacLaren,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
McCool,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLean (York, C.),
McLennan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Michaud,
Miller,
Monk,
Morin,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Paquet,
Parent,
Perley,
Pickup,
Porter,
Pringle,
Proulx,
Robitaille,
Roche (Marquette),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Smith (Oxford),
Sproule,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tolmie,
Turriff,
Ward,
Watson,
White,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Wilson (Russell),
Worthington,
Zimmerman.—103.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Chisholm (Huron),
Jackson (Elgin),
Lancaster,
Marshall,
Owen.—5.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

## CANADIAN BATTLEFIELDS AT QUEBEC.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). moved second reading of Bill (No. 111) respecting the Canadian battlefields at Quebec. He said: The object of the Bill to which I have now the honour of calling the attention of the House is to give effect to an idea which of late has impressed itself upon the people of this country, which has been discussed in the press and on the public platform, which has engaged the attention of patriotic clubs and associations and

which, no doubt, has been the subject of conversation at many firesides, and seems to have been everywhere received with unanimous acceptance and favour. This year is the tercentenary of the city of Quebec. In a few weeks three hundred years will have rolled by since Samuel de Champlain broke ground where the city now stands. It seems entirely fitting, under such circumstances, that this anniversary should be duly solemnized. It may be observed that, if the object is to recall and remember the founding of the city of Quebec, the most appropriate way of doing it would be to remember the founder. And there is all the more reason to do so because Samuel de Champlain is one of the most remarkable personages connected with Canadian history. His record is a record of romance, of enterprise, of discovery. He was a navigator, a discoverer, a geographer. His published writings show that he had the far vision of the statesman. And, a fact most important in the eyes of Canadians, he may be said to have been the first person of a class afterwards so famous—the Canadian voyageur. But Champlain has not been without honour in the city he founded. The tourist who today visits the city when, in the morning, he steps out of the Chateau Frontenac, on the broad platform which bears the same name, in order to get a view of what is perhaps one of the most beautiful panoramas in the world, has his attention claimed by a noble pile of bronze and granite which has been erected by the citizens of Quebec to the memory of Champlain. So there is not much more to be done in that direction. But the occasion seems to be proper to recall and to celebrate the baptism of fire through which the city passed in the last stages of the long struggle which was maintained between France and England for supremacy on this continent, and to dedicate and consecrate the ground which has been hallowed by the blood of so many noble men who gave their lives for the respective causes with which they were connected. It is, I believe, an undisputed fact that the battles that took place around Quebec are among the most dramatic in modern history. The perseverance of Wolfe in planting his army under the walls of Quebec · the vigilance of Montcalm to baffle a manœuvre which he knew must be fatal; the determined, undaunted resolution of Lévis to regain the city and the courage of Murray in meeting him—all these are incidents which, at the time, produced a deep impression upon the imagination of mankind; and that impression, instead of being effaced by time, has been deepened. It is our good fortune that we, in this House and in this country, the descendants of those who fought and bled and died there, can review these things in no other spirit than the spirit of fraternity, and that we can all worship the heroes of our respective races in the common pride that all did their duty and did it in the fullest possible measure. Our object is to consecrate that ground, to reclaim it, to redeem, as far as we can, the errors of the past, and to set that ground aside as an object lesson for ourselves and our descendants. And our immediate object is to have a grand ceremony of dedication. Further than this the legislation which I have proposed does not go. While we set forth the idea, we have no intention of carrying it out ourselves, but intend to leave it to a commission to be created for that purpose. The Bill which I have the honour to propose provides, in its first section, that a commission of five members shall be appointed. It is essential that, in this commission, all shades of opinion in this country, all possible views, shall be represented. I may announce at once the names of those whom we propose to form this commission: Mr. George Garneau, the present mayor of Quebec; Hon. Sir George Drummond, of Montreal; Mr. Byron E. Walker, of Toronto; Colonel George T. Denison, of Toronto; and Mr. Adelard Turgeon, of the city of Quebec. There is provision in the Bill that if any province contributes $100,000. it shall be entitled to be represented on the commission. There is also provision that if the government of the United Kingdom, or any of the governments of the colonies, contributes a similar sum, they shall be entitled to be represented on the commission.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask does the first mentioned commissioner hold office by virtue of being mayor of the city of Quebec?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not so provided. Mr. Garneau is the present mayor of Quebec. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is worthy of consideration. The powers of the commission are, first, to make a plan for the reclamation of the ground, and then to carry on the work as they may deem advisable. Such work may be of great magnitude or of smaller magnitude. There is a plan which would involve an expenditure of perhaps $2,000,000, but as to this we have no opinion to offer at this moment; it is to be left to the commission to determine the nature of the work to be carried out.

Mr. FOSTER. And the extent of the expenditure?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The extent of the expenditure is simply this. At present we provide that an appropriation of $300,000 shall be placed at the disposal of the commission. I have the authority of the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec (Hon. Lomer Gouin) that the legislature shall appropriate $100,000. I have the verbal assurance of the mayor of Quebec that the city of Quebec will also contribute a reasonable sum. More than this, I have nothing to say as to contributions.

Mr. FOSTER. If my right hon. friend will allow me, I would explain what I mean. Does the government give $300,000 unconditionally, or does it give it on the basis of an estimate of a certain sum to be required, and the $300,000 as the contribution of the Dominion of Canada provided the full amount is raised?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When the commission prepare the plans they will be laid before parliament. It will be for parliament to determine at the proper time whether the work as contemplated should be carried out, or whether a more restricted work should be undertaken, and this will depend very much upon the resourecs which we receive. It is expected that we should receive private contributions to a reasonable amount, but at the present time we have not taken these into consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it proposed that $300,000 should be put into the hands of commissioners to be expended forthwith under their direction and before any plans are shown or any estimate has been required?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. It is proposed that the sum of $300,000 should be placed in the hands of a commission and that other sums which may come from other sources should also be placed in the hands of this commission. It is proposed that there should be this year in the city of Quebec a grand celebration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city and of other events in the same connection. If these plans are carried out they will necessarily involve the expenditure of a very large amount of money, perhaps the greater part of the appropriation voted by parliament, perhaps the whole of it. But as to this I have no suggestion to offer. At the present time, however, we propose no more than to create a commission with certain objects in view and to place in their hands $300,000; with the object, first, of having a celebration in the city of Quebec, and, secondly, to undertake the reclamation of the battle-fields on the Plains of Abraham and at St. Foy. I may frankly say to the House that if the commission undertake all the work that has been contemplated, it is likely that the Canadian parliament will be asked at a future date to contribute more money. But we do not ask this at the present time; we leave it altogether to parliament to decide what it chooses to do. I may add that His Excellency the Governor General has been in communication with the authorities in England. It was expected that perhaps His Majesty the King would himself be present in person at the celebration, and it was expected that the British fleet would be present, and that the French fleet, and perhaps the American fleet would also be invited to be present. His Majesty the King has signified that he could not come, but His Excellency the Governor General has received the assurance that the Prince of Wales has expressed his willingness to be present. I have received a letter from His Excellency in this regard which it gives me great pleasure to communicate to the House:

Government House,
Ottawa, March 3, 1908.

My Dear Sir Wilfrid—It gives me great pleasure to inform you that His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, in response to your invitation, has graciously signified his willingness to attend the tercentenary celebrations of the founding of Quebec by Champlain, provided they can be held during the last week of July.

The prearranged movements of the Atlantic fleet which will accompany the Prince of Wales to Quebec, make it necessary for His Royal Highness to arrive on July 22 and to depart on the morning of July 29.

His Royal Highness regrets that for this reason his stay in the Dominion must be so curtailed as to make it impossible for him to visit places other than Quebec on this occasion.

Lord Elgin who is anxious to do everything in his power to make the tercentenary a success, wishes to congratulate the Dominion on the important announcement which it is my privilege to request you to make to parliament, of His Royal Highness' approaching visit.

Joining most sincerely in those congratulations, I remain,

Yours very sincerely,
GREY.

Mr. Speaker, I have no other remarks to offer to the House, but simply to congratulate the House on the hearty expressions of good will which have come from both sides in regard to this project.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the right hon. gentleman takes his seat—would he be kind enough to tell us what property will have to be acquired, I mean in acreage, and how it is occupied now? How much property do the government own there now and how much will have to be acquired, and from whom, and what vested interests would have to be satisfied?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On a future occasion I shall be pleased to give all the information I have.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have not seen, neither I think has any member on this side of the House seen the Bill until after my right hon. friend commenced his remarks upon it, that is, we have not read it. This is a matter of great importance; the idea itself in many respects is a very worthy one, and in some respects a very splendid one. At the same time I would like, before voting $300,000 of the people's money, to have some kind of an idea as to what was proposed to be done, the extent of the lands which it is proposed to expropriate in addition to what is owned by the Dominion of Canada, what

is the nature of the improvements and embellishments which it is proposed to make on those properties so as to render them worthy of the idea at present conceived and which we have in our minds in a rather hazy way. I have had the advantage of a little conversation with His Excellency with reference to his idea, but nothing I have heard yet has brought the matter down within the region of practicality, so far as the points I have mentioned are concerned. It would hardly seem to be the best thing in the world to give $300,000 or more to be expended in a great pageant, or something of that kind, and then find that we had not succeeded in getting sufficient to make these historic places really worthy in their improvement and embellishment. I mean that it would seem prudent, when we embark on a scheme like this, that we should have the advantage of the thought and the planning of the commissioners, or of some one who has generated the idea. Everything seems to be in the air. What proportion of the lands do we ourselves hold there? Is it the intention of the government to have those cleared and put in possession of the commission? If that be so, what position does this precious Ross rifle factory occupy, which I understand is situated somewhere in those regions? Is that upon a portion of the lands which have to be expropriated? How was it that the Ross rifle factory came to be placed there? Did the government force this factory to be put upon these lands and are we liable for a large amount of money if we attempt to get rid of it? Is it proposed that the government shall deliver over its own property free from encumberance or that that shall be part of the work of the commission and that the expense shall be defrayed out of the general collections? I believe myself that there will be a generous response in the way of contributions to the idea, but I should think that almost any country which or any people who contribute would like to have some general idea of what was to be done with the money before they made their contributions. My right hon. friend will see that these are what appear to me to be practical questions, and that in so far as we can get something of that kind we ought to do so before we vote the money. The difficulty I find is that everything is nebulous. We do not know what is proposed and men do not like to go into a thing and vote money, even though the idea is a brilliant one, unless they see the ways and means and know the plans upon which it is to be carried out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The request of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is a legitimate one. I can only, however, partially satisfy him. There are only two ideas at the present time. One is to have a celebration in the city of Quebec. As I said a moment ago it is the tercentenary of the foundation of the city of Quebec by Champlain. We want to commemorate it. We find, however, that there is nothing more to be done in so far as we can see to do honour to the memory of Champlain. Champlain has a splendid monument in the city of Quebec. But it has been suggested that it would be an eminently proper thing if at this moment we took the opportunity of reclaiming the battlefields at Quebec in which as Canadians we are all interested. We all feel that the spot on which the battle took place in 1759 is sacred ground and I believe that every one also will concede that the battlefield on which the battle of 1760 took place is equally sacred ground. I must say that we have all been very guilty in this country. We have allowed these grounds to remain absolutely as nature made them, or we have allowed them to be invaded by private interests and to become private property. Many years ago the gaol of the city of Quebec was placed almost on the very spot where Wolfe died. Anybody who has visited the place knows that the small monument erected to Wolfe is just within thirty or forty feet of the gaol. Everybody agrees, as I think my hon. friend will agree, that these encroachments should not be allowed. The Ross Rifle factory is located at a certain point between the citadel and what is known as the plains of Abraham.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the tenure of the Ross Rifle factory ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will come to that by and by. The immediate object to which to-day we want to commit ourselves is that these lands should be reclaimed and that as much of them as can be spared from private interests and private needs should be taken possession of by the public authorities in order that they may be preserved and beautified. The questions which arise are : What are you going to do with the grounds, how can they be secured, in what manner can they be reclaimed, in what manner can they be used in order to justify the idea that you have in your mind ? This is a plan which is susceptible to greater or less development. These grounds can be beautified to almost any degree or they may be beautified in a more restricted way. As to this I have no explanation to offer to my hon. friend at the present time. This must be the work of the commission. The commission must prepare a plan which afterwards must be submitted to parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. Must be submitted to parliament ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, must be submitted to parliament. No expenditure can be made except by authority of order in council, the plans have to be submitted to

us, but at the present time parliament is committed to nothing more than the expenditure of $300,000. It may be that the whole of this money may be absorbed by the celebration which is to take place this summer—I hope it will not be, but it may be—but at all events if the whole of the money which is provided were to be absorbed by the celebration of this year it is possible that parliament will be asked, at no distant day, to provide a further sum to reclaim such land as has to be reclaimed. But parliament will not be committed to anything more. I think that everybody will agree that it is reasonable that we should do this at the earliest possible moment before any more encroachments shall be made upon these battlefields. First of all I think that the gaol ought to be removed. The gaol belongs to the Quebec government. I have no doubt but that the Quebec government would be prepared to do so although they may not be prepared to do it immediately because the gaol is a good building, not very old, and perhaps may last for many years to come. The Ross Rifle factory has been placed between the citadel and what is known as the plains of Abraham. It stands on ground belonging to the government. I think that it is under lease, although I am not quite sure of the tenure under which it is held.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Ninety-nine years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Renewable.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Renewable.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is practically a sale then ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, a gift.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This will have to be removed but we can select our time. There is no necessity that it shall be done immediately. Of course, it will be an eyesore and if we undertake to beautify the place as it ought to be beautified it should be removed but there is no necessity for doing it immediately. Now, in regard to the land that we have ourselves, we have the whole of what is known as the Plains of Abraham, 75 acres in extent, we have the citadel and between the citadel and the Plains of Abraham there is some property, the extent of which I cannot say, which belongs to the Quebec Seminary. That is as to the first battle. As to the second battle, that of 1760, I think that most of the land upon which it was fought is now private property. Part of it has been built upon and probably it could not be obtained but part of it is still vacant and I think that it could be got at no very great price. That is the information which I have at the present moment. One idea is to have a celebration, the second is to have, at the earliest possible moment, this land reclaimed in order to consecrate it as national property forever, that it may be placed in our hands and not be used for anything else. As to the manner in which this land should be beautified nothing has been determined. My hon. friend, if he has talked with His Excellency, knows that His Excellency has certain views upon this point and he has seen in the public press many plans for the beautifying of this land which, if they were carried out would go into the millions, but as to this, there is nothing definite at the present time and we feel that we cannot bring down anything definite until we have the plan of a strong commission such as we propose to organize to deal with this question.

Mr. SPROULE. How much land is occupied by the Ross Rifle factory and how much by the seminary ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Ross Rifle Company have, I think, about nine acres and the ground occupied by the seminary, is fifty or seventy or perhaps one hundred acres.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Could the right hon. gentleman state to the country what dates have been fixed within the period mentioned by him for the actual celebration in July next ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Prince of Wales has expressed his willingness to be present if the celebration can take place in the last week in July, from the 22nd to the 27th.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. A period within these dates will be selected ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The celebration will take a week possibly.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the government ever contemplated, since this has come up, the joining of the great historic battlefields, forts and the like of that, all in one large scheme of restoration and beautification ? There are some that possibly have been almost obliterated, but there are still battlefields, and forts, that it is a great pity this country should not restore and guard and keep for their historic value, and as lessons to the citizens of this country. Now that the spirit is aroused, it is an opportune time to make an investigation into that subject and to know whether the expenditure of a little more money might not be possible, and a number of these historic marks in our history restored and preserved. There is the old fort in the city of Toronto which is of great historic interest ; there are a number in the maritime provinces as the Minister of Militia will know ; there are others in the province of Ontario. The idea I have suggested is one that might be considered, whether in connection with this proposal or not I do not venture to say. I suppose the tercentenary has to come when it comes, but

if it could be postponed until you have these unsightly encumbrances removed from the battlefield at Quebec it would be much better. However, perhaps they can be covered up in some artistic way so that sightseers would not know but that there are possibly palaces behind.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex). There are some most interesting historic sites along the Detroit river extending from Amherstburg to the town of Sandwich and the city of Windsor and the city of Detroit opposite. A few years ago the Ontario Historical Society met there and spent a most interesting day viewing the different objects of interest, and they recommended very strongly that steps be taken to preserve the old fort at the town of Amherstburg. The remains of the old fort are still there; there is a ditch which was used in connection with it, and it was thought that the place might very well be fitted up and preserved to commemorate the very stirring events that in days gone by took place in that neighbourhood. Petitions were sent down to the government and they are, I suppose, in some pigeon hole. I hope this discussion will lead to their being resurrected, because the people in that locality are constantly expecting that something will be done by the government. Now that Mackinaw has passed into the hands of the Americans, this is perhaps the furthest point west at which we can commemorate the old struggle between two nations. Then in this district also, Pontiac in the days of his conspiracy made his field of battle there. Indeed, all along that river front was the scene of the last struggle, because the news of the treaty did not reach there for some years after it was signed, and the fighting was still continued with the Indians, not knowing whether the English or the French were supreme. Later on in the war of 1812 General Brock was there, and it was one of the most important points in that contest. A monument has been erected to Brock at Niagara but nothing has been done to mark his operations here. It was here too that Tecumseh, that brave Shawnee centered his operations, and there is a stone in the old town of Amherstburg on which it is said he stood when exhorting his people to heroism in defence of British supremacy.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it guarded.

Mr. CLARKE. I know where it is and I can point it out to my hon. friend. I may say that there are a number of cannon balls that were taken off the schooner 'Ann,' and, there are also a great many historical relics in the hands of private persons and of public institutions in the town of Amherstburg which could be obtained to decorate any monument which might be erected to perpetuate the memory of these brave deeds. Afterwards, in the rebellion of 1837 this locality was the scene of further struggle, and I believe that the late leader of the Conservatives in the Senate, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, was one of those who stood guard there to protect this country at that time. Later, in 1860 during the Fenian Raid this locality was the very centre of conflict. I would recommend to the government that their serious consideration be given to the petitions that have been sent in from the Ontario Historical Association. Lately there has been some discussion on the matter in the newspapers, and I trust the right hon. the Prime Minister will not forget this locality, should he propound any general scheme to commemorate the historic spots of Canada.

Mr. ADAM ZIMMERMAN (Hamilton). I have received a petition from the Veteran's Association of Wentworth asking for a grant towards the expense of erecting a monument on the scene of the battle of Stoney Creek which is one of the most important events in Canadian history. I may say that the ladies of the Wentworth Historical Association have secured the ground where the battle took place in 1812, and they have prepared plans for a monument and are asking the government at the present time for a small contribution of some thousands of dollars. I hope the government will take this into consideration and that the battle ground of Stoney Creek will be fittingly marked.

Mr. HANCE LOGAN (Cumberland). It is a most commendable idea to mark out the battlefields of our country and restore and preserve the monuments of our historic past. In the province of Nova Scotia we have three places which mark epochs in our history. There has been a good deal done in Annapolis Royal to beautify and to preserve the historic spots there. And something has been done also at Louisburg, although a few years ago the scenes of the great struggle there were in a state of decay. At Fort Beausejour where the last stand on the continent of America was made by the French, the old fort is absolutely unprotected and has gone almost to ruin. I remember once being there at a picnic, and within the crumbling walls of the old fort some one in a speech very appropriately quoted the words of the hymn, so dear to us:

Change and decay in all around I see.

The old magazine was there but the bricks had tumbled down, and souvenir hunters have cut out pieces of the stone and have carried off most of the wood that remained of the construction of the fort. There still are left the great mounds inclosing the space which protected the French army and the old magazine is yet capable of being restored. There is no protection whatever for the remnants of the structures; cattle wander through them at will, and there is nothing to show that Canadians take any pride in this spot where the fate of two

nations was sealed. I trust that this idea suggested by the hon. member (Mr. Foster) will commend itself to the government. It may not be possible to do anything in connection with the particular matter we have before us now, but it may be that a commission of distinguished Canadians should be appointed to deal with this whole question. We have talked about it in parliament year after year and it has been talked about in the country, but time passes and nothing is done. A few years hence it may be too late because at the present rate of decay nothing will then be left for us to restore. These old ruins will soon have absolutely passed away and it is a good idea for us to consider very seriously the question of suitably marking these spots which have a special interest in connection with the history of our country.

Mr. SAM. BARKER (East Hamilton). I wish to add to what has been said by the hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Zimmerman), that I think there are special reasons why the battle of Stoney Creek as well as those of Chateauguay and other places should be commemorated and that this should be undertaken on this occasion.

Mr. MORIN. Lundy's Lane, too.

Mr. BARKER. Lundy's Lane, there are several. But at Stoney Creek there are particular reasons why it should be undertaken. In the first place it would cost very little. In the principal park within the city of Hamilton there is the ground on which Col. Harvey, with the British troops encamped. That need not be touched. It was from that camp that the British troops in the dead of night marched seven or eight miles to the field of Stoney Creek where the American troops were encamped. The battle was fought at the field and the property has already been acquired by the Ladies' Wentworth Historical Society. They have also acquired and preserved in good shape the building which was occupied at that time by the general commanding the American troops. Close by the veterans have acquired and paid for the burial ground in which the officers and soldiers on both sides who fell are buried. Altogether it is a most interesting historical spot and it would be a pity if this occasion were not seized to take it over into the care of the Dominion and perhaps of this commission. The cost would be very, very trifling, perhaps nothing at all except an appropriate little monument which might be erected. The property is there, there can be no doubt about its historical features and I think those who have read military accounts of that fight, know that, small as the battle was, it was very important in the history of Canada. I would therefore recommend that subject to the earnest consideration of the Prime Minister.

Mr. LOGAN.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Whilst I have no doubt the idea is an excellent one and I think I have remarked that I am prepared to endorse it freely, I do not think that on this occasion we should go further than the purport of this Bill. The commission we propose to appoint is a strong one, composed of men who would give all their heart to these matters and I would rather have suggestions from them as to whether a separate commission should be organized or whether these other battlefields should be placed under the control of the present commission. If the House is satisfied this evening to pass the present Bill, I think that will be quite enough for the present day.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to dissent from the proposed patriotic movement, dealt with by this Bill; but it seems to me it would at least have been prudent to have been able to inform the House and the country to what expense we are likely committing ourselves. While we may look for a reasonable amount of assistance from private subscriptions, I do not think a very large amount will be realized from this source and therefore the expense of acquiring and maintaining these historic grounds will fall back upon the country. I understood the First Minister to say that nothing could be done except by the Act of parliament; but as this commission has power to acquire land by purchase or expropriation the expense may be important. The First Minister has told us that the Ross Rifle Company occupy 9 acres of this ground in which I understand they have erected very extensive buildings which will all have to be expropriated or bought, no doubt at a very considerable sum.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are not expensive buildings.

Mr. SPROULE. So much the better, but I suppose they will not be acquired for nothing. I understood too that the Seminary had about 50 or 75 acres of this ground and as I remember they have quite a number of expensive buildings there. Did the First Minister say that the ground we owned or that we desire to own would amount to about 75 acres?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That we own already.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that exclusive of the ground occupied by the Seminary and the Ross Rifle Company or is that included in the 75 acres?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Ross Rifle ground is taken out of what we understood by the Cove Field. It is not the Plains of Abraham, it is quite independent of the 75 acres of which I spoke.

Mr. SPROULE. We would have to acquire the 75 acres of the Seminary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It could be done without that but that would naturally be the consequence.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that if we are to own it at all we should own and preserve the whole of this historic battle ground. It is of course contemplated to make a national park of this ground and this might be expensive, or it might be done in an economical way. I think however it would have been prudent and wise to have been able to submit some outline to the House of what we will probably be committed to in the future.

Mr. D. A. GORDON (East Kent). Tecumseh fell at Moravian-town near Thamesville, and if these sacred spots are to be marked I would ask that Moravian-town be considered along with the others.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think we are all agreed as to the wisdom of the proposal as far as it evidences an intention of commemorating those battle fields upon which were laid the foundations of Canada as it is to-day. His Excellency the Governor General in the advocacy which he has made throughout the country of this measure has done a patriotic work and rendered a patriotic service to the country. I do not at the moment propose to enter into the details of the scheme or the method in which it shall be carried out. In fact we have not very much information from the right hon. gentleman as to that. I presume that is because the information is not available. Speaking of battlefields and other places of historical interest that were the scenes of the great events which led up to the Canada of to-day, there are spots in the province of Nova Scotia, one of which has been mentioned by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan). I have in mind, at this particular moment, the site of the old Fort Royal at Annapolis, and I have an indistinct recollection that within the past ten or twelve years some buildings of great historic interest were removed from there. Perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) would know. Some rumor came to me some six or eight years ago of some change made there.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, only restoring. We did a great deal of work at Annapolis in this way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was there not a block house or something of that kind removed?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There was a building burned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps that is what I had in mind. I know it was considered very unfortunate at that time that it should have been destroyed. My right hon. friend the First Minister mentioned in his opening remarks that plans have to be submitted to parliament. I think that was an inadvertance. They have to be submitted to the Governor in Council. It occurred to me that perhaps what the First Minister expressed in that regard might be very well inserted in the Bill. We are committing ourselves to merely an expenditure of $300,000, a considerable portion of which no doubt will be used in the celebration of the events intended to be commemorated. In preserving and commemorating these battlefields we should give the people a sense of proprietorship, so that they will be able to look at them with pride, and strangers coming to our country will see there—when they observe what has been done by the federal and perhaps by some of the other governments and the people of Canada as a whole, and no doubt with the assistance of people in other portions of the British dominion—a commemoration of the early history of Canada which will show them that we have not forgotten the past and the work of those who did so much for the building up of this country. When we come to that part of it, it seems to me that parliament should have an opportunity to speak its mind with regard to the manner in which this should be done. You cannot very well come to parliament and ask for what possibly may be a considerable expenditure without taking parliament in the first instance into your confidence and submitting what is proposed and getting the ideas of the representatives of the people. Of course this is a mere detail and perhaps it could be better discussed in committee, but I thought it well to mention it just now, and perhaps my right hon. friend might see his way clear to amend the Bill in that regard.

Mr. GEO TAYLOR (Leeds). I am not a lawyer, but from a cursory glance at the Bill which has just now been put into our hands, I think it goes a little further than has already been mentioned. I am quite in favour of voting $300,000 or any other sum to assist in the celebration at Quebec and in giving a fitting reception to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales should he visit Canada, but this Bill commits the country, judging by its preamble, to a good deal further expenditure. According to the preamble:

> It is desirable in the public interest of Canada to acquire the great historic battlefields at Quebec, restoring so far as possible their principal features, so as to make them a Canadian national park.

That means it is desirable that we should buy out the Ross rifle factory and all the other improvements on these grounds. But if we are to grapple with this question at all, there are other points just as much entitled to be considered. We have right at our doors, within a few miles of the capital, the site of the battle of the Wind-

mill at Prescott, one of the most important battles in the history of Canada. If we are to grapple with this question of preserving our battle-fields we should take them all up together and have a commission deal with the whole of them. I have brought to the attention of the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) for a number of years the fact that we have at Kingston Fort Henry and the towers which were built there and which are a credit to the men who built them. These towers are going to decay. A few years ago the tops were blown off some of them; their stones and masonry are crumbling away and all for the want of an expenditure of a few hundred dollars to preserve them. I am quite prepared to vote the $300,000 asked for, but if we look into the Bill we will see that once we vote that $300,000 we commit ourselves to an expenditure in connection with this one battlefield the extent of which we do not know. I think all the battlefields should be included in the same Bill and the country be committed to restore them all at the same time.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). I desire to say a word in commendation of the proposition in this measure. But the main object of the Act seems to be somewhat different from its contents. We are called upon to vote $300,000, but any one who knows the history of great celebrations will admit that there will be very little left of this amount after the celebration this coming summer. It will take fully that amount to entertain properly the Prince of Wales and the other celebrities who will come there to take part in this very important celebration. The matter is one of great national moment. I most heartily approve of the sentiments it will stir in the hearts of all our citizens, regardless of race or origin. The people of Canada, as a whole, feel a hearty inclination to support the proposition which has been so well launched by our esteemed Governor General, His Excellency Lord Grey. The appeal he has made to the public at the meeting held in the city of Ottawa was very inspiring, and I have no doubt the responses which will be given by the people of Canada will be equally strong and commendable. At the same time we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that a great deal more money will be required than the sum mentioned in this Bill. I understand that His Excellency estimates that $1,250,000 will be required for the restoration of the plains and the establishment there of a suitable monument. I have had an experience of the kind the past three or four years, and I know the difficulty of raising funds. Although the people approve of the movement, it will be necessary to inaugurate a campaign that will spread over the whole country and be taken part in by the citizens as a whole so as to induce them to contribute to this great national celebration. It is all very well to ask the government to contribute a large amount, but the people should be prepared to contribute their share, and the only way to get them to do that is to bring the movement home to every one of them. I for one think that the sentiments which this commemoration will call for in the hearts of our people are such as should be encouraged, and every effort should be made to have that commemoration taken part in by the people of Canada as a great national movement.

It is very well to speak of all these great battlefields in other parts of the country, but this deals with one, and one at a time is quite sufficient. A large amount will be needed for this one movement, and until we accomplish this, which I think in the minds of all stands as the most important, the others can wait. There is no battlefield equal to the Plains of Abraham and the ramparts of the city of Quebec. It is well called by Sir Gilbert Parker 'The Seats of the Mighty,' and certainly the historical associations of these fields should stir a much more animated debate than we have had to-night. It may be that the multiplicity of battlefields that present themselves to the various members have diminished the enthusiasm they ought to feel for this one particular spot. I for one would like to see this matter heartily taken hold of. It is to be regretted, as has been said, that even the good acts of this government are mixed up with something that we do not like—there is always a fly in the ointment. I have felt it my duty to cast my first vote with the government a few moments ago, and now I am called upon to endorse a scheme that they propose, which I do with all my heart, though I cannot approve of the position in which this country finds itself in relation to it. We are called upon to buy back the site of the Ross rifle factory, which was almost given away by this government in a way that should never have been done. And I cannot at this time reconcile that alienation of this part of our public domain with what should have been in the minds of the business men who are said to compose this government. It seems that always we have to accept the fly in the ointment, and this is the fly in this ointment in this case. This will militate against the carrying out of this idea more than any other thing. But the idea itself is a grand one, and I desire to see hearty appreciation of the scheme. As a humble citizen of Canada, I am prepared to forward it in every way. I think the members of this House should take that view and should see to it that in every constituency in the Dominion of Canada a movement is carried on, great or small, according to the ability of the people, to respond in noble and generous manner to the appeal made so well by His Excellency the Governor General and now supplemented

in this way by the government's proposal to vote $300,000 to assist in carrying it into effect.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

The Governor in Council may appoint five commissioners, who shall hold office during the pleasure of the Governor in Council, and who with any additional commissioners who may be appointed under the authority of this Act, shall be a body politic and corporate, under the name of "

Sir WILFRID LARURIER. I left this blank because I had so many suggestions. I thought I would leave it to the House in case hon. members had other suggestions to make. If there is no objection, I would call it 'The Commission on Quebec Battlefields.'

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose, under the circumstances, it is difficult to give another direction to this movement. It has already taken a certain direction, both inside our own country and outside of it, and it is very difficult to take it up now and give it another direction. But if we were going to take it up from the first, we should most certainly enlarge it. In that case, I would call this Bill 'An Act respecting the Canadian Battlefields,' and I would make the preamble read :

Whereas, it is desirable in the public interest of Canada to acquire and preserve the great historic battlefields of Canada——

And so on. And I would appoint the very best commission that could be appointed. I would give them a year in which to study the whole question and present a report to this parliament taking in the battlefields of this country and giving a plan for their restoration and preservation, not under a system of vast expense, but with a fair idea of proportion, distinguishing between those of great interest and those that are of lesser interest, even though to the locality they may be very dear and precious. Then, with the matured plan, I would have this parliament do something efficient to drag out of the dirt and to put where they ought to have been from the first the historic grounds of our country We have not much history in this country, but what we have is splendid and romantic ; and these object lessons, the battlefields stir the memory and take us back to our beginnings, are better than many school teachers and platform teachers; they are the ever present embodiment and ever present reminders of the great deeds that have been performed, that made our country possible, and an incentive to equally good deeds for the preservation of our liberties and of the country that has been given to us. With a plan before us, we could take it up and discuss it, and could make our appropriation and ask for additional appropriation outside for the benefit of this commission, and a great movement could be made in this country which, feeling as we do at this particular time, could be carried on to a successful issue. Now, would it be impossible for parliament to say : Here is our tercentenary ; we will provide a certain amount for this celebration, and then we will appoint a commission to take up the whole question of the battlefields of Canada and prepare a report and plan, and we will see what we can do to adequately cover what I believe to be a very grand project, yet one of the most useful that we could undertake? Is it impossible simply to devote ourselves at the present time to a contribution to the tercentenary and then put our commission to work, joining it in effort and sympathy with the historical societies, with the Canadian clubs, with every patriotic body, and let the whole movement proceed with the co-operation of all? If this were done, what we could accomplish would astonish ourselves.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The idea of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is an excellent one, but I would not connect it with this project. And for this reason : If this Bill is to be the basis of the whole thing, and if there is to be a celebration to take place in the last week in July, there is not a moment to lose. The commission must begin at once, and will have not a single moment but needs to be consecrated to the work. For this reason, I think that the excellent idea of my hon. friend must be made a separate matter. There is also the consideration suggested by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). There are a number of battlefields. We have few great battlefields in themselves, but, such as they are, they are dear and sacred to us. But, as the hon. member for Brantford says, the battlefields which we all agree in regarding as most important are the battlefields around the city of Quebec. This consideration appeals more to the imagination of people than any other. It is not too much to say that the battles which took place around the citadel of Quebec were the most important perhaps in modern history. They started a new world, a new order of things, they determined the future of a new continent. I think, for these reasons, we must insist upon the legislation as it is.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest as an appropriate name 'The Corporation of the Quebec National Battlefields Park Commission.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is too long. My hon. friend the Minister of Fisheries suggests 'The Quebec Battlefields Commission,' which I think is preferable.

Mr. FOSTER. Why not make it the 'National Battlefields Association . ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suggest the 'National Battlefields Commission.'

Mr. MONK. We are endeavouring in Montreal to supplement what the governments are doing, by collecting funds for the purpose of advancing this object, making a popular subscription to which both rich and poor may contribute. We have a committee which is actively at work. Many suggestions have been made to me that it would be a great pity to change the name of the battlefield. The impression seems to have gained ground, at any rate in the province of Quebec, that the name of the Plains of Abraham is to be changed, and that the park will be known under another name. I think there is great objection to that. It has been known as the Plains of Abraham long before the battle was fought, it is so described in all the histories. All the romance that attaches to the event itself seems to be associated with that name. I believe that a man named Abraham gave his name to that piece of ground before the foundation of the city.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Abraham Martin.

Mr. MONK. I believe that every morning he used to lead his animals out to pasture over that plain, that I think is the reason why it became known as the Plains of Abraham. I think if my right hon. friend would give some assurance that the name would be preserved, it would help those who are engaged in making collections.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So far as I am concerned, I think that to change one syallable of that name would be a desecration and a sacrilege. It is an historic name, well known all over the world.

Mr. SPROULE. Then call it the Plains of Abraham Battlefields Park Commission.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I move that to insert at the end of section 1 'The National Battlefields Commission.'

Motion agreed to.

Mr .SPROULE. Would it not be advisable to put some limit to the number of the commission ? We provide that the commission shall be composed of five members, and additional members that may be named by the provinces.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think there is any necessity for that. I do not think that there will be too many commissioners as a consequence of provincial contributions. I would be glad if the commission were composed of fifteen members from all the provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. It has been suggested that contributors to a certain extent might be entitled to membership.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are nine provinces in the Dominion. I have the assurance that the province of Quebec will contribute. The province of Ontario may contribute, but I have no hope that any of the other provinces will contribute. I have a hope that the British government will contribute, but I have not heard so far of any other possible contributions.

Mr. FOSTER. How about General Botha?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He might possibly contribute also. The idea is that any province which contributes $100,000 shall have power to appoint a member. Now how many provinces does the hon. gentleman think will contribute ? Does he think that the province of Ontario will contribute ? I think it will, its finances are in a flourishing condition.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it will contribute.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does he believe that any other province will contribute ? I doubt it, on account of their finances. I believe it is quite possible, and I believe even, that the British government will contribute; and I am not without hope that South Africa will contribute. If it does, it will produce a great effect, not only throughout the British Empire but all over the world.

Mr. FOSTER. The new government of New Brunswick might be approached.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, it is said there is a good side to everything; if it should contribute, it would be to us some consolation. But really there is no need for apprehension that the commission will be too large. There are five members appointed by the Dominion government, one by the Quebec government and one by the Ontario government, that will make seven, and one by the British government will make eight, and perhaps another, which will make nine. If any hon. gentleman thinks there is any necessity of limiting the number, I would be willing to listen to any suggestion.

Mr. SPROULE. I should have a more hopeful aspiration than to imagine that there is no province except Ontario that would contribute to it. It seems to me that if the national pride of this country is what we believe it to be, the provinces would contribute more or less and would desire to have, if for no other purpose than the historic name, some representation on that commemoration. Therefore, it is most likely to be a larger one than the right hon. gentleman has contemplated. I should at least expect so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, I am only too glad to hope it also. I am delighted to think that we may expect more than we had anticipated but if we get a contribution from the nine provinces of the Dominion does my hon. friend believe that

every one of these provinces would be entitled to be represented by commissioners, or does he say that that would be too many? If we were to limit it to ten, which are the provinces that should be represented and which are the provinces that should not be represented?

Mr. SPROULE. I would be disposed to adopt a sliding scale so that provinces which are not as willing as others to contribute $100,000 might also be entitled to representation. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, might not contribute that amount and yet they might contribute a considerable part of it and it would be only reasonable to give them representation on the commission. It will be an historic commission and I think there should be a little latitude in that regard because all the provinces are not equally strong financially and I would expect that the commission might be a larger one than the right hon. gentleman has anticipated. While saying that I think we would be quite within the mark to provide that the commission shall be composed of not less than five nor more than fifteen commissioners so as to give representation to provinces which may not contribute more than $15,000 or $20,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the provinces are to give less and still be represented on the commission I think it would become very unwieldy. I understood the suggestion of my hon. friend was to limit the number of the commission. If any of the provinces were to contribute, say, $10,000 or $20,000 or $50,000 and still be represented on the commission the number of commissioners would be very numerous.

On section 2,

The Governor in Council shall name one of the commissioners appointed by the Governor in Council to be chairman of the commission, and he shall hold office as such chairman during pleasure.

Mr. FOSTER. Why should not the commission choose its own chairman?

On section 3,

The Governor in Council shall appoint a competent person to be secretary of the commission, who shall hold office during pleasure, and receive such salary as is fixed by the Governor in Council and provided by parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see why the government should appoint the secretary. If the commission do the work it should have the control that the appointment gives to the secretary. He is really the officer of the commission, and the appointing power should be under the control of the commission itself.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I admit that the question is not free from difficulty but we thought that on the whole it should be left to the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. It ought to be an independent commission and the question of patronage should be eliminated altogether. Otherwise you will be bothered to death as to who shall be your secretary then and it becomes a question of patronage. For these reasons the commission should be allowed to say who shall be their secretary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, I do not know about that. My hon. friend will agree that in the commission which we have selected we have eliminated altogether the question of patronage. The commissioners are to be quite independent of any political considerations. They are to have control of all expenditure, they are absolutely independent and there is no patronage. In that respect we have been governed by the Improvement Commission here. We have appointed the Improvement Commission and we have appointed the secretary and I think he is a very satisfactory one. I think we can do the same thing in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. The government is making a yearly contribution to the Improvement Commission at Ottawa. There may be that additional reason there.

Mr. HENDERSON. How long will this commission last? Will it be perpetual?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. The position of secretary will be one for life almost?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. During pleasure.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, that means during good behaviour.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If we have the good fortune to find a secretary who is active and intelligent and who will do most of the work for the commission that is the kind of man we want to get. If the commission were to sit in the city of Ottawa I have in my own mind a man who would fill that requirement, but the larger part of the work will be done in the city of Quebec and I do not know who will be the secretary. I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Does the right hon. gentleman believe that the secretary will spend the whole or only a portion of his time at the work?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A portion of his time only.

Section 6,

If the commission is unable to agree with the owner of any lands or immovable property, or any part thereof, or interest therein, so authorized to be purchased or acquired, as to the purchase, acquisition or transfer there-

of, or the price to be paid therefor, the commission may acquire such lands or immoveable property or interest without the consent of the owner, and shall in such cases, for all purposes of taking, acquiring, ascertaining the value of, and making compensation for the said lands or immoveable property, have all the powers of a railway company subject to the Railway Act, relative to the taking and using of lands, and the compensation and damages therefor, and the Railway Act shall, mutatis mutandis and in so far as applicable, apply to the taking and acquiring of, and the ascertaining and payment of the compensation and damages for, such lands or immoveable property by the commission.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would that include leased lands?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Any lands.

Section 9,

The Governor in Council is authorized to appropriate for the purposes of the commission all the lands or immoveable property now vested in His Majesty for the military or other public purposes of Canada and forming part of the aforesaid battlefields.

Mr. FOSTER. In the very improbable event of war how would that section affect that property being used for military purposes? Do you alienate these lands?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In that event the Governor in Council would reserve the right to take possession.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What lands are now reserved for military purposes?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Cove Fields.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The government have the Cove Fields, the Citadel and the Terrace.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the troops be debarred from manoeuvering there?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Surely not.

Section 10,

No land or immoveable property shall be purchased or acquired by the commission except with the previous authority of the Governor in Council, and no expenditure shall be made by the commission until it has been approved by the Governor in Council.

2. The commission shall before entering upon any work of improvement or construction, or any other work involving the expenditure of money, upon the lands taken or acquired under the authority of this Act, cause to be prepared plans of the proposed works, showing locations, and submit the said plans for the aproval of the Governor in Council, and the commission shall furnish such further descriptions or information to the Governor in Council as are required; and no such works shall be proceeded with until approved by the Governor in Council; and in like manner plans of the museum or any building to be erected within the park shall be subject before the commencement of the work of building to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) wants to have parliament substituted for the Governor in Council in this clause. I have no objecion to that. My hon. friend can express the idea as he wants to.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose property were purchased and parliament were not in session?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Parliament would have to authorize it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it necessary to put this Bill through to-night?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We want to proceed as fast as possible with it.

Mr. FOSTER. The Senate will not be in session until the 10th of March.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This would require a little consideration. I would not like to put it in such shape as to make it unworkable, but I would like parliament to have some voice in it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will reserve this section and my hon. friend can think it over and make his suggestion.

Section 11,

The commission shall from time to time, and before making expenditures, under this Act, submit to the Minister of Finance detailed estimates of the expenditures proposed to be made, accompanied by information sufficient to enable the Governor in Council to determine as to the necessity or advisability of the proposed expenditures and every portion thereof.

Mr. FOSTER. That section will apply to the celebration proceedings.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To everything.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the money to be provided for that by vote of parliament every year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We are voting the money by this Bill now.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose you have one million dollars contributed and the commission is going to spend it, according to this section they would have to submit to the Minister of Finance every dollar of this expenditure.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Would the Minister of Finance have control over the funds contributed by private parties?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would think it should only apply to the funds that are placed in the hands of the commission by the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is that objection, but the contributions come from the local legislatures and the municipality and private subscribers, and I believe that after all the best way is to have this money subject to the control of parliament in the last resort.

Mr. FOSTER. The fact that the government has control might give greater confidence to parties contributing outside the country; that is if we have the right kind of government.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The object is to have this commission under control of parliament?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is proper.

Mr. ALCORN. You might get over the difficulty which has been suggested by changing the last words of section 10 so as to read:

All such, together with the estimates and annual statements mentioned in the following sections shall be laid before parliament within the first twenty days of every session of parliament and shall be subject to the approval of parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will let section 10 stand.

Progress reported.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up on Thursday?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take up this same Bill, and the Minister of Railways proposes to make a statement about the Railway Department.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 5, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### QUESTIONS.

### MARINE HOSPITAL, LOUISBURG.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked:

1. How many sailors have been received or treated in the marine hospital at Louisburg since its completion?
2. Why are sailors landed at Louisburg treated in a private boarding house by the port physician, instead of being sent to this hospital?
3. If this hospital is not in a condition to receive patients, what reason can the department give for the delay in equipping it?
4. How much land did the department acquire as a site for the hospital and at what price?
5. Did the department call for tenders for the site of the marine hospital at Louisburg?
6. What tenders were received and from whom?
7. When and why was Dr. C. D. Barnaby, port physician at the port of Louisburg, dismissed?
8. Who was appointed as his successor, at what date and at what salary?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. None.
2. Formerly they were received and treated in a private boarding house, but now that the hospital is in operation they will be treated there.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. Four acres of land and a right of way, $1,000 for the land and $100 for right of way.
5. No.
6. Answered by No. 5.
7. On November 17, 1906, and in the interest of the service.
8. Dr. Freeman O'Neil, January 12, 1907, salary of $200 a year, same as predecessor.

### FOREIGN TOBACCO.

Mr. DUGAS asked:

1. What is the quantity of foreign tobacco employed by Canadian manufacturers during past financial year, upon which a refund of 10 cents per pound was allowed?
2. On how many pounds of foreign tobacco has that refund of ten cents been allowed during the same year?
3. What is the full amount thus refunded on these tobaccos during the same financial years?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

The quantity of tobacco exported upon which a refund of duty was paid on the foreign raw leaf contained therein was 112,891 pounds. The amount of the refund was $10,737.70. It is impossible to determine the exact quantity of foreign raw leaf actually contained in the above quantity.

There was, in addition to the above, 363,518 pounds of cigar cuttings exported upon which a refund of $36,351.80 was paid.

### ADULTERATION OF FOOD.

Mr. E. D. SMITH—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

How many firms have been fined for manufacturing and selling adulterated food in 1906 and 1907, and how much was the average fine and the average cost to each person fined?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). Seventy-nine persons, or firms, paid the cost of collecting and analysing samples at an average cost to each per-

son, or firm, of $10.18. Eight persons, or firms, were fined through the courts. The average fine was $10 and the average cost to each person, or firm fined was, so far as the department can determine, about $18.

ORIGINAL LAND REGISTERS OF LORD SELKIRK'S ESTATE.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM asked :

Has the government ever made an effort to secure the custody of the original land registers of Lord Selkirk's estate covering the period from 1812 to 1835?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot answer for previous administrations, but so far as the present administration is concerned, all such matters have been placed in the hands of Dr. Doughty, the Dominion Archivist and a most competent officer. I do not know whether these land registers can be had, but if my hon. friend (Mr. Chisholm) has any information on the subject it would be most welcome.

IMPROVEMENTS AT PORT COLBORNE.

Mr. LANCASTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What is the total amount expended to date on the improvements at Port Colborne, on the Welland canal?
2. What is the total amount of the contract or contracts already made for said improvements?
3. What is the total amount estimated as required to complete such improvements?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Expended by Department of Public Works up to 31st December, 1907, $892,-008.22.
2. $880,840.
3. $20,000 to complete.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. $1,581,178.26.
2. M. J. Hogan's contract at schedule rates. Messrs. Hogan and Macdonald at schedule rates.
3. $80,000.

BURLINGTON CHANNEL.

Mr. E. D. SMITH—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Who has been in charge of the repair work on the Burlington channel on behalf of the government during the last four years?
2. On whose recommendation was the appointment made?
3. What salary did the party in charge receive?
4. When did he commence and when did he finish his work, and how much has he received to date?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works :

1. George Hart.
2. It would not be in accordance with the practice of the department to give the names of the parties who made the recommendation.
3. $3 per day.
4. (a) April 6, 1903. (b) February 2, 1906. (c) $2,349.

LOBSTER LICENSES.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens) asked :

1. Has the government received a petition from fishermen in Savage harbour, P.E.I., asking for a license to fish and pack lobsters in that locality?
2. If so, is it the intention of the government to grant the prayer of the petitioners? If not, why not?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. A petition has been received from lobster fishermen on a portion of the north shore of Prince Edward Island, embracing Savage harbour, asking for a lobster canning license.
2. No, as after full inquiry, there appear to be no special conditions in this case calling for a departure from the general policy.

PORT VERNON RIVER BRIDGE, P.E.I.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens) asked :

1. Has work on the wharf of Port Vernon river bridge, P.E.I., been completed?
2. If so, (a) at what cost, (b) if by contract or tender, and (c) who was the contractor?
3. Is the work to be extended?
4. Is the government aware that the wharf accommodation at the port is still insufficient?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works ) :

1. No.
2. (a) Cost to date, $2,607.09. (b) and (c) By day labour.
3. Matter under consideration.
4. Representations have been made that additional accommodation is required.

ROSS RIFLE COMPANY.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Since the execution of the lease of Sir Charles D. Ross of May 27, 1902, has the government by lease or otherwise alienated to Sir Charles D. Ross, or the Ross Rifle Company, or either of them, or to any one for them, any further portion of the Cove fields of the plains of Abraham?
2. If so, when, what portion thereof, and on what terms?
3. Has a request been made for such additional land, has the application been ac-

ceded to, is the question still under consideration, or has the request been definitely and finally refused?

4. If refused, what were the reasons for refusal?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. No.
2. Answered by answer to No. 1.
3. Yes; refused.
4. Not considered advisable to do so.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES—COMMANDER SPAIN.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. Was there at any time a question raised by the Auditor General as to the largeness of the payment to Commander Spain, of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, on account of his travelling expenses?

2. If so, in what year was the expense complained of paid, and what was the amount?

3. Did the Auditor General examine the attendance book of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and through its examination prove that Commander Spain had charged expenses as absent from Ottawa while his attendance at the department was established by his siguature in the attendance book?

4. What was the amount so overcharged by Commander Spain?

5. Did Commander Spain refund an amount? If so, where is the refund to be found in the report of the Auditor General, and for what year, and what amount was refunded?

6. Was there any correspondence between the Auditor General and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries or with Commander Spain, or any other officer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries on this subject?

7. If there was, why was the correspondence not published in the report of the Auditor General in a similar manner to other correspondence of like character?

8. What action did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries take in connection with the matter?

9. Was there an investigation made? If so, by whom, and was a report made?

10. Will the Minister of Marine and Fisheries lay on the table of the House all correspondence, reports and papers on the subjects?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes.
2. 1904-5.
3. Yes, but satisfactorily explained.
4. Not overcharge, but refund of balance as indicated, P—252, 1905-6.
5. Answered by above.
6. Yes, five letters between Auditor General and Deputy Minister Marine and Fisheries.
7. Because correspondence belonged to former year and report closed, so I am informed by the Auditor General.
8. No action required.
9. No.
10. Yes.

LOUISBURG BAIT FREEZER.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What amount did the cold storage building at Louisburg, N.S., cost the government, and what amount was contributed by the fishermen in cash and labour?

2. Who is the keeper of the freezer and what remuneration does he receive?

3. What quantity of bait was stored in the freezer in 1907 and what amount was collected for the storage of the bait?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. The government's share of the cost was $1,000. The balance of the cost was $1,290.16, which was paid by the Fishermen's Bait Association in cash and labour.

2. Fishermen's bait associations themselves employ the keepers of freezers and pay the remuneration that may be decided upon.

3. No report yet received from the secretary of the association for 1907; but in any case the government would have nothing to do with the collections for the storage of bait, as the freezers are run by the associations under regulations provided.

CENSUS MAP.

Mr. AMES asked:

In connection with the census of the provinces in 1906 has any map been published showing distribution according to nationalities?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). No.

DISTRICT EXHIBITIONS.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT asked:

1. What district exhibitions, or others, have been subsidized during the course of the past five years?

2. What was the amount of each of such subsidies?

3. Did the Dominion government ever subsidize two exhibitions in the same province for the same year?

4. Has the same government ever subsidized an exhibition, or more than one, during two consecutive years, or more, in the same province?

5. Does the government intend to subsidize successively every district exhibition company?

6. If so, according to what order and in accordance with what principle as regards the amount of such subsidies?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. Province of Ontario, Manitoba, British Columbia, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Prince Edward Island.

2. Fifty thousand dollars each, with the exception of Prince Edward Island, which received ten thousand dollars.

3. No.
4. No.

5 & 6. The government has no fixed policy determined for the future.

COLD STORAGE PAPERS.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister of Agriculture been successful in finding the missing letter I asked him for a few days ago?

Mr. FISHER. There is such a letter on the private files of my office. I look upon it as a private and confidential communication, but in consequence of the hon. gentleman's question I have communicated with the writer of the letter to know whether he would allow it to be put on the file.

INSTRUCTIONS TO MR. BASTEDO.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Bastedo has been appointed to negotiate with the different provinces as to the fisheries. Some time ago the Minister of Marine promised to lay on the table of the House the instructions given to him.

Mr. BRODEUR. If there are special instructions, I will bring them down; there is the order in council.

ORIENTAL CONTRACT LABOUR.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the First Minister information to give to the House with reference to the telegram published in the newspapers as to the action of the Asiatic League in reference to the influx of Hindoos? And also with reference to the statements said to have been made by Count Hayashi in Tokio, that Japanese labourers under contract were not forbidden entrance into Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I received a telegram yesterday from New Westminster referring to the statement of Count Hayashi I am sorry I have not here the answer which I sent to that telegram, but it was to the effect that we could not credit the report attributed to Count Hayashi; that it was incorrect in some way, because Mr. Lemieux has stated on the floor of the House that contract labour cannot be imported into Canada except by the previous sanction of the Canadian government, and no such sanction has been given.

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). I had a visit this morning from the Consul General of Japan in Ottawa, and I called his attention to the statement which had been made in the press. I presume the Asiatic Exclusion League meant the Japanese press of British Columbia, because there are two or three newspapers published in the Japanese language in Vancouver. The Consul General for Japan has authorized me to say that he had been instructed—as I have already stated in the House when I came back from Japan—that in future no contract labourers would be admitted into Canada unless the Canadian government would approve of their importation.

BELLEVILLE HARBOUR.

Mr. PORTER. What is the cause of the delay in bringing down the returns ordered by the House on the 11th of January with regard to the commissions appointed from 1896 down to the present time and their expenses? And also in regard to the expenditures made on Belleville harbour, which was ordered on the 12th of February.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will my hon. friend send me a memo?

Mr. BRODEUR. As to Belleville harbour, we have communicated with the authorities there. We have not the information here.

Mr. PORTER. The newspapers up there are very full of it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works when I may expect the return relative to the pier at Grand Bend, St. Joseph and Bayfield and if he would be good enough to include any pettions that he has received in regard to these matters?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will have the returns just as soon as possible. They are being prepared in the regular course, and the instructions are to lose no time in getting them ready.

CANADIAN BATTLEFIELDS AT QUEBEC.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 111) respecting the Canadian battlefields at Quebec.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

On section 10—powers to be exercised subject to approval of Governor in Council—

Mr. FOSTER. It was agreed, I understand, to substitute the parliament of Canada for the Governor in Council.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, but in discussing the matter afterwards with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition we did not think it would be sufficient to put it in that form. If you said that no land or immovable property shall be purchased or acquired by the commission except with the previous authority of the parliament of Canada you would probably make it impossible for the commission to acquire the necessary land. If the land is acquired with the authority of the Governor in Council, that is subject of course to their responsibility to parliament. If my hon. friend would prepare an amendment which would express his views I would have no objection, but for my part I do not think the ground would be covered by substituting the parliament of Canada for the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. I talked the matter over with the leader of the opposition this morn-

ing. He had carefully gone over the two clauses of this section, and he could see nothing better than to substitute, as was suggested by the right hon. gentleman himself, the parliament of Canada for the Governor in Council. The section as it stands gives carte blanche to the commission to go ahead and purchase whatever land or immovable property they may consider necessary, subject simply to the authority of the Governor in Council. The idea we had the other evening was that the celebration itself, which is imminent, and which no one desires to interfere with, quite the contrary, might very well be left entirely, free and that the expenditure for that might be made under the authority of the Governor in Council, but with reference to the permanent acquirment of properties, great or small, extended or narrow, it was thought better that parliament should see what plan the commission, after full consideration, developed, and then parliament would be in a position to authorize the expenditure. Otherwise you are asking us to vote an indefinite obligation, which may reach half a million dollars or a million dollars, without any plan being mapped out. Would not all things be properly conserved if no attempt were made to put any difficulty at all in the way of the celebration of the tercentenary, while the commission should be asked to give their best thought during the year to the whole matter and then outline their plan, which would afford a definite basis for parliament to come to some conclusion upon? The only objection to that, I understand, is that it may be difficult to secure land unless it is got quickly. How that may be I do not know, but it would strike me that all private lands that will be required will have to be expropriated, and they are not likely to cost more a year from now than they will now. If they are not expropriated, there is nothing to prevent the commission taking options upon them as soon as they please. I think the country at large, while willing to do everything possible in the line of the idea broached, would be much better satisfied if they knew the extent of the obligation before undertaking it. On this side of the House we have not the slightest desire to put anything in the way of the proper and fitting celebration of the tercentenary, but with regard to the purchase of land we would like something in the form of a plan.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am altogether of the same mind as my hon. friend. I wanted to have the whole matter controlled by parliament, but I could not see how it could be done. Of course, no money can be expended unless it is voted by parliament. However, I have no objection to meeting the views of my hon. friend if he will let me have the words he wants substituted for those in the Bill, so that I may have the matter placed before the Department of Justice. Meantime, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that the clause read as follows:

No land or immovable property shall be purchased or acquired by the commission except with the previous authority of parliament, and no expenditures shall be made by the commission, except for the celebration of the tercentenary, until it has been approved by parliament.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. If I may be permitted, as I was not able to be here at the second reading, I would like to say something on the principle of the Bill. I hope my remarks will be taken by the House in the best of faith and without any arrière pensée. What I am about to say represents, I think, the views of the majority of the people who are first concerned, the people of Quebec. I am sure no one has any idea of opposing the Bill and I do not rise for that purpose. The Bill has been called an Act respecting the Canadian battlefields at Quebec, and this legislation is asked for in connection with the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the birthday of Canada, of the founding of the city of Quebec. It appears to me that the principle of this festival has been forgotten. It is certain that if the amiable explorer of Saintonge should return he would feel a legitimate pride at the changes that have taken place since his first visit to the St. Lawrence. He would find where he planted a poor wooden cross, a prosperous city. He might perhaps be more surprised at the manner in which this festival is being celebrated. It seems that the hero of the feast has been forgotten, that the name of Champlain is placed entirely in the shade and that another scheme, of an entirely different character, has been brought forward, a scheme which would be quite in its place and which I would favour to the utmost in the year 1959. But we must not forget that we are now in 1908; that Quebec was founded in 1608 and that we are not celebrating the second centenary of the battle of the plains of Abraham, but the third centenary of the founding of the city of Quebec.

I appreciate and approve the movement to consecrate the Plains of Abraham as a national park, but at the same time we must not forget our present object, the celebration of the tercentenary of the founding of Canada.

At the meeting held in the Russell theatre, Ottawa, under the auspices of the Canadian Club, the dominant note was that it was a privilege

To associate one's self with the battlefields of Quebec, which gave the French Canadians good government and a place within the em-

pire, to the British half a continent on this side of the Atlantic and an empire of self-governing dominions, and to the United States their independence.

That may be all very good, but I was under the impression that the French Canadians had won their freedom since the battle of 1759, and I think it is a mere figure of rhetoric, to say that the soldiers of Wolfe fought against the liberties of the French Canadians or that the French Canadians fought to defend their religion and nationality. The soldiers fought for their respective sovereigns, and I do not believe had a thought of the great principles at stake in that battle. Judging by the agitation that has been going on in the country, Champlain, the hero of the feast, is almost entirely forgotten; he is treated as a dead letter, and an effort is made to make the feast entirely an Imperial festival. Surely this feast should be thoroughly Canadian. I am quite sure that Champlain in founding Quebec would never for a moment have thought that the other colonies would be called on to name commissioners to decide how the festivities in connection with the anniversary of the foundation of his city should be arranged. We seem to be going far from the idea which was in the minds of the people of this country in initiating the celebration, if the whole object of this Bill is the nationalization of the Plains of Abraham. It would seem to me that the figures here given as to the probable cost are below the mark, because on one part of the Plains of Abraham that has been mentioned, where the Ross rifle factory is situated, there never was the shadow of the tail of a battle. To expropriate the real Plains of Abraham would cost many millions, for it must be remembered that the plains of Abraham commenced at the St. Lawrence river and went over to the cliff which rises over the valley of the River St. Charles. This is now practically all built up and where the first battle of the Plains of Abraham took place is now one of the most desirable and expensive residential parts of the city of Quebec. I think that Wolfe's right wing rested at what is now the monastery of the Franciscan nuns which is in the very heart of the city. Therefore it seems a physical impossibility to make a park of what was then the Plains of Abraham. Then we would be nationalizing only parts of the Plains of Abraham. There is, for instance, the scene of the battle of St. Foye, where a large number of those who fell met their death, and the Moulin Dumont which was captured and recaptured again and again by the Highlanders and by the French. But there is actually a monument on that spot.

We have also heard that the name of the Plains of Abraham should be changed and many names have been suggested. I think that not even parliament, which is supreme, could change history. The name of the Plains of Abraham is historical and a Bill of this parliament cannot change it. I would like to see provision placed in the Bill restraining the commission from changing these names. I have the greatest respect for the commission, but in glancing over their names I do not see the name of any competent judge of the national idea of the Plains of Abraham or of the celebration of the tercentenary of the founding of Quebec by Champlain. But it seems to me that a strong restriction should be put in the Bill to prevent any change in the name of the Plains of Abraham. It is an ordinary-sounding name, perhaps, but it is a name that is historic, a name that is glorious, a name known throughout the world. We cannot change it without seeking to change history, and that is undesirable even where it is possible.

I learn that it was stated at this meeting of Canadian clubs at the Russell Theatre, that, at the Plains of Abraham took place the birth of the Canadian nation. It seems strange that, at a meeting where it was stated that we were to celebrate the three hundredth birthday of Canada, it should be stated a little later that Canada came into being on the Plains of Abraham. French Canadians was born with the founding of Quebec by Champlain ; English Canadians came with the Plains of Abraham ; but the Canada that we know was born in 1867, when the two elements in this country made peace and joined hands to make one Dominion. If we are going to celebrate the centenary of the birth of Canada, we must wait until 1967. That which we propose to celebrate this year is the three hundredth anniversary of the birthday of Quebec.

Many plans for this celebration have been suggested. The one that seems to have taken most with the people is to erect on the citadel of Quebec a statue to be called the Angel of Peace. It certainly seems a rather strange idea to set up the Angel of Peace on a citadel. We are told that this is to take the place on the Plains of Abraham of the Ross Rifle factory and also of the gaol. I do not know that the Angel of Peace will be a very satisfactory substitute, with the workmen of Quebec, for the Ross Rifle factory and the $5,000 a week of wages that it pays them. We are told that the Angel of Peace would be regarded as giving to the immigrant a welcome on coming to this new land. For my part, I should rather be in favour of leaving the gaol, so far as the immigrants are concerned. I think it would be a salutary thing for them, on coming to this country, to see that there is a gaol, and, if they have come to this country, as some of them seem to have done, because the choice was offered them of going to gaol or going to Canada, it would be well to impress them with a

respect for our laws which, for the last ten years or so, many of them have failed to exhibit. It seems to me there will be a better way to commemorate the foundation of Quebec and even the nationalization of the battlefields of Quebec than by building the Angel of Peace there. Why should we not change the gaol of Quebec—which, by the way, does not look half so bad as the gentlemen who made speeches at the convention of Canadian clubs would have us believe—into a national museum ? There are in the Laval University in Quebec millions of dollars worth of paintings and these are articles of national and historic value, which, at any moment, may be destroyed by fire. It seems to me that we should be doing a much more practical work for Canada, and one quite in keeping with this celebration, by nationalizing what is left of the Plains of Abraham, and building there a museum where could be stored these treasures of Laval University and others that would be gladly contributed by the citizens of this country. I understand that there is to be a park on the Plains of Abraham. Where is it to be? As I have said, there is practically nothing left of the place where the battle was fought. There is a monument there to commemorate General Wolfe, but everybody knows that Wolfe did not die there and was not carried there. The proposal, I understand, is to take the racecourse of Quebec, or whatever it is called, and this little field that is left at the side of the river, and set up there the statue of the Angel of Peace and make a park. What peace would that statute represent?

Now, I hope that my English speaking colleagues in this House will take what I say in the best way, because they may be sure I mean nothing but good. The French Canadians have seen with joy their English-speaking countrymen ready to join them in celebrating the third centenary of Quebec. In that we have seen the same spirit of British fairplay and justice that they displayed when the question of Canada's nationality was in view. What peace, I say, would this Angel of Peace represent ? Would it be the peace that reigned at Warsaw ? The peace we have had in this country since 1867 ? For, we have seen the confederation of Canada, in the province of Quebec, the minority receive, I will not say the most just treatment, I would more truly say the most generous treatment, that any minority has received at the hands of a majority. But the minority in the other provinces—whether it be in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick, in Prince Edward Island, or let it be in Manitoba, or, more recently in Alberta and Saskatchewan, has seen its privileges and its rights curtailed. Will it be that kind of peace that the Angel of Peace on the Plains of Abraham will represent? If that is the kind of peace that is meant, let me tell this House that we do not want a statue to celebrate it; the peace that we would like to have commemorated is that which was made when the two elements in this country joined in one, and the statement was made that in this country there was no superior race and no inferior race. Let us commemorate the peace which will represent the true idea of this country, the spirit which presided over our affairs in 1867 in the establishment of confederation. And, Mr. Speaker, let us build a monument, not of stone or bronze which must pass away, one which will yield to storms and to the influence of the outer elements, but let us build it of enduring sentiment which should not pass away. Let it be a peace such as was expressed by the words of one whom everybody in this House, on either side, will acclaim as amongst the greatest of Canadians, Sir John Macdonald. And let us establish that monument not upon the Plains of Abraham alone, but in the hearts of our people. Sir John Macdonald told us that in this country there is no superior race and no inferior race; there are no French Canadians and no English Canadians ; but there are Canadians speaking French and Canadians speaking English, but all are Canadians, and to say that one of these elements has more privileges than the other is speaking à propos de rien. to use the very language of Sir John Macdonald, and that all are upon an equal footing. If we give effect to the spirit of our constitution, we shall not build upon the Plains of Abraham a statue to represent a general sentiment however lofty, but we shall build a monument to the Canadian nation, a token of its eternal unity and future prosperity.

I say that, during this next summer, when we are going to celebrate the tercentenary of the city of Quebec and the practical foundation of Canada, it should be in the spirit that would cause the majority to give the minority the treatment to which it is entitled, and to recognize the rights, which, within the last twenty years, have been curtailed. Then may we look for a joyous celebration indeed of the foundation of this country. And it should be remembered that we are not celebrating next summer the tercentenary of the battle of the Plains of Abraham, however glorious that anniversary may be and however worthy of celebration—and I hope the House will understand that I would be one of the first to join in helping to celebrate it—but we are celebrating the tercentenary of the foundation of the city of Quebec and of this country by Champlain. But I hope that the peace established on the Plains of Abraham will not be forgotten but that it will be celebrated in the true spirit of this country. The past is done. We cannot tear out a page of history. There are two

elements in this country, and they are here to stay.

If we do not get into our minds the conviction that the two elements are here to stay we may as well make up our minds that there will be room for none of them. I hope that during this celebration we will forget the past and start with a better idea of the future and put into practice the true spirit of our constitution. I may be told that I am rather narrow in my views, but I might quote the words which General Murray used in 1760 when opposing the policy in the province of Quebec of the imperial government. He said that the loss of the French Canadian element would be a loss, not only to Canada, but to the empire. It had been the privilege of General Murray to incur the hatred of the imperialists because he had defended the French-Canadians and held that they were necessary to the empire. I hope that we will celebrate this tercentenary in a true spirit, not as a celebration of the overthrow and defeat of the French on the Plains of Abraham, but as celebrating the birth of the Canadian nation, and in so doing we should not forget the spirit of our forefathers. In twenty years hence the foreign immigration to this country will be an element not in sympathy with the national spirit which has, since confederation, been developing among Canadians of English as well as of French origin ; and unless these two elements work in harmony and recognize each the value of the other we may, owing to this foreign influx, have to confront a more bitter struggle than that which took place on the Plains of Abraham. It is time now that the majority should join hands with the minority and put into practice the words of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government that in this country there is one nation divided into two elements—French and English speaking—each with the same rights and privileges. Then we may look with confidence to the future of this country and work out our destiny in the spirit given expression to by Champlain when he spoke of the mission of this country as not the establishment of kingdoms, or the enlargement of the empire, or the winning of battles, but the higher and better end of civilization and the salvation of mankind.

Mr. SPROULE. If I properly interpret the hon. gentleman's remarks, he has hardly been seized with the spirit of the occasion. He speaks of it as being the celebration of the birth of a country in which there are two elements. If I understand it properly, it is rather the birth of a country where the people are all British subjects so that there cannot be two elements.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. There are some British subjects who seem to be considered as British subjects and others who seem to be treated as inferior British subjects.

Mr. SPROULE. What nationality might that imply—the Doukhobors ?

Mr. LAVERGNE. I think it was the hon. gentleman himself, and practically some members of the cabinet, who put the French-Canadians and the Doukhobors of the Northwest on the same footing.

Mr. SPROULE. I think, as a member of the opposition, that we might complain of the treatment which has been meted out to us for some time. But as British subjects we go our way giving our blows and taking them at the same time. The hon. gentleman spoke of the nation as composed of a majority and a minority. I do not know that there is any minority in this nation. It is all one nation. We are all British subjects. We are celebrating the birth of British dominance, and if we are willing to join in that tercentenary with pride and pleasure, it is because we believe that as British subjects it is our right and duty to do so and because we believe there has been an amalgamation which represents neither the majority nor the minority but the British empire. That is what we all desire to stand for, and in doing this we are giving the best evidence that it is not a minority or a majority but all British subjects who desire to honour this occasion.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one point which we should not lose sight of. This celebration will take place in the latter part of July. If the advertisement is large, as no doubt it will be, and the expectations held out are alluring, there will be a tremendous influx of people into the city of Quebec about that time and during the days this celebration will continue, and no doubt great difficulty will be found in caring for all the people who come. If you turn 10,000 extra people into the city of Quebec, that will tax its general accommodations very seriously. But if you turn 50,000 or 100,000 into the vicinity of Quebec for three or four days, where will you put them? The celebration will be al fresco, but you must have some shelter for these people and some means of feeding them, unless they are going to feed on pure patriotism and all that kind of thing my hon. friend (Mr. Lavergne) has been talking about. The lodging of those people is one of the most serious problems connected with the whole thing. The government no doubt will have to face it. It will take the whole fleet of the Marine and Fisheries Department and all the tent accommodation of the Militia Department to shelter even a very small portion of the numbers who will be there.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The difficulties my hon. friend has pointed out have certainly presented themselves to other

minds than his own. They have been the subject of frequent conversation between myself and some of the parties interested. I have talked the matter over with Sir Thomas Shaugnessy, the representative of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has the management of the Chateau Frontenac at Quebec. Of course the hotel accommodation will not be sufficient, but the difficulty is one which we will have to face, and, as my hon. friend knows, necessity is the mother of invention. I do not agree with our young friend from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne), that there is a superior and an inferior race in this country. I belong to the race of the minority, as he does, and I state that we are on a footing of equality with everybody. Again I want to say to my hon. friend that on that occasion it is probable there will be an equality of misery on the part of many of those who visit the city.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. My hon. friend belongs to the minority but he has the chance of being the first of the minority and of the majority. If my right hon. friend were living in the province of Quebec he would find that if he wanted to send a telegram, to send a little bit of freight, to take a train, to telephone, to read the laws of this country, to avail himself of any public utility, or public service, or to go to any department of the government of the country, or even to talk to a minister of the Crown, he would find that he was very much in the minority.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If I were to go to a restaurant I would find a French menu also.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I understood that this day would be set apart for the second reading of this Bill. However, we are in committee and anything we have to say upon it will be better said now. I regret that I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) about a superior and an inferior race with the interpretation that he puts upon the phrase. If it were in the province of Ontario we would say that the British are the inferior race as far as practice is concerned. We have to do all the bowing and kow-towing to our friends in the province of Quebec and they are the ones—in our opinion, you know—who are the superior race as far as rights and privileges go. When you find the subject viewed from both aspects, when each side feels that it is aggrieved, we are fairly justified in assuming that things are not half bad after all. Reference has been made to the two races in Canada. Let me point out that I take no stock whatever in these race cries. The people in France are identically the same class of people as the British race are. The old Franks—the name means freemen—were a Teutonic race, akin to the Germans and the Anglo-Saxons, who settled in Britain and, with the exception of a very small sprinkling of the Latin race which settled in France, we find the people of France identical with the people of Germany and the people of the British Isles. They have the same aspirations, the same love of liberty and no country in the world —I make no exception—has ever given more striking example of the stern struggle for liberty and freedom than France has. You may search in vain the records of Germany, of Italy, of Spain and of Great Britain and you will not find any country in the world which has placed upon record as stern a determination to be free as the French people have from time to time and at all times in that country.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the Scotch?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Next to the French our good friends of Scotland, I should say, rank well up in the line, although if I chose to go into that question I think I could show where the Scotch have not been so self-sacrificing on all occasions as our good friends from France have been. In dealing with this question of races in Canada we need not talk of a superior race and an inferior race or of a race that does not enjoy all the rights and privileges that any other race possesses. As I pointed out upon one occasion in this House, in crossing the continent from Winnipeg to the mountains, I came across twenty-seven different languages—an hon. gentleman says eighty-three, but I am speaking of what I know myself—and if we are going to look upon them from the view point of language and not from the ethnological point of view they are all on the same footing as long as they obey the laws. I am heartily in favour of commemorating the tercentenary of the founding of Quebec and of commemorating the name of that splendid hero, Samuel de Champlain. I want to point out at the outset that his name was Samuel.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. A chip off the old block.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I have not the slightest doubt but at that period he was also called Sam, the same as those who bear that name are to-day called Sam. I want to point out still further that you will search the pages of history in vain to find one bearing that name who was not a lover of liberty.

An hon. MEMBER. Uncle Sam.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Uncle Sam was and is a stalwart lover of liberty. Let me point to the movements which were agitating the world immediately previous to the founding of Quebec. We find the struggle for liberty going on throughout the length and breadth of the then civilized world. We find our French friends, led by De Monts,

Champlain, and others—I could give the names of all of them—encouraging settlement in Acadia and in what is now the province of Quebec. These men, although chance threw them later under the control of the fur traders, came in search of that liberty, the thought which was universal in the minds of men all through Europe at that time. The lovers of liberty of Great Britain, France, Germany and Holland united in forming settlements along the shores of the new world so that they might be free from the little petty tyrannies in church and state that had ground down poor old humanity in those lands. In Acadia we find these lovers of liberty laying down their settlements, and in Quebec we find them laying down their settlements headed by Champlain who had fought under the flag of Henri of Navarre, at the battle d'Ivry for liberty. We find men in England seeking to free themselves from the tyranny that was grinding the hearts out of the people. We find the British people founding the New England States, we find our Dutch lovers of liberty settling on Manhattan Island, we find the French people settling along the shores of Georgia, Florida, Carolinas and Brazil, the British also in South Carolina, and we find a splendid French colony seeking the same liberty and under the same captains along the shores of the St. Lawrence. The whole idea actuating these settlements was that mankind might be free. I therefore hold up both hands and join most heartily in any movement, cost what it may, which will perpetuate the memory of Samuel de Champlain on the Plains of Abraham, in the County of Victoria, up the Ottawa, along the shores of Lake Nipissing, along the shores of the Georgian Bay, or wherever that splendid soldier and statesman may have pursued his adventurous way. I hold up both hands in favour of commemorating the memory of a man who has done so much for the civilized world as Samuel de Champlain. In so far as the details of the celebration may be concerned, I have great faith in the Minister of War. In time of war I have great faith in him. Now, that a question has come up in time of peace I want to say that when the South African war broke out and when the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—I am not saying what his own personal views may have been—was tied up by certain elements in his own party on the question of sending troops to South Africa, I know personally that the Minister of Militia was absolutely in favour of sending the boys to South Africa without any qualification.

However, the Minister of Militia has a capable general officer commanding, he has capable officers around him, and there will be no trouble in handling the troops. As to housing the visitors, I imagine that on the Quebec and Lévis sides accommodation can be found easily for 50,000 to 100,000 people, but as necessity is the mother of invention, if the worst comes to the worst, tents and improvised shelters could be erected so that there need be no fear on that score. When the occasion arises again I shall hold the First Minister and the Postmaster General as well to the promises they have made that other parts of Canada will be remembered in these commemoration services. It is of course highly proper and fitting that we should commemorate the tercentenary at Quebec, but there are other parts of Canada prominently associated with the name and doings of that great soldier and splendid statesman, Samuel De Champlain, and I trust the government will not forget to have a commemoration in these places.

Progress reported.

## SUPPLY—RAILWAYS AND CANALS—TRANSPORTATION.

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

Hon GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). In rising to make a few observations on the Department of Railways and Canals I shall state frankly to the House that I make no profession of having mastered the details of that very large department, the work of which is so interwoven with the interests of the people of the whole country. In endeavouring to gain some information as each day's work progresses, the conclusion has been forced on my mind that if I should be able to approach within measurable distance of the ability shown by my predecessors in the management of the affairs of this department, the people of Canada ought to be fairly well satisfied. The staff of the department is, I think, exceptionally efficient, and in consequence the work is made as easy for the minister as the work of that department can be made. But, there are myriads of details which I do not pretend to have grappled with, much less to have mastered. Indeed if any one should pretend that he had been able in a few short months to master all these details, he would to my mind demonstrate that he was incapable of ever mastering them. It is a large part of the business of this department to do something to better the transportation facilities of the country; but were I to-day to discuss the question of transportation in its larger sphere I would get into a realm that would take me very far away from my object this afternoon. I ask the indulgence of the House while for a short time I discuss in a cursory way and very briefly a few of the matters connected with the department. In the first place, speaking of the canals, I shall not discuss them in detail but shall merely try to give the House and the country a little bit of information as

to what has been done and what is being done in connection with our canals. If we include the Rideau canal, which runs from Ottawa to Kingston, I am well within the mark when I say that the expenditure on our canals in Canada has been at least $120,000,000. En passant I may add that on the Rideau canal between Ottawa and Kingston will be found some of the finest scenery in America or in Europe either, and those hon. gentlemen who have not taken the opportunity to enjoy a trip through that canal should do so at the earliest moment and learn something of the beauties of nature with which we are surrounded.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Take the steamers up some Saturday.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman might go next Saturday. Now, the business on the St. Lawrence canals is not so great as we had hoped it would be. On the other hand the business done at the Soo canal has increased to nearly two-thirds of the capacity of the canal, or about 12,000,000 tons. The lockages on the Cornwall canal, which will give an idea of the trade up and down the St. Lawrence, amounted last year to 4,417.

Mr. J. D. REID. That means lockages up and down?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. While that does not represent as great a traffic as we would like to see on that waterway, yet it is greater than it was last year and it is increasing year after year. But, the number of lockages at the present time cannot be compared with the lockages of past years as indicating the extent of trade, because the canals have been deepened, and larger vessels are used, and larger cargoes are carried, and consequently the tonnage for the same number of lockages would be greater now than before. The following figures give an idea of the traffic through the St. Lawrence canals :—

| | |
|---|---|
| Down river traffic, St. Lawrence canals. | |
| Wheat.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 15,461.600 bushels |
| Corn.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 3,882,800 " |
| Oats.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 3,937,700 " |
| Flax.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,950,700 " |
| Barley.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 414,000 " |
| Total grain down river through St. Lawrence canals.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 25,646,800 " |
| Coal.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 395,200 tons. |
| Other freight.. .. .. .. .. | 31,700 " |
| Passengers.. .. .. .. .. .. | 9,981 |
| Up river traffic, St. Lawrence canals. | |
| Pulp wood.. .. .. .. .. .. | 81,000 cords. |
| Lumber.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 21,350,000 ft.b.m. |
| Other freight.. .. .. .. .. | 117,500 tons. |
| Passengers.. .. .. .. .. .. | 9,005 |

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. How many lockages on the Soo?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not got the number but I have given the tonnage. The traffic on the St. Lawrence cannot be judged by the traffic at the Soo because a great deal of the Soo canal traffic comes down the lakes and finds its way to Buffalo or some other ports; it cannot get through to the St. Lawrence unless we change the size of the vessels or deepen the canals.

Now, we have had considerable discussion as to the deepening of the canals and the building of new canals, and I find that up to date on the Welland canal we have expended about $31,000,000. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) the other day read a letter the contents of which I had discussed with probably the same gentleman, about the possibilities of Port Colborne for the development of Canadian traffic. At that point the government is building an elevator which will be completed for this season, I think, to the extent of about 800,000 bushels bin capacity; but it can be very much enlarged on the present plan. I am free to confess that I am at a loss to know whether it would be better for the government to control that elevator absolutely or to lease it to some company that would make it a part of a through line of transportation. I think every person will confess that government management of elevators up to the present has not been as successful as we had hoped it would be. It has been reported to me that in order to make the Port Colborne elevator a real success and the benefit which it ought to be to the carrying trade of the country, it would be wise to lease it to some company connected with through trade, because that company would find it advantageous to use the elevator not only for traffic from the west to that point, but from that point to the east.

Mr. KEMP. What elevators does the hon. gentleman refer to that the government own?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are three altogether, I think—one at Halifax, one at St. John and one at Montreal, and so far as I can learn, they are not as busily engaged as I would like to see government elevators engaged. There are reasons why it would be better to keep elevators under government control; but if they are going to be under government control and practically idle, they are not accomplishing the purpose for which they were erected. It has been supposed that the great amount of trade that goes through American channels could be diverted to Canadian channels by way of the Welland canal. An expert on this question has pointed out to me that the cost of transporting wheat from Fort William to Buffalo is 1·50 cents a bushel, and from Buffalo to New York 5·90 cents, making in all 7·40 cents a bushel. That is the rate at the present time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The winter rate?

Mr. J. D. REID. There is no rate from Fort William to Buffalo in the winter time.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend, of course, understands that the grain is stored at Buffalo, whence it is taken to New York; that is part of the transportation problem. Under the new scheme of deepening and enlarging the Erie canal, this gentleman tells me, it is proposed to make the rate 3·50 cents from Fort William or Duluth to the city of New York; that is, the rate from Buffalo to New York is to be reduced to 2 cents per bushel.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the minister mean to say that that rate has never prevailed in the Erie canal or even by rail in times gone by?

Mr. GRAHAM. It does not now, and we are trying to deal with the present situation. He also states that if we deepened and enlarged the Welland canal so that enlarged vessels could pass through it and proceed east as far as Kingston, Brockville or Prescott, an extra half-cent a bushel would carry the grain from Port Colborne to the lower port, making the total rate from Fort William to that port 2 cents a bushel; and from there to Montreal it could be carried in vessels of from 60,000 to 75,000 bushels capacity for about 1⅜ cents per bushel; a total rate from Fort William to Montreal of 3⅜ cents a bushel. That would give the Canadian route an advantage over the American route of ⅛ cent per bushel, with only one transhipment, which would be at the river port.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does my hon. friend not know that wheat has been carried from Fort William to Quebec at 4 cents and a fraction per bushel?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend can make money if he can do that at the present time. Now, if this can be accomplished, it is worth the country thinking about. That is the opinion expressed to me by a large vessel owner as well as a large shipper. To accomplish this would mean a heavy expenditure in addition to what we have already made; but the country has become accustomed to large expenditures in connection with transportation——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM—and justifiable expenditures; because anything that makes it easier to carry the products of the people to market enhances the value of those products. I would not express an opinion on this idea, but I do say that it is worthy of investigation by the government.

Mr. BENNETT. What object is to be served by the construction of an elevator or elevators at Port Colborne?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is estimated that last year 14,000,000 bushels of our grain went by way of Buffalo, and 12,000,000 bushels by way of our own ports. The elevator at Port Colborne has been built for the purpose of facilitating the transhipment of grain from larger vessels into smaller vessels which can pass through the Welland canal and down the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BENNETT. A vessel carrying 80,000 bushels can at present pass through the Welland canal and discharge her cargo at Kingston into light barges. Assuming that a vessel carrying 200,000 bushels would come to Port Colborne, and tranship there into barges that passed on to Montreal, what would be the difference in the rate between a 200,000-bushel vessel on the upper lakes and an 80,000-bushel one?—because that is the only advantage possible. At present there is not any difference.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think there would be much difference. My information is obtained from the Canadian Marine Association, with whom I discussed the matter the other day. They said they could float 6,250,000 bushels of wheat. They hope next year to be able to float nearly 7,000,000 bushels. That is they hope to have vessels of the capacity to carry that many bushels at one time. If all the vessels belonging to the Canadian fleet were loaded at once, there would then be 6,250,000 bushels of wheat afloat.

Mr. BENNETT. What has that to do with the question of moving the grain more cheaply? The American vessels can still ply in the trade between Port Arthur and Buffalo; that is not against the coasting laws.

Mr. GRAHAM. My argument was, repeating the argument given to me, that if we wanted to secure cheaper transportation of grain we would have to send the grain through the Welland canal without transhipment. At present we have an elevator at Port Colborne and if the canal is enlarged this elevator will not be of so much use as it is now; but until the canal is enlarged it is to the interest of the Canadian trade to have these transhipping facilities at Port Colborne.

Mr. FOSTER. At what time is it hoped to have the elevator at Port Colborne ready for work?

Mr. GRAHAM. We expect to have it ready at the beginning of this season for 850,000 bushels bin capacity. It will require enlarging and we have the plans for enlarging it completed.

With reference to the Trent Valley canal, the government has had in mind that where it is possible to do so without making a

much larger expenditure the water powers along the route should be developed. There are on the Trent Valley canal possibilities for the development of a great deal of water power that hitherto has not been used to its fullest extent. The building of the canal will increase that water power and the government desires, wherever it can do so without too great an expenditure, to assist to develop that water power so that it will be available for the use of people living along the line, and others. Of course, where this development will cost too much money, I imagine the prime object of the canal, that of transportation, will be adhered to; but where power development can be assisted for instance by slight alteration of a plan, I think it is in the interest of the whole people that the water power should be developed.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And controlled properly.

Mr. GRAHAM. And controlled properly under a policy I imagine that will have to be enunciated later.

Mr. PORTER. In developing the Trent Valley canal will the rights of municipalities and riparian owners be respected, or will the power be taken over entirely by the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. These cases will all have to be considered; there are so many different cases, we have several before the department to-day. So far as possible, the government must respect the rights of all parties, and I think that in nearly every case it is not impossible to do that.

It may be of interest to the House, in connection with this department, to place on 'Hansard' a few details of the progress of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Much of what I have to say has been published in the report but the statement which I am to present may contain some things of a later date; my information is up to December 1. Although this may not be directly connected with the department as the Intercolonial is, it may be of interest to the House and to the country. In detail my information as to the different sections, starting at Winnipeg where the Grand Trunk Pacific Company's work begins, is this:

Grading, culverts and wooden bridges.

From 0 to 13th mile. No grading has been done; the work is very light, merely surfacing.

From 13th to 650th mile. The grading is practically completed, merely a few narrow cuttings remaining to be widened, and a few embankments not yet fully brought up to grade level, to be completed. The culverts and wooden structures are about completed.

From 650th to 796th mile (Edmonton). Considerable grading has been done in patches, aggregating about 54 miles. There, however, yet remain about 1,750,000 cubic yards of excavation to be done to complete the grading. A large proportion of the culverts are built and the pile foundations of about 75 per cent of the bridges are driven.

Steel bridges.

At 45th mile. The Assiniboine river is to be crossed by a steel bridge 415 feet long, 34 feet high. One span of 255 feet and two spans of 80 feet each. The concrete piers are in course of construction, one having been completed and 3 others being worked upon, but not far advanced beyond the excavation of foundation which is completed.

At 469th mile. The south Saskatchewan river is crossed by a steel bridge 1,497 feet in length and 74 feet high; of 1 span 50 feet, 1 of 127 feet, 1 of 175 feet and 5 of 229 feet. The concrete piers and abutments are completed, and the steel superstructure is delivered at the site of the structure. Two spans are erected and the work of erection is being continued.

At 675th mile. The Battle river is to be crossed by a steel bridge 2,770 feet long and 180 high. The work is in progress on the concrete piers, pedestals and abutments, of which there will be 2 piers, 100 pedestals and 2 abutments. Many of the foundations are excavated, but concreting may be said to have only just been commenced. Work is still in progress, the piers, &c., being housed in and kept warm during the building up of the concrete.

At 787th mile. The North Saskatchewan river is to be crossed by a steel bridge 1,647 feet long 136 feet high; of 4 spans 40 feet, 10 of 50 feet, 2 of 150 feet, 3 of 229 feet. The 28 concrete pedestal, 2 abutments and 2 of the piers are completed. The work of building the last remaining two concrete piers is in progress; they are housed in and kept warm during the progress of the work.

In addition to the steel bridges mentioned, there is the bridge over the Assiniboine river at St. Lazare—at the 203rd mile—250 feet in length, which is being crossed by a temporary timber structure.

Track-laying.

The track is laid from the 45th mile to the 326th mile, and from the 426th mile to the 468th mile, aggregating 310 miles; in addition to which 47 sidings are laid in.

Ballasting.

From the 53rd mile to 140th mile. The road is full ballasted and lifted.

From the 140th mile to 213th mile. It is half ballasted with a first lift.

Station buildings.

At the 43rd mile (Portage la Prairie) a union station-house of brick is in course of erection, and is nearing completion.

At the 141st mile (Rivers) a station-house is in course of erection.

At the 385th mile (Nokomis) a station-house has been erected.

Engine-houses and machine shops.

At the 141st mile (Rivers divisional station) an engine-house and machine shop and boiler-house are in course of erection; the work is advanced to the extent of about 90 per cent.

At the 277th mile (Melville divisional station) an engine-house and machine shop are in course of erection; about 35 per cent of the work is executed.

Water tanks

At the 141st mile (Rivers divisional station) a well and water tank are being provided; about 86 per cent of the work has been executed.

At the 202nd mile a water tank and pump house are erected.

At the 217th mile a water tank is under construction; about 25 per cent of the work is done.

Fencing.

Forty-six miles of fencing has been built west of Portage la Prairie.

Telegraph line.

From the 5th mile to 276th mile the telegraph line is erected, being a length of 271 miles.

Of course there is no construction west of Edmonton except a wharf at Prince Rupert.

The figures in connection with the Yellowhead Pass may prove interesting. The Yellowhead Pass is a better pass in every way than any other except so far as the curvature is concerned. The grades are less but the curvature is a little greater. But the cost is considerably less, and we are interested in the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific in the mountain section, on account of the guarantee given by the government.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister speaks of the Yellowhead Pass route?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have spoken of that, but I may mention the others now. The estimated cost of the Yellowhead Pass route, exclusive of terminals, is $42,115,500 being less than the estimated cost of the Pine River Pass route by $4,536,100.

Mr. FOSTER. These estimates are for what mileage?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the Pine River route be longer or shorter?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it is a little longer. The estimated cost of the Yellowhead Pass route is less than that of the Wapiti route by $3,490,000, and less than the Peace River route by $6,251,000. So it will be seen that the Yellowhead Pass route appears to be cheaper as well as better.

Mr. HAGGART. Is that the one they have adopted?

Mr. GRAHAM. Practically adopted.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why is it better?

Mr. GRAHAM. I believe it is better in grade. The only thing in which it is inferior is in the degree of curvature necessary, but in other ways it is superior.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Is it better in grade than the Pine River route?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister be good enough to tell us the mileage from Edmonton to the ocean?

Mr. GRAHAM. From Edmonton to Prince Rupert is 955 miles. Now, I have dealt with the part of the transcontinental highway that is being constructed by the company. The part that we are most immediately interested in is the part that is being constructed under the Transcontinental Railway Commission.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister tell us at what time it is expected that the road from Winnipeg to Edmonton will be finished?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not that information at present. The length of the government section, the Transcontinental, from Moncton to Winnipeg, is 1,807 miles. With the permission of the House, I will read a statement from the commission, giving some later information than is given in the report as to the progress of the work:

The location of the line is practically completed, with the exception of about three or four miles at the entrance to the Winnipeg terminals, and a few points where revision may be made of the present location to reduce grades, distances or work. Contracts for construction have already been awarded covering in all, say, 859 miles as follows: 119 miles in New Brunswick; 150 miles east, and 195 miles west of the St. Lawrence river, and 78 miles easterly from the Ontario boundary in the province of Quebec; 72 miles from the Quebec boundary westerly, and 158 miles from the Manitoba boundary easterly in the province of Ontario; 87 miles in the province of Manitoba.

Mileage of grading done on the contracts already let in the various provinces is approximately as follows:

| | Miles. |
|---|---|
| New Brunswick.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 16 |
| Quebec (east of the St. Lawrence river) | 41 |
| Quebec (west of the St. Lawrence river) | 101 |
| In western Ontario and Manitoba.. .. | 171 |

The mileage of track laid is approximately as follows:

| | Miles. |
|---|---|
| In New Brunswick.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | ¾ |
| In Quebec (west of the St. Lawrence river).. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 34 |
| In Manitoba.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 49 |

The necessary rails and fastenings covering the contracts already let have all been contracted for and a large proportion of them delivered. The ties for the 150 miles west of the St. Lawrence river, and 245 miles easterly from near Winnipeg have also been contracted for, and large deliveries have been made on same. The ties for the other contracts already let are included in the contracts for grading.

Contracts for steel bridges required on the 150 miles westerly and 50 miles easterly from the St. Lawrence river and 245 miles easterly from near Winnipeg are all entered into, and considerable progress is being made in their manufacture and erection.

Tenders are now being advertised for the following contracts: New Brunswick, from Chipman to——

These will be receivable in a very few days.

| | Miles. | Miles. |
|---|---|---|
| New Brunswick— | | |
| From Chipman to near Intercolonial Railway.. .. .. .. | 40 | |
| From near Intercolonial Railway crossing to near Tobique river.. .. .. .. .. .. | 67 | |
| From Tobique river to near Grand Falls.. .. .. .. .. | 21 | |
| | | 136 |
| Quebec— | | |
| From the New Brunswick boundary westerly.. .. .. | 52 | |
| | | 52 |
| Ontario— | | |
| From 8 miles west of the Abitibi river crossing westerly.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 100 | |
| From a point 19½ miles westerly from the crossing of Mud river easterly.. .. .. | 75 | |
| | | 175 |
| Total.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | | 365 |

The letting of contracts for the three portions in New Brunswick and the 52 miles in eastern Quebec will make the work continuous from Moncton to Weymontachene, a distance of, say, 654 miles. The total length of the line from Moncton to Winnipeg being about 1,807 miles.

The only lamentable part of the Transcontinental, so far as the government is concerned, was the appalling calamity of the fall of the Quebec bridge. The discussion of that subject will come up later on the report. I mention it so that it cannot be said that I omitted it. The saddest feature of that calamity was the loss of life. Canada is big enough to replace the bridge and rich enough to stand the expenditure if we must; but we cannot replace the lost lives or heal the broken hearts. For these we can but express sorrow. In due course, the policy of the government on the building of the bridge will be brought down. For, whatever our differences may be, this much will be known to the world—that Canada, though a young country, is able to complete what Canada has begun. Whatever our differences may be on the subject, we will all agree that the Quebec bridge must be reconstructed and reconstructed on safe and permanent lines.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the hon. minister a statement showing the total number of miles under contract east of Winnipeg and the estimated cost when completed ?

Mr GRAHAM. I regret that I have not those figures with me. I will be able to give that detail when we go into the estimates. I had not intended to go more into detail at this time than seems absolutely necessary.

Another very important part of the work of the Department of Railways and Canals is the Railway Commission. We have discussed that in the House recently. In the death of the chairman of that commission, Canada sustains a national loss. The late Hon. A. C. Killam was a man who not only was capable of a great amount of work, but he had the ability to perform that work well; and he had the approachableness that made it easy for every person, even the humblest citizen of the Dominion, to do business with the Railway Commission. It will be very hard to replace Judge Killam as chairman of the Railway Commission. The Railway Commission of Canada has done good work and important work, and we expect that it will continue. In the selection of this commission and giving to it of such wide powers, Canada, I think, took a step in advance of any country in the world. I think I am safe in saying that the powers given to the Board of Railway Commissioners of the Dominion of Canada are wider than those given to any similar board under any government in existence.

We expect to reap great benefit from that commission. Canada has already derived great benefits from its work. Of course, we cannot accomplish the purpose which we set out to accomplish without taking some time. This is something it will take years to fully accomplish. For years we had been without a railway commission, and had been doing business in other ways. A great deal of the business difficulties between the railways and the public came before the courts; some of them were dealt with by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. We have established a new, a more speedy, a more approachable and practical medium than the courts could possibly give. But, of course, it will take some time for the public and the railway, telephone, telegraph and express companies to adjust themselves to the new conditions. But I am warranted in saying that the Railway Commission has already accomplished a great deal for the people, and I trust that in the future, with the increase of its members and the enlargement of its powers, greater good will be accomplished. With regard to the work accomplished, I might cite a few figures :

During 1904 there were 705 applications.
During 1907 there were 2,600 applications.
During 1904 there we 3,375 communications filed.
During 1907 there were 18,984 communications filed.
During 1904 (11 months) 3,803 communications sent out.
During 1907 there were 18,311 communications sent out.
During 1904 there were 304 orders issued.
During 1907 there were 1,816 orders issued.
During 1904 there were 7 public sittings.
During 1907 there were 66 public sittings.
During 1904 there were 136 applications heard.
During 1907 there were 321 applications heard.

These figures speak for themselves as to the increase of the work and the apprecia-

tion by the public of the work being done. But these figures do not at all give the complete work done by that commission. In scores and scores of what we might call petty grievances, hearings have been given single individuals. These are not put down at all in the record of hearings. There is just a little record of the complaint and of its having been straightened out without any notice being given. And in this connection the loss of Judge Killam will be greatly felt, because he had the capacity, the ability and the suave manner of settling difficulties among people with the least possible friction.

It would not be out of place for me to put on record some concrete examples as given by Dr. Mills, another member of the commission, showing what has been accomplished in dollars and cents. He gives these illustrations in orders delivered in Ottawa during the month of January of reductions in rates consequent upon orders of the commission:

Fruit, reductions from a single station, St. Catharines, Ont., to Montreal, on pears, $45 per car; on staple tender fruits $21 per car; on apples, pears, &c., to Winnipeg, $54 per car; to Brandon, $72 per car; and on pears and standard tender fruits to other points, east and west, in like proportion; glass bottles, Wallaceburg to Toronto, $15 per car, and to Hamilton $18 per car; cooperage stock, Chatham and Wallaceburg to Montreal (local and export), $4 per car; split peas, Toronto to St. John, N.B. (export), $9 per car; cattle, Windsor and Sarnia to Montreal, $4.50 per car; metallic shingles, Toronto to Winnipeg, $30 per car, and to Strathcona, Alberta, $123 per car; grain, shipments between local points (reduced to same rate as flour), say, Thamesville, Ont., to Montreal, $24 per car; grain for export, from Windsor to Montreal, $6 per car, from Owen Sound, $7.50 per car, from Guelph, $9 per car, and from Toronto, $6 per car; beans, Chatham to St. John, $16.50 per car; packing house products, Toronto to Montreal (export), $3 per car; wall paper, Toronto to Montreal, $15 per car; all transcontinental traffic, eastern Canada to British Columbia terminals, $15 per car; also a readjustment of rates from distributing centres west of Montreal, so as to place them on a fair basis, and a general overhauling of the rates from Ontario points eastbound, reducing and readjusting them so as to abolish the discrimination which has hitherto existed in favour of Detroit, Port Huron and other points in Michigan, as compared with Windsor, Sarnia, Chatham, and other points in western Ontario. The order providing for these far-reaching and very important readjustments has made extensive reductions in all rates from points in western Ontario to Montreal, Ottawa and other points east as far as St. John, Halifax and Sydney; for example, Windsor to Montreal. $26 per car; St. Catharines to Montreal, $30 per car; St. Thomas to Quebec, $54 per car, and so on.

I give these as a few examples of some of the practical work done by the commission. Canada has taken a wider departure than any country in the world in the powers she has given this commission. The benefits we have received have been great, and we expect to have still greater benefits in the future. A branch of the department over which I have the honour to preside, which has attracted perhaps as much attention as any other, is that known as the statistical branch. It has been entirely reorganized, and for many days after the issuing of its report I received very flattering communications concerning the contents of that report. And the press of Canada which takes any interest in the question of transportation—as nearly all the papers do—invariably had a kind word to say for the very valuable information contained in the reports. Anybody who desires to study the transportation question and make comparisons has only to study that report and he will get information which has never before been compiled in Canada, and which could only be collated under the system adopted by the Railway Department. The gentleman in charge, Mr. Payne, has done his work well; and when a man performs a work of that kind and the press speaks so highly of it, it is only fair to recognize his work, on an occasion of this kind. I have given a good many figures from that report, and shall not detain the House with many more. Last year the railways of Canada carried 32,137,319 passengers and 63,866,135 tons of freight. The people depending on transportation facilities of the Dominion for a living are at least one-sixth of our population, so that when we are doing anything to enlarge our transportation facilities and extend our railways in a legitimate way, we are doing something that will assist the people in obtaining employment and giving them employment such as they would not have but for these facilities. In discussing what has to be done for the control of rates and transportation generally, while being fair to the public at large, we must not forget that a large proportion of our population is to-day dependent upon the great transportation companies for its livelihood.

The Prince Edward Island Railway is one in which a great deal of interest has been taken in this House. I made a statement the other day concerning the expenditures in that province. I may say to my hon. friends, who discussed this matter so thoroughly the other day, that Prince Edward Island is not at all forgotten in the transportation problem of this country. Governments may be slow. They move by steady, easy stages. This government has moved more rapidly than any other in the expenditure of money on Prince Edward Island. Perhaps, however, more is needed. Perhaps the railway facilities ought to be extended. I am prepared to discuss that with my hon. friend at any time, either privately or publicly, because, after all, what we all aim at, I think, on both sides of this House, is to do everything possible, con-

sistent with the finances of the country, to make Canada a better country to live in and to attract people who do not now live here to our shores.

Mr. LENNOX. What about the tunnel?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend raises a contentious question in a clear matter of business.

Mr. LENNOX. It is a live question all the same.

Mr. GRAHAM. Now, Sir, my observations to-day lie more directly in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. I want to discuss that problem, not as a maritime question, not as a line of railway, that interests only a few people but as a question which affects the country at large. Every man from Vancouver to Halifax is a part owner of the Intercolonial Railway, and I want to discuss it as a national undertaking or as a national asset, and I will try to do it fairly. I will give a few figures concerning the Intercolonial Railway at the present time.

Last year my predecessor placed before the House a full and exhaustive comparison of the rates, regular and special, passenger and freight, in force on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway, as with those in force on the Grand Trunk, Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern. I do not propose to repeat them. The rates as shown still remain true. The past fiscal year was a short one, nine months, and ended on the 31st March. The comparisons set out in the report of the department are, therefore, not on the old basis of the statistical year. It is, however, the intention of the department to keep up the statistical year comparisons, and they will be reported in the railway statistics in common with all other railways.

During the past fiscal year on the Intercolonial Railway: Freight train miles aggregated 3,036,013, as compared with 3,149,173 in the preceding fiscal year for the like period, a decrease of 113,160 train miles.

Freight car miles, loaded and empty in 1907, 52,698,113; in 1906, they were 58,047,469; a decrease of 5,349,356.

In 1907 the tons one mile were 663,215,240; and in 1906, 617,555,908; an increase of 45,659,332. In other words, with less train miles and less car miles we increased our ton miles; a marked improvement.

In 1907 we had 17·35 cars per freight train, in 1906, 18·43; a decrease of 1·08 cars per train.

The tons per car, all cars, in 1907 were 12·58, in 1906, 10·63; an increase of 1·95.

As every person who has studied this question readily understands, the more tons we can move with the least number of trains and cars the greater chance there is of at least keeping even on a government owned road. In this respect the Intercolonial Railway seems to make a little gain each year. It does not pay to haul over the country empty cars or partially empty cars and the fuller we can make these cars, the greater the number of tons we can get into them the better it is for the railway.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the minister the figures showing what it costs to move a ton per mile now as compared with what it cost last year?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not sure that I can make that comparison. I will give a little later on what it costs per ton for this year but I am not sure whether I can make the comparison for last year.

Mr. HAGGART. Last year it cost $1.02 per mile to run a locomotive. If the earnings were about equal to the cost, the cost was about $1.02 or $2 per ton mile. There is no comparison of those figures in the statistics.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I will call attention to that fact because we want to make it an absolute record so that we can compare the figures from year to year without any difficulty.

The tons per car of loaded cars were, in 1907, 14·52, and in 1906, 12·26; or an increase of 2·26 tons per loaded car; a marked improvement. In 1907 we had a passenger train mileage of 2,033,562, and in 1906 of 2,076,444; a decrease of 42,882 miles.

| | Passenger miles. |
|---|---|
| The passengers one mile in 1907.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 111,876,186 |
| The passengers one mile in 1906.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 100,177,932 |
| An increase of.. .. .. .. .. .. | 11,698,254 |

A marked improvement for the better.

The average receipts per ton per mile, all traffic, on the Intercolonial Railway were, for the year, 1907, in cents, ·0059, or approximately six mills per ton mile. For the preceeding year the amount was ·00588, a slight increase: viz: ·00002 cents.

The average receipts per passenger mile for the year 1907 were 1·745 cents, and for the year 1906, 1·768; a slight decrease. On the whole, the average is about 1¾ cents per passenger mile.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What about the other systems of railways?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Intercolonial is a trifle lower than any other road in the Dominion of Canada.

The gross receipts for the fiscal year, nine months, were:

| | |
|---|---|
| Passenger earnings.. .. .. .. | $1,952,438 88 |
| Freight earnings.. .. .. .. .. | 4,032,745 00 |
| Mail and express.. .. .. .. | 235,039 88 |
| Miscellaneous.. .. .. .. .. .. | 28,087 24 |
| Total.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 6,248,311 00 |
| Expenditure— | |
| Maintenance of way and structures.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $1,111,888 68 |
| Maintenance of equipment .. | 1,180,521 16 |
| Conducting transportation .. | 3,485,224 83 |
| General expenses .. .. .. .. .. | 147,537 16 |
| Rental of leased lines.. .. .. | 105,000 00 |
| | 6,030,171 83 |

Balance, surplus, $218,139.17.

At the end of the statistical year, June 30, 1907:

| | |
|---|---|
| The gross earnings were.. .. | $8,599,119 03 |
| The gross expenses were.. .. | 8,202,064 12 |
| Surplus of earnings over expenses.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 397,054 91 |

Gross receipts—

| 1906. | 1907. | Increase. |
|---|---|---|
| $5,586,155 21 | $6,248,311 00 | $662,155 79 |

Working expenses—

| 1906. | 1907. | Increase. |
|---|---|---|
| $5,650,923 90 | $5,925,321 83 | $274,397 93 |

Expenditure on capital account for nine months, $1,506,248.26.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question in reference to passenger transportation? My hon. friend says that the average is 1¾ cents per mile. Does he make a charge for free transportation or take free transportation into consideration at all?

Mr. GRAHAM. All returns are made on the basis of all passengers carried and all receipts from passengers and the average of 1¾ cents would cover the free transportation. That is the way all the roads make their returns.

Mr. MARTIN (Queens). How does the Intercolonial Railway rate of 1¾ cents compare with the rate on the Prince Edward Island Railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. I regret I have not that information, but if my hon. friend figures it out as this is figured out perhaps there would not be so much difference.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). Will the minister give us later the information with regard to the Prince Edward Island Railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think my hon. friend will find it in the statistical report, but if not I will endeavour to get it. Now, I find that at the end of the statistical year, which is June 30, 1907, the gross earnings were $8,599,119.03 and the gross expenses $8,202,-064.12, showing a surplus of earnings over expenses for the 12 months of $397,054.91.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the expenditure on capital account for the whole year?

Mr. GRAHAM. For the 9 months it was $1,506,248.26; I have not got it for the whole year. I might say that I have carried this statement a little later than the 30th June and I find that up to the end of December, 1907, the gross earnings were $7,169,469.36 and the gross expenses $6,790,444.95, leaving a balance of $379,024.44. I want to sound this note. I want to be perfectly candid with the House and I therefore state that December and January have been very bad months on the Intercolonial as on other railways. The financial stringency has interfered with the business of all railroads to quite a large extent, and instead of having other railways using our cars and giving us a return of $12,000 or $15,000 a month a good many of our cars are lying on the sidings unused, just the same as are 350,000 cars in the United States. Then, the adverse conditions have been intensified by reason of the heavy storms necessitating increased expenditure to operate the road. Cold weather makes it more difficult to run a railway, and in severe storms the rolling stock has to be employed fighting snow drifts instead of hauling freight.

Mr. LEFURGEY. This is the mildest winter they have had for years in the maritime provinces.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. There was a snow storm in New Brunswick the day before yesterday.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is trying to be facetious, but this is a dry subject and I refuse to have anything spicy introduced into it. Now, while we have quite a respectable surplus on the Intercolonial at the present time I frankly state that when the end of the fiscal year comes on March 31, I do not think there will be as large a balance to the credit of the Intercolonial as there was at the end of December, owing to the conditions I have mentioned. But the Intercolonial Railway is not alone in this; all the railways in the United States and in Canada have had the same experience. It is no reflection of course on the Intercolonial or its management that it should be compelled to face the same conditions that every railway in America has to cope with.

I would like to speak with regard to the employees of the Intercolonial Railway. I am not going out of my way to praise them when I say that in whatever transactions I have had with the employees of the Intercolonial Railway, I have come to the conclusion that they are as fine a body of men as will be found in the service of any railway in Canada. I cannot agree with the suggestion that the men who work on the Intercolonial—I care not what their politics may be—are not as good as the men working on any other railway. I believe they give to the Intercolonial Railway as good service as the employees of the Grand Trunk give the Grand Trunk, or as

the employees of the Canadian Pacific Railway give that great corporation. I believe that if you go carefully into the facts you will find that man for man the staff of the Intercolonial gives as good value to the Intercolonial Railway day after day for the remuneration they receive as do the employees of any other railroad to their employers. It may be interesting to the House to know the total number of employees on the Intercolonial Railway is 8,291, distributed as follows:

Number of employees on the Intercolonial Railway.

| | |
|---|---|
| Maintenance of way, structures.. .. | 2,077 |
| Maintenance, equipment.. .. .... | 2,332 |
| Conducting transportation.. .. .. | 3,342 |
| General administration.. .. .. .. .. | 540 |
| Total.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 8,291 |

It has been said that politics enter into the management of the Intercolonial Railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course it was only in a joke that was said but it has been said. Let me point out that 63 per cent of the employees of the Intercolonial Railway are members of unions and their advancement is in the hands of the unions and cannot be meddled with by any political party. They are subject to the laws of the union, they get their promotion and their increase of pay as the union laws direct, if the men be competent. And, the manager himself does not interfere with that arrangement with the unions. Every one knows what would happen if that arrangement was not carried out. We have the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Firemen, the Brotherhood of Trainmen, the Brotherhood of Railway Telegraphers, all these men have their organizations, and these matters are regulated under arrangement made by the organizations with the management of the railway, and the promotions of the men are made according to the rules of the union, the men being qualified, and no political influence can interfere with this arrangement by which 63 per cent of the employees are controlled. It may be said: But why do you employ men belonging to these unions. I have been approached on this matter by several men who have said to me: You are allowing the Intercolonial to be run by unions. I say no. This is the age of organization and the employees of the Intercolonial Railway or of any other railway have as much right to form a combination for the protection of their own interests as has the Manufacturers' Association or any other organization.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who disputes that?

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend had listened to me he would have heard me state that I have been asked why I allow the unions to control the Intercolonial Railway. The unions may make mistakes; they do; sometimes they are unreasonable; sometimes other people are unreasonable as well as trades unions. Sometimes they ask for things that I think they should not have, and they do not get them if I can prevent it if I think they are unreasonable. But take them all in all the labour organizations so far as the Intercolonial Railway is concerned have not been unreasonable. When I have met their officials or representatives in any capacity whatever, they have sat down and reasoned things out with me in a very intelligent manner, and up to date we have been able to come to conclusions with perhaps a little give and take on both sides, and always these conclusions have been in the interests of the proper running of the road. I have come to the conclusion that the presence of labour organizations such as I have mentioned is a benefit to the management of the road rather than a detriment. I think this is an answer to some critics who have suggested that the Intercolonial, being a government road, should not recognize labour unions. While it is a government road it has to be run on these lines like any other road.

For the employees there has been established what is known as a Provident Fund, which I think is better, in the interests of the men, than any of the funds connected with the other roads. The Grand Trunk has adopted a new system, which is a great improvement on the former condition and approximates very closely to that of the Intercolonial. Under this system the employees, at their own request, in order to have the right of assisting in the government and management of the fund, contribute a certain amount per year, and the government contributes a share not exceeding $100,000 a year. This fund has brought about an improved feeling among the employees, and between them and the management of the road. On the cold principle of dollars and cents, the railway does not lose anything by the establishment of this provident fund. A government cannot and a private company ought not to dismiss men, who, after many years of faithful service, have reached an age when they are unfit to take up employment in another walk of life. The establishment of this Provident Fund enables us to do two things—to look after men who have been in the service of the government for many years in a way that is creditable to us, to put in younger men who can perhaps perform the duties with more enthusiasm and zeal than the older men, and also to abolish such positions occupied by older men as can be abolished without injury to the service. The fund is administered by the minister through a board, consisting of five persons; one of whom is the general manager

of government railway, two are appointed from time to time by the minister from among the chief officers of the railways, and the remaining two are elected by the employees contributing to the fund. The present members of the board are: David Pottinger, general manager, government railways, chairman; W. A. Dubé, superintendent, Lévis, appointed by the minister; T. C. Burpee, engineer of maintenance, Moncton, appointed by the minister; J. W. Nairn, locomotive engineer, Truro, elected by the employees; John Stewart, locomotive engineer, Moncton, elected by the employees.

The employees who receive the benefits of this Act are divided into five classes:

Class A.—Those who have attained the age of 70 years after being fifteen years in the service.

Class B.—Those who after being fifteen years in the service become physically or mentally incapacitated from following their usual occupation in the service.

Class C.—Those who have attained the age of sixty years after being fifteen years in the service, and request to be retired from the service.

Class D.—Those who are permanently disabled from following their usual occupation in the service, as the result of injuries received while on duty and actually at work in the service.

Class E.—Those who previous to the coming into force of this Act, entered the service at such an advanced age as to cause them to reach the age of seventy years before being fifteen years in the service; provided that on attaining the age of seventy years they have been at least ten years in the service.

The monthly allowance paid to persons who retire, and are placed upon this fund is 1½ per cent of the average monthly pay received for the eight years immediately preceding their retirement for each year of their service, and the amount so ascertained is paid monthly to the retired employee during the remainder of his life.

Men who lose their employment owing to inability to perform the service are provided for, and there are other provisions for the protection of the men. To show how the system works, let us take the case of a man who for the last eight years, or 96 months previous to his retirement, had earned $5,425, or an average of $56.51 a month. The time of his service is say forty years. At 1½ per cent for each year of service, he would receive 60 per cent of $56.51, which would give him a monthly allowance of $33.90; and under the provisions of this fund no man can receive less than $20 a month. Hon. gentlemen will see that this is a humane method of looking after the older employees of the Intercolonial, and one worthy of the government, and I am surprised that it was not established long before it was.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is there an age limit at which a man may enter the service and come under the fund?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed that the age is 35 years; but the fund is made pretty liberal to men already in the service. I may say that the monthly allowances now amount to $3,292.40, and 128 employees have taken advantage of the terms of the provident fund, and have been retired.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the hon. gentleman give the amounts an employee would have to pay into the fund?

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend will defer that question, I will answer it at another time.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister give figures showing the result of what has been done so far—how many have been retired, how many offices have been saved, and the wages and retiring allowances at present as compared with the wages before? That would be instructive if the minister would make a note of it and give the information later.

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall be glad to hunt that information up. I may say that the average per month paid to those who have been superannuated is at present $26.

Now, I come to a question which is perhaps more difficult to deal with, that is the question of the definition of capital as distinct from revenue or current account. I think it is fair to say that in England, speaking broadly, everything that is for betterment is charged to capital account, while the expenditure to keep the original investment intact is charged to revenue. On this continent, from the investigation which I have been able to make, I have come to the conclusion that there is no cast-iron rule. The directors usually own a great portion of the stock and in a good year, when there might be big dividends for the shareholders, the directors are inclined to expend large portions of the revenue on services which might possibly be charged to capital. This serves two purposes, it greatly improves the road, of which they are the chief owners, and preserves the large revenue for the directors rather than dispersing it in dividends to the shareholders. When the year is leaner, the directors of roads on this continent are inclined to infringe a little on capital account and spend out of it money that might well be taken out of revenue. On the Intercolonial there has been an effort, during the last few years at least, to place the road on a business basis, so far as the balance between revenue and capital account is concerned; and if possible to follow closely the English practice of taking what is for the betterment of the road from capital account and what is for the maintaining of the original investment in the road from the revenue account. The Cana-

dian roads have been fairly successful in their management, but those who have studied the American roads will agree, I think, that owing to many vicissitudes about 70 per cent of the American roads have, at some time in their history, passed through the hands of a receiver.

Mr. FOSTER. A number of years ago.

Mr. GRAHAM. At some time in their history.

Some hon. MEMBERS. And some now.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And will again, lots of them.

Mr. GRAHAM. Possibly. We in Canada are going along safer lines, but I am trying to show the consequence of the absence of a fixed principle as to the charging of expenditure to capital or revenue account. The equipment of a road to-day is not what it was even ten years ago. The ex-minister will agree with me in that. The trend to-day in ships is to build them larger so that they can carry more traffic in one trip—fewer trips and more traffic. The trend on the railway is the same; small cars are being displaced as rapidly as possible by large cars; small locomotives are being replaced as quickly as they wear out, and sometimes before that, by locomotives of the Mogul standard, of very large hauling capacity, in order not only to keep up with the traffic of the country but also to keep the haulage rates so that the public will have the advantage of the cheapest transportation. Cars, locomotives and trains are being enlarged. This has necessitated, as a direct result, the improving of road beds, the building of new bridges. Wooden structures that would carry the lighter train loads of a few years ago, have had to be replaced by steel structures and 80 or 90-pound rails have taken the place of light rails. Where the ballasting was not of a sufficiently high standard to make a perfectly solid road it has had to be changed and improved. Grades have been reduced; the Intercolonial if it is to keep up to the standard of other roads will have to invest money in cutting down the grades from Moncton east. The expenditure in the last few years to bring the Intercolonial up to the standard of roads that are being built now has been large; but I believe that expenditure has been warranted because if the people and parliament of Canada, who pretend to be taking such an interest in the transportation question, are not prepared to keep their own railway up to the standard of other roads, they cannot expect to be taken seriously in their attempt to do their share in solving the transportation question on the American continent. There have been large expenditures, but they have been warranted in the improving of the road.

What is the position as regards capital and revenue? Beginning last April, the opening of the financial year, the department have adopted this plan: they lay aside $25,000 per month from revenue account; they charged it to revenue and credit it to what you might call betterment account; and it is hoped that in a few years the revenue account will have placed to the credit of the betterment account a sufficient amount of money to pay each year all that is required for that purpose, so that there will be no more question as to the balance of expenditure between capital and revenue. That has been done this year and it is working out well, but it can be easily seen that it is a difficult task at first because the betterments have had to be so great and they will so continue for a few years—that this fund will not be sufficient to meet the demand for betterments; but it is confidently expected that in a few years these two accounts will balance one another. Then, for all practical purposes, the Intercolonial will be on a better basis than any other railroad on the continent so far as concerns the division of expense as between capital and revenue accounts.

But we are told that the Intercolonial Railway has cost too much per mile. I wish to make a comparison in that respect. The length of the Intercolonial Railway on April 1, 1907, was 1,448·62 miles and the expenditure on capital account $82,744,937.89; this includes all the equipment, making the average cost per mile, including equipment, $57,112.93.

The length of the Prince Edward Island Railway on April 1, 1907, was 261·3 and the expenditure, including equipment, on capital account, that is the total cost of Prince Edward Island equipped, was $7,372,099.26. The cost per mile of the Prince Edward Island Railway was thus $27,965.17. It, of course, is a narrow gauge railway and so the cost per mile is less than that of the Intercolonial Railway.

But the average cost per mile of the railways in the United States is $57,966 or about $850 a mile more than the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The enormous over-capitalization that occurred in the United States, but which did not occur in this country, must be taken into consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM. That does not affect the cost of the railways.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Oh yes, it does.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not talking about the capitalization but the actual cost of railways in the United States. The average in the United States is $57,966, while the average cost of the Intercolonial Railway, including equipment, is $57,112.93. This, I think, is very much in favour of the Intercolonial Railway, as far as the comparison of construction and equipment is concerned.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the minister mean cost of construction after the roadway is acquired ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I mean cost of everything, including the equipment.

Mr. LANCASTER. Including the land purchased to build the road ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Everything, the cost per mile.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Graham) gave a comparison between the Intercolonial and certain railways of the United States. Can he give a comparison between the Intercolonial and other Canadian railways as to cost of construction and equipment?

Mr. GRAHAM. I was looking over the figures the other day, and, while I cannot give them, the impression I got in reading them was that the Intercolonial compared very favourably indeed with other Canadian roads.

Now, I come to the question of management of the Intercolonial by a commission. I wish to approach that question in the most open way. It is a question for discussion. It is not a political question but a business question: What is the best way to manage a government railway, by commission or by the government direct? This much I will say; no matter how many commissions you appoint, the people of Canada will not allow the government to escape one iota of responsibility for the management of this government-owned road. So long as it is a government road, under government control, whether that control be direct or through a commission, no matter what government is in power, the government will be held responsible for the management. And, further, if I were going to put the Intercolonial under a commission, I would not put it under a commission of three. (Perhaps I would not put it under a commission at all, but that is another matter). If I were putting it under a commission, I would make it a commission of one man who should be held directly responsible for the management. I think that while a road is under construction, when those in charge need to consult together, perhaps a commission of three, or even of more, may be the best system : but when you come to carry out the details of management of such a road as the Intercolonial, only one man can be boss of the situation and carry on the work properly.

Mr. KEMP. That would be a manager?

Mr. GRAHAM. What's in a name? If I were to appoint a commission, I would appoint a commission of one man, not three. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) suggested that the Intercolonial should be controlled by a commission, and one reason he gave was that the Ontario government railway was being successfully managed by a commission. Mark you, I would not for the world criticise the management of the Ontario government railway. Every step forward that that government railway makes is something to the credit of the men with whom I was associated for some years, for they conceived the idea of constructing that Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway. They were not cheered on at first as they would be now. But whatever may be said by hon. members opposite, whatever they may find it in their hearts to say good, bad or indifferent about the late government of Ontario, this much at least is to the credit of that government —and their opponents themselves admit it —that in spite of the cool support given them, they did build 112 miles of railway in the province of Ontario which is now being pointed to by everybody as a great success. I take great pride in the success of the Ontario government railway, believing that when that portion of the history of the province is written, those with whom I was associated will be given credit for the work they did; and in that credit, as having worked with them, I claim my share.

Mr. TISDALE. According to that argument, the hon. gentleman ought to put the Intercolonial under a commission.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have just said that a commission of three was all right so long as a road was under construction, but that when it came to management if a commission were appointed at all, it should be a commission of one man. The government of Ontario are still conducting the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway. I say in all frankness that the Intercolonial to-day is as well managed as the Toronto and Northern Ontario. I do not think that will be gainsaid, and I think it will be the more cordially assented to the more carefully the facts are studied. That is no reflection on the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario management—quite the contrary, it is a compliment to it. No one will say that the expense of managing a road of 138 miles—a little less than one division of the Intercolonial—in a rich country, with rolling stock absolutely new, with a road absolutely new, can be compared to the expense of running a line such as the Intercolonial, a road of great length, and old enough to require continued renewals and with many old cars. The expense of properly running the Intercolonial is much more than the expense of running the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway. When the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario reaches the Grand Trunk Pacific, or when, if the original idea is carried out, the road reaches Hudson Bay ; after it has been running ten or fifteen years ; when the present rolling stock has lived its life, when the

rails are worn, when the ballasting goes wrong, when the bridges have to be replaced —then, if due allowance be made for the difference in other conditions, a comparison may fairly be made. But let me point out this further to show how misleading a comparison of mere results may be. I admit that the Intercolonial costs more per mile to run than the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario, and it must cost more. But give us the average rates on the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario, and we will not only have a surplus, but will also have a lot of money to put to betterment account and improve the condition of the road. The average net freight rate on the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario is 1:518 cents per ton mile as compared with :584 cents on the Intercolonial. In other words, the freight rate on the Ontario system is 160 per cent higher than that on the Intercolonial. If the people would stand the freight rates over the Intercolonial that are charged on the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario, its earnings would be 160 per cent higher. The passenger rate on the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario is 2·585 cents as against 1·768 on the Intercolonial, or 47 per cent higher. I submit that the Intercolonial is as well managed as the Ontario road. I want it to be distinctly understood that I am not criticising the management of the Ontario road, for I have great pride in its success and progress. Here we have a road 138 miles long, built into, perhaps, the richest mineral country in the world. It has passenger trains laden to their utmost capacity, carrying explorers, capitalists, workmen and tourists into that new country, and over the whole length of the completed road. Supplies are going in and ore is coming out. Anybody who has travelled over the two roads can see the difference between the opportunity that the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario has as a money maker as compared with the Intercolonial.

Then I come to the Intercolonial Railway itself. This railway was never built as a commercial proposition. If it had been, it would have been built straighter to start with and would have come through the state of Maine. It was built as part of the compact of confederation. The people of the maritime provinces had their natural markets elsewhere than in the Dominion, and in order to induce them to enter confederation we agreed to build this road. It was not built as a money-maker but to bring the people of the east nearer the markets of central Canada. It was also constructed to encourage inter-provincial trade by bringing the people nearer together, so that Canada might grow more prosperous and better relations be developed between the extremes of the country and the interior. I do not want to look on that road as the property of the maritime provinces. Neither do I assent to the argument, which we have had advanced, that the canals of Ontario are the property of the west. The canals perform their functions in the transportation service of the country and the Intercolonial Railway perfoms an equally important function in solving the transportation problem. Every pound of freight landed at Halifax and every passenger has to be hauled over the Intercolonial Railway. Go by the Canadian Pacific Railway to St. John if you will, still you have to run over the Intercolonial Railway before you can get out of Halifax coming westward. Every dollar saved in the haulage of freight from east to the west is a benefit to the people of Canada, even those who live as far away as Vancouver and the Yukon. Every dollar saved the people in their passenger traffic from Halifax west over the Intercolonial Railway is an advantage to all the people. We cannot benefit any part of Canada in the transportation problem without benefiting the entire people. I want to claim that I own part of the Intercolonial Railway. Every citizen owns part of it. And we all get our share of benefit from the development of that asset to its utmost capacity. Let me say to the people of the maritime provinces, the canals were not constructed for the people of Ontario but for the development of Canada as a whole, and of the traffic that goes down to St. John and Halifax, a portion goes through the canals of Ontario.

An hon. MEMBER. Very little.

Mr. GRAHAM. And if he does not go through these canals, then the freight rates that are cut down in the summer owing to the canal competition give the advantage of a reduction which would not exist if those canals had not been constructed. In discussing the transportation problem, I refuse to disassociate any part of the Dominion from any other part. We must discuss this question as a whole. What benefits the people of one part benefits the people of all the country. In endeavouring to do anything for the development of transportation, my object would be, not the advantage of the maritime provinces or the people of Ontario or the west, but the benefit of the people of Canada as a whole. That, I believe, is an object worthy of the attention of any government or any parliament, and I believe that Canada is showing itself more alive to this great question than any other country in the world. As to the future of the Intercolonial Railway, I do not want to be prophetic. I look upon it as a great national asset. It has been suggested that we should lease lines in New Brunswick and I have a report submitted to me showing what lines should be leased. Well, if I were going to lease lines in New Brunswick or anywhere else, I

would have a report made by my own officials after they had been instructed to examine into the question with the utmost care. I do not say that these other reports are not correct but they are not those of my officials ; and if I want to construct new lines, which may be necessary, I shall have my own officers report before doing anything. This much I do say, that it is worthy the attention of this government that all these questions should be investigated with the utmost care, and I am free to say that should I come across a road that I think would improve the facilities for transportation of a particular section of the country and be of great advantage, not only to that section, but to the Intercolonial itself and to Canada, I would consider the advisability of leasing or buying that line and adding it to the government system, but I would reserve the right to select lines I wanted and not take over any I did not want.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you heard of any of that kind ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have an investigation in my possession which I think might convince me that there were some lines of that kind, but would not make up my mind that they were in that particular case until I had them fully examined by competent men responsible to the Canadian government.

Mr. CROCKET. Is my hon. friend referring to a report he received from a commission appointed by the New Brunswick provincial government ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is probably from that commission but I am not sure. The investigation was undertaken by the New Brunswick government. I do not know the details as to how it was brought about. A problem opens up before us on the Intercolonial Railway. The Grand Trunk Pacific will be at Moncton and it must get to the sea-board. It must have a way to get to St. John and Halifax. How ? I do not attempt fully to answer that. It must have a way to get its traffic to these two ports, because, although I am in Ontario, I am in hearty accord with the idea of developing Canadian ports as much as possible. If the Intercolonial Railway is to take charge of the transcontinental business at Moncton, it will be necessary in the years to come that a double track be built from Moncton to Halifax and arrange for a better service to St. John, either from Moncton or from a point west of that city. If we were to double track from Moncton to Halifax, I am not sure that we would follow altogether the line of the present railroad. We have fulfilled the conditions of confederation in building the Intercolonial Railway. If I were to consider a double track from Moncton to Halifax, it might be advisable to endeavour to get around the Cobequid mountain and get a straighter line to Halifax with less grade than we have at present. It is necessary, in order to carry the traffic that will go east, that we should get the grades as low as possible and, Sir, if we can get around the mountain——

Mr. HAGGART. Get it out of the way.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well we have removed larger mountains than that. For the traffic from the west, or the portion of it that goes to Halifax, the grades will have to be reduced. We cannot afford to have too many pusher grades upon that line. We cannot afford to have grades of one per cent. The highest grade we can have is four-tenths of one per cent in order to carry heavy loads at a profit. To make that line profitable to the people who provide the traffic and to the Dominion of Canada the grades have to be reduced to at least four-tenths of one per cent. If that can be accomplished from Moncton to Halifax by going around the mountain it would be in the interests of the Intercolonial Railway. I have detained the House too long. I have endeavoured to look at this question from a national standpoint rather than from the standpoint of any section. The Intercolonial Railway is a great national asset in the management and results of which every man in Canada is interested. Every man in Canada has an interest in the part which the Intercolonial Railway plays as a regulator in carrying the produce of the east to the west and of the west to the east. If that be an object worthy of the attention of the House I ask it, when matters come up affecting the Intercolonial Railway, to consider it from a double standpoint, first, from the standpoint of carrying out the pledge which was given to the maritime provinces at the time of confederation, not as a commercial venture, and, from the second standpoint, that the Intercolonial Railway is a great part of the transportation service of this country.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). The Minister of Railways stated that it was impossible for him to be acquainted with the details of his department during his short term of office, and I can quite understand that he might be there for a number of years before he would be fully cognizant of all the details of that large department. But no one expects him to be. No one expects that the minister of that department should know all the minutiae of its workings, or to be like the celebrated King of Prussia who was said to know the number of buttons on every private soldier's coat. All that is expected from the minister is that he should have a knowledge of the general affairs of his department and that he should be able to see that his instructions are carried out by his

officers. I followed the minister, in what I was going to call his peregrinations over the different subjects he touched on. He first described the beautiful scenery of the Rideau canal, and I agree with him that along its banks is to be found the most delightful scenery in all Canada. I was glad to hear from him that the receipts from the canal were increasing especially as it is connected with that celebrated canal with which the Prime Minister is so well acquainted, the Tay canal, which enters the Rideau canal. The great Corsican wrote in his will: Je veux que mes cendres reposent au milieu du peuple français que j'ai tant aimé, and so, one of the dearest wishes of my heart is that my ashes shall repose on the banks of that canal amidst the people whom I have loved, and who have so long trusted me. The minister spoke of the Trent canal and I believe the Trent canal is an undertaking which will be of immense advantage to the section of the country through which it runs. These little canals as they have been called, traversing different sections of our country are of immense benefit to the people who live near them because they afford them the very cheapest means of transportation. The hon. gentleman dealt lightly with the Sault St. Marie canal, and I would remind him that through that canal passes a traffic greater than passes any waterway in the world. There are more ships going through that canal in a year than enter the great port of London, England. Fancy a traffic of 58,217,214 tons passing eastward and westward through the St. Marie canal and remember that this traffic is increasing every year to the extent of 7,000,000 tons. The traffic of the Soo canal is four times greater than that of the Suez canal and it is greater than it will be possible to send through the Panama canal when it is constructed. The question of transportation is vital to this country. Canada is placed in a geographical position which enables her to take control of the transportation of the American continent, and as the control of the transportation of the continent will enable us to control the destiny of the continent it should be the object of every true Canadian to take advantage of the position which nature has placed us in. I have already treated of what I think is the best way to assure that object. The people of the United States are fully alive to the situation. They are increasing the Sault St. Marie locks so as to give 22-foot navigation, and remember that 22-foot navigation is the standard we must aim at to control the transportation of America. Read the speech of Mr. J. J. Hill and you will see the advantage Canada possesses in this respect, and read the speech of President Roosevelt and you will find he advocates the building of a ship canal from Lake Michigan to the Mississippi, a portion of which is already constructed in the Chicago drainage canal. Then again it is proposed in the United States to deepen the Erie canal. The larger the vessels you can employ to carry your freight the cheaper will be the cost of transportation and the deeper your canals the larger your vessels. The tendency of the day is to build large locomotives with great hauling power, and to increase the depth of waterways so that large vessels may be used. While it may be possible to build a canal to the Mississippi river from the great lakes, the immense expenditure of money necessary and the almost impossibility of keeping that canal clear puts it out of the range of practicability. Therefore, we in Canada control the situation. There are a great many people in Canada who live in the settled portions of Ontario and along the St. Lawrence who advocate the deepening of the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence canals so as to give them a capacity equal to the St. Marie canal. If we are to divert the traffic it must be done in a canal of the same depth and capacity as the American standard for the upper lakes. The minister may be perfectly right, following the recommendation of the deputy head of his department, that a commission should be appointed to inquire whether the rates could be lowered via the Georgian bay canal.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Which Georgian bay canal—the Trent or the other?

Mr. HAGGART. I know of only one Georgian Bay canal.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is the Trent canal. The other is in the air yet.

Mr. HAGGART. The question of transportation is not a political question at all; it is a vital question in the interests of this country. If we are to become the great dominating race on the continent of North America, we must take advantage of our geographical position. Geographically nature has given us facilities which the United States does not possess. The hon. minister, speaking of the rates of transportation from Fort William to the seaboard, mentioned the rate of 5·90 cents per bushel from Buffalo to New York. He has been misinformed on that point. The ordinary rate per bushel on wheat from Buffalo to New York seldom rises above 4·5 cents; it is generally as low as 4 cents, and sometimes lower. If the hon. gentleman will look at some of the transportation maps prepared for the government, he will find that 4 cents per bushel will take wheat from Port Arthur to Montreal and deliver it there, plus what would be a reasonable toll on the Georgian Bay canal if it were completed; and the rate to Buffalo is the same. Therefore we have the means of providing transportation from Fort William to the seaboard at as low a rate as can be given from Fort William to Buffalo. That is an immense advantage. I have before pointed out that a difference of one-

half or one-quarter cent per bushel will divert the traffic from one port to another. Thus the means for providing the cheapest transportation from the interior to the ocean are in our possession if we provide facilities for taking advantage of them.

The next question the hon. gentleman dealt with were the facilities at Port Colborne at the mouth of the Welland canal. The minister was perfectly right in saying that if the Welland canal were deepened, elevators at Port Colborne would be entirely useless. He was perfectly right also in saying that government elevators are a bad investment. Not a single bushel of grain has been sent to the government elevator at Halifax. The same is true of the government elevator at St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no ; it has received a good many hundreds of thousands of bushels this winter.

Mr. HAGGART. There were a couple of hundred thousand bushels, I believe, taken around by Moncton, and dumped into our elevator at St. John. But the whole elevator business at St. John is done by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The same is true of the Quebec elevator. The building of these government elevators was a favourite scheme of the late Minister of Public Works, Mr. Tarte, who was an authority, and took a great deal of trouble to inform himself on the transportation question. He was of the opinion that large vessels, carrying 200,000 bushels of grain, would unload at Port Colborne, and tranship the grain to smaller vessels to be conveyed to Montreal. But this could be done without an elevator at Port Colborne at all. The grain could be taken to Buffalo, and be unloaded there into Canadian vessels, and be carried to Montreal ; the only difference would be that the distance would be five or six miles longer. However, the idea of building the elevator at Port Colborne was to confine the vessels to our own waters and to our own ports ; but I believed at the time that it was a useless expenditure. To accommodate the traffic, the Welland canal would have to be deepened to 22 feet ; but I doubt if that will ever be done, because the whole route to Montreal would have to be deepened as well, not merely the locks, but the river channel, and this would involve an expenditure which would not be at all justifiable.

The next matter the hon. minister dealt with was the Railway Commission, which he stated possessed more power than any other Railway Commission on this continent, which is quite true. He said it was a popular institution, and was absolutely necessary for the control of the railways of this country. Well, to a certain extent it is. Its powers are greater, I think, than ought to have been given to any railway commission. En passant, he paid a compliment to the lately deceased, the head of the Railway Commission. I agree fully with him. I knew the gentleman well, and a brighter, cleverer, abler man we never had in a position of that kind in Canada. He was a credit to the country, and filled his position in the most admirable manner, and the government will have the greatest difficulty in filling his place.

The minister then passed on to the statistical report of his department. We were promised that by the late minister, but the report is not in accordance with the promise he gave. It does not contain the full information that ought to be given in a report of that kind. Let me give one or two instances. I asked the hon. minister what was the cost per train mile last year of a locomotive. He told me nearly $1.02 per mile. I wanted to know what was the cost of carrying material per ton mile, and I cannot find it at all. He can find out the cost per locomotive mile by taking the receipts from freight and passenger traffic on the whole railway and dividing that amount by the number of miles travelled by locomotives, and with a great deal of trouble he could find the cost per ton mile. It is easy to find out in this case because unfortunately on the Intercolonial Railway the receipts are not much more than the expenditure and if you divide $1.02, the cost per locomotive mile, into your receipts, you will find the cost of carriage. That is exactly what it cost last year. The receipts for nine months according to the minister, are $218,000 in excess of the expenditure ; he does not know what the balance will be at the end of the year. I shall show later that his receipts are not at all as great as he states.

The minister referred to the National Transcontinental Railway and gave many details in reference to the contracts that have been let. He did not tell us whether these contracts were in excess of the estimate made by the Finance Minister of the probable cost. They are surely in excess of the estimate of the Prime Minister who stated that the cost to the country would be only $13,000,000. The Finance Minister was not so modest ; he said the expenditure would be largely in excess of that amount. It is time that we had a concise statement compiled from the figures of the contracts that have been let by the government of what the expenditure upon the National Transcontinental Railway would be. We should also be informed whether the work will be completed within the time specified. If I correctly remember the statute, the Grand Trunk Pacific were required by their contract to have that road completed in 1910. What possibility is there of that ? When will the road be completed according to the estimate of the Minister of Railways and his department, in view of the contracts let and the work now under way ?

What does the minister intend to do about the Quebec bridge? The bridge is down and how many years will it take to compete the link between Quebec and the other side of the river? Then what effect will the building of the road from Quebec to Moncton have upon the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway? We are building that road so that it will be in active competition with our own road from Levis to Moncton. In order to facilitate the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway the minister says he will possibly double-track the road from Moncton to Halifax. Is that because an election is coming on soon and he is dangling that before the people of the maritime provinces? He also stated that he was seriously contemplating the taking over of some of those branch railways in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. What a scheme! What railway in either of those provinces is paying a dividend? What advantage would it be to the people of this country or to the maritime provinces for the government to take over any of these railways? Is this arrangement to be like the bargain that was made for the purchase of the Drummond County Railway, where the government paid $1,500,000 for a railway that was in the market, a bankrupt concern, that had been offered for sale at $500,000? What justification is there for the expenditure of anything like the amount that will be involved in the purchase of these roads? The minister talks about the new way of keeping accounts. He states that in England any betterment of the road which is of permanent advantage is charged to capital account. What would he think of his own manner of book-keeping if I drew his attention to some features of it? The minister's predecessor assured the House that the railway stations were virtually insured by the government, that it was cheaper for them to take the risk of fire than to pay insurance, but when a railway station was burned, he calmly told us that the rebuilding was charged to capital account. The minister has followed his example and has charged the expenditure for rebuilding the shops at Moncton to capital account. We had an assurance from the previous minister that the rebuilding of the shops was to be charged to capital account, but that the installation of machinery was to be charged to the current expenditure of the railway. The present minister has forgotten that promise and is charging all the machinery for these shops to capital account. In other words, to make a show to the people of Canada, he charges to capital account every expenditure he possibly can.

I see that he has purchased twenty-three new locomotives for the Intercolonial Railway and has charged their total cost to capital account; he has hardly charged a car to current expenditure. Why is that done? Is it not in order to make a good showing before the people and parliament of Canada. The life of a car or a locomotive is calculated at twenty years. The minister ought then to put in for renewals chargeable to current expenditure five per cent of the total cost of locomotives and cars on the Intercolonial Railway; but he has not charged one of them. The former head of the Liberal party in this House contended thirty years ago that the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway should be closed, that a road that has been running for a number of years as a government road should not have a capital account at all, and that, if you make an expenditure, that expenditure must be justified by the earnings of the road. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), criticising my remarks about the capital account of the Intercolonial, said that I had advocated that there should be no further capital expenditure made on that road. Of course, I did not say that. What I said was that, in order to have a correct check upon the officers of the road, and in order that the House might have a correct check upon the minister, no expenditure should be made on capital account except when a road was acquired, as in the case of the Southeastern or the Drummond County.

The minister states that he has a surplus of $288,000. Does he forget that, in 1897, when this government came into power, the total capital expenditure on the Intercolonial had been $55,000,000. We had a promise from the Minister of Railways at that time that the capital expenditure he proposed to make would increase the receipts and redound to the benefit of the whole undertaking. In order to make a comparison, then, between net receipts of the Intercolonial of to-day and the net receipts of the Intercolonial Railway of 1897, you must add to the expenditures the interest on the increased capital expenditure. Now, the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial up to the present time has been about $83,000,000, or an increase of about $28,000,000 over what it was in 1897. Add the interest on that at 4 per cent and you have about $1,120,000 of additional expenditure which must be provided for before the minister can claim a surplus.

Now, why is it that the Intercolonial is in the position in which we find it? When I was administering the road, the receipts equalled the expenditure. And those receipts have largely increased, especially the receipts for local traffic, the best paying traffic that a road can carry. I am sorry to say that the through traffic has not increased materially over that of twenty years ago. The increase has been, as I have said, in the local traffic. What I advocated under the hon. gentleman's predecessor, was that, for the information of the House, a statement should be made by experts to show in what respects the rates on the Intercolonial differed from those on

the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk. It ought to be easy to make such a statement, for the classification of all the railways in Canada is the same. It is true that, in some respects, the traffic on the Intercolonial is carried at very low rates. For instance, sugar from Halifax is carried to Moncton at a less than paying rate. For a while, traffic was taken through from Quebec to Halifax at less than it could be carried for. There is none of that at the present time. Formerly the coal rates from the mines to the maritime ports were the lowest possible. But, eliminating these things, or allowing for them, a comparison could be made between the freight rates of the Intercolonial and the freight rates of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific. Why is it that it cost $1.02 per locomotive mile on the Intercolonial and that we get only $1.02 in return for it? The Grand Trunk costs exactly the same, but its receipts are $1.87 per locomotive mile. Most of the American roads cost a little more, but the receipts are much greater. The minister gave the reason for that. The reason is that the Intercolonial is running useless trains, trains that are empty. There must be some such reason. The train mileage has been lessened and the receipts increased. Why is not this policy carried out more generally? Why is it that, with the same freight rates as the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway the Intercolonial cannot earn as much per mile? There is something wrong in the management of the road. According to the minister's statement, the management is entirely in the hands of the unions. The minister makes the bald statement that promotion and increases of salary are not made by the minister or officials, but that the unions have absolute control in these matters.

Mr. GRAHAM. I said that 63 per cent of the employees were members of the unions, and that their promotions were under union rules.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood him to say that 63 per cent were under union rules and that the union controlled the increases in wages and the promotion.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not put it quite so strongly as that, I think.

Mr. HAGGART. My hon. friend denied the charge that his department was subject to political influence. He denied that men were promoted and kept on owing to the recommendations of certain members of parliament, political supporters of the government. He said that the Minister of Railways had no political influence at all over his department in that respect, that all the influence was in the hands of the union, to which 63 per cent of the employees on the Intercolonial Railway belonged. He said that the promotions and the salaries were dictated by the union. That was a most extraordinary statement. Just fancy the absolute control over the employees on the Intercolonial Railway being, not in the department at all, but in the hands of a union which is controlled by these very employees. If that be the case, then the minister has no control over the expenditure or the running of his road. He cannot dismiss or promote a man except with the consent of the union. That is a most extraordinary position. Why, a government railway, under the control of the people of this country, should not have a union on it at all. The employees on the government railway have parliament to look to, if the minister does not do them justice. The absolute control over the Intercolonial Railway should be in the hands of the minister and his officers subject to the authority of parliament. The retention of a man or his dismissal or promotion should be in the hands of the government officers; and until it is, you cannot expect any different results than those you have at present.

Why does not the minister give, in his report, the amount expended per mile on the Intercolonial Railway? Every other railway gives it. Why does he not give us the freight rates and a comparison between the freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway and those on the Grand Trunk and other roads? The hon. gentleman's predecessor (Mr. Emmerson) tried to justify the expenditure by saying that the Intercolonial Railway was a popular road, that it belonged to the people and was not intended to have any receipts above the expenditure. But he was met with this reply: Why then do you charge the same rates per mile on the Intercolonial Railway as any other railway does? He denied that he did, but the statement was reaffirmed. That statement was that the rates on the Intercolonial Railway are as high as on any other road except some railways in the extreme western portion of the Dominion. Why cannot we have the figures in the statistical report? Surely it is essential that we should have them. We ought also to have the expenditure per mile on the Intercolonial Railway. We have that in the returns of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. We had the minister saying—which I think was a perfect reply to my hon. friend from York (Mr. W. F. Maclean)—that the average passenger rate per mile on the Intercolonial Railway is 1·75 cents. We ought to be given that information in the statistical report. Leaving out the nine railways which are situated in British Columbia, and which are allowed by local statutes and also by our statutes to charge as high as four cents and five cents per mile per passenger, the average rate per mile which passengers travelling in the Dominion pay is 2·2 cents or two and one-fifth; or more

than one-half the passengers in Canada, who utilize our railways, pay less than 2 cents per mile.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No, they do not.

Mr. HAGGART. Why, that is in the statistical return the hon. minister has furnished us with. That struck me as extraordinary, but I think the returns are perfectly correct. I am with the hon. gentleman when he says that the Intercolonial Railway is a work of which all parties in Canada are proud. We look upon that railway as part of the general transportation scheme of the country. There is no feeling at all of jealousy in the western provinces with regard to the expenditure on this railway in the maritime provinces. We look upon it as a great national work. But even if it were a work confined entirely to these provinces, we would have no feeling of opposition to it. What we want is to give the maritime provinces an equal chance with every other portion of the Dominion as regards the carriage of passengers and freight and other railway facilities from one section of the country to the other. Give the people fair rates and have the road managed as economically as possible. Give all the advantages possible to the maritime provinces and you will have no trouble. Instead of coming here from year to year with an increased expenditure on nominal capital account of $3,000,000 and a deficit besides of $500,000 to $750,000, you could, by practising ordinary economy, make the road a paying one. What the minister should do is take his different officers in charge and say to each one: Certain results are being furnished by every other railway, why cannot you give the same results? You must give these results, or if you do not I will try somebody else in your place. Let there be no political influence allowed to keep parties in positions they are not fitted for. Let there not be a superabundance of employees from one end of the road to the other, a great many of whom are unfit for the work. Have men who are experts, do your duty to the people of the maritime provinces, see that there is economical management, and you will have vastly different results. I think that the hon. gentleman has good inclinations in that direction but he has made one error, and that is the double tracking of the road and a four-tenth grade from Moncton to Halifax. Build that competing line from Lévis to Moncton, lease the couple of roads in New Brunswick, the leasing of which the minister says he is seriously considering, and you will have a drag on the road that will increase the deficit. You will also demoralize your staff. When I had the management of the Intercolonial Railway, we had as a head staff certain parties who took a pride in the road and in seeing it economically administered; but if you load them down with these new undertakings you will take the whole heart and soul and inspiration out of them. The hon. gentleman is making a mistake. There ought to be something in the shape of railways left to private enterprise in the particular provinces. We are not all enamoured with the government ownership of roads. We do not all believe that a government road may be more economically run than any other road because it may be in the interest of the country to have corporations governing these roads and having an interest in them. A great deal of the capital of this country is invested in railways and it is fair that it should be so. But, in my experience in reference to contracts for material and supplies for the Intercolonial Railway, I found that you could get material from contractors for that railway as cheaply as for any other railway in Canada by open competition. We had a fair way of dealing with them. If there was any dispute as to the quality of the material furnished we simply sent a sample of it down to McGill College in Montreal, appointed an arbitrator between the government and the contractor and whatever the report was the contractor never said a word about it and the government was perfectly satisfied. We got better and cheaper material by following that practice. As the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says, an employee on the Intercolonial Railway belongs to the Anglo-Saxon race, and he can do as much work there as a man can in any other part of the country—if he is properly looked after. If he is not looked after in this or any other section of the country he will not do as much. There are two things that I draw to the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and ask him to look into. One of these is the train mileage, and I would suggest that he find out what the receipts and what the costs are. I understand that the officers of the department have not made a proper return of them. If you do not get a proper return point out to them what they do on the Grand Trunk, on the Canadian Pacific Railway or on any of the American railways and ask for like results from them. The Minister of Railways says: This is an old railway and it cannot bear comparison as to its roadbed and rolling stock with a new railway. You have paid out enough money in the last ten or fifteen years to have the most complete and best equipped railway on the continent. The older a railway is the better its roadbed is. A new railway or a new roadbed is not comparable to an old railway or an old roadbed. The hon. gentleman's comparisons between the provincial road and the Intercolonial Railway were not of much effect. However, I must say that the tone of the hon. gentleman is different from that of some of his predecessors to a certain extent and I like his tone. I think he is anxious to do the

best he possibly can to make the road a success and a paying concern.

His intentions are right in reference to the transportation feature, but they are misdirected, but I hope that the hon. gentleman will look into the future and do what he can to help to bring about the adoption of a broad system of transportation, and that he will take from the Public Works Department something that they stole from him; that is the building of the Georgian bay canal. They have no right to the building of that canal. That is a work that appertains peculiarly to the Department of Railways and Canals. Inquire, if necessary, by commission, look into the subject thoroughly and whether it is necessary to construct this work, whether it is necessary to deepen the Welland canal, or whether it is necessary to deepen the St. Lawrence to the sea, see that the facilities that nature has provided for us are made available to our uses. I am of opinion, not alone,—I will not venture to join with my own the opinion of a celebrated gentleman whom I mentioned some time ago—that the regulation of freight rates on the continent of America is not the railway. It is to be, in future, the canal. It is a popular regulator of the carrying trade. We can all build boats, or we can get money for the purpose and enter into competition. We cannot all build a railway and have a railway train running upon it. The proper rate regulator is the canal. Some canals that have never carried one ounce of freight from one point to another are to such an extent the regulators and controllers of freights that the country receives more than the interest on the expenditure in the benefit that accrues from lessened freights. Nothing controls freights as the canals do. For the purpose of moving heavy freights, and in fact the bulk of freight that has to be carried from one end of this country to the other, it is necessary and absolutely necessary that we shall have increased canal accommodation. Look at the development that is taking place in the building of canals in Germany and Russia. Look at the ship canal from Liverpool to Manchester. Look at the large canals in different parts of Europe. At one time the general opinion was that we must rely for transportation facilities wholly upon the railways. There is a revolution in that opinion now. Canals are now, in popular estimation, absolutely necessary to develop and control transportation.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the canals of Europe. Does he allow anything for the difference of climate between Canada and Europe ?

Mr. HAGGART. There is a distinct difference in climate. The German canals operate pretty nearly the same number of months as do our canals or perhaps two or three weeks in the year longer than ours do. I refer to the Kiel canal, the canals along the Weiser and those parts of Germany. In the southern portions of the country they probably operate nearly the whole year, as they also do in Belgium. The Manchester ship canal, by the use of ice-breakers, is perhaps operated for nearly the whole year. Perhaps the Erie canal is open a week later in the fall and a week earlier in the spring than the St. Lawrence is, but climatic differences do not affect the principle whatever. I do not know that there is anything further for me to say. I have criticised the administration of this railway again and again. I think there is a bright future for the Intercolonial Railway, but I strongly lament the mismanagement and the large expenditure on that road from 1896 up to the present day which were entirely unjustifiable. I hope that in the management of the road the Minister of Railways and Canals will not be controlled in any way by any minor political influences although he may be by the purchase of a railway or the double tracking of the road from Moncton to Halifax which influences have affected the management of the railway in the past.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker, before congratulating my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) upon the splendid presentation of the Intercolonial Railway budget in the present year, I desire to bear my humble testimony to the work of the departed chief of the Railway Commission. He was the right man in the right place. He was honoured by all, respected by all and loved by those who knew him best. Nova Scotia, the native province of the late Judge Killam mourns with the rest of the Dominion the loss of her distinguished son, and looks with pride at the high and distinguished position he occupied on the bench of Canada, and as Chairman of the Railwy Commission.

I desire to congratulate the Minister of Railways upon the presentation of the case for the Intercolonial which he made to us this afternoon. It was filled with hope to those who live along the railway ; it was filled with hope for the people of the whole Dominion who have an interest in this great national asset. It was a speech of the rising sun, compared with which the speech of the ex-minister (Mr. Haggart) was a speech of the setting sun, or the twilight, or even of darkness itself. The ex-minister (Mr. Haggart) tells us that not a dollar is to be spent on the Intercolonial on capital account ; that no improvements are to be made ; that no modern equipment shall be purchased in future, and that no branch lines are to be acquired, because forsooth, it would discourage the officials of the railway. Did any one ever hear of the officials of the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway being dis-

couraged because these two great railways have absorbed the veins that lead into the great arteries of their system. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) pooh-poohed the idea of double tracking the Intercolonial from Moncton to Halifax. Everything for the betterment of the road has been condemned by him to-night. All I can say is that if it should ever happen in the evolution of events that he again as Minister of Railways should have this great national railroad under his control, then, God save the Intercolonial. The hon. gentleman tells us we shall not increase the capital account, that we shall spend nothing to improve the road unless we can get it out of the pockets of the patrons of the road. But on the other hand the hon. gentleman says that the Intercolonial freight rates are as high as on other roads, and that being so how are we going to get increased revenue?

Mr. HAGGART. I thought I explained that so that the densest would understand. I did not say you should take your capital out of revenue ; I said that the capital account in the Intercolonial book-keeping should cease and that the expenditure should be charged to the ordinary revenue of the road.

Mr. LOGAN. Exactly ; the hon. gentleman says that all improvements and additions should be charged to revenue, and surely none but the densest would use such an argument. My hon. friend is an astute politician and he knows what he is talking about to-night when he says there shall be no further expenditure on the Intercolonial on capital account. Then, if you want improved locomotives and better rolling stock and new permanent structures, and a double track, how are you going to get all these if you do not charge to capital account ? At the present time the revenue and the expenditure very nearly balance each other. In the past there has often been a deficit. Under these conditions where are you going to get money to better the road? I agree with the hon. gentleman that the freight rates of the Intercolonial are in many cases excessive. There is a general impression among certain people in Canada that the Intercolonial Railway carries freight for almost nothing so as to benefit the people of the maritime provinces, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) was Minister of Railways and he knows better. He says that the freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway, (and the passenger rates too he might have added) are about as hight as the rates on other railways in Canada. And if that be so, and if the revenue and the expenditure nearly balance, how are you going to get money unless you increase the rates still higher or reduce the wages of the working men on the Intercolonial. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) advocate that ? I can tell him on the authority of the general manager of that road, that if the same rate of wages as is now paid the workingmen on the Intercolonial had been paid by the hon. gentleman when he was Minister of Railways in 1895, he would have had to provide an extra million dollars on the basis of the same number of men being employed. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what is going to be done with the Intercolonial if no more expenditures are made on capital account?

My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) condemned government owned railways but as to that I leave him in the hands of his leader and of his confrère—I was going to say his other leader—the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean).

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. His would-be leader.

Mr. LOGAN. They can wrestle with the hon. member (Mr. Haggart) on the question of government ownership of railways. We on this side of the House have not been advocating government ownership of railways to any considerable extent, but we do claim that when we do own a railway like the Intercolonial Railway we should take care of that road and make it the greatest success we possibly can.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) referred me to my leader about government ownership of railways. When did the leader of the opposition ever advocate government ownership of railways ?

Mr. LOGAN. Surely my hon. friend has read the Halifax platform.

Mr. HAGGART. I never heard before that the leader of the opposition advocated such a thing.

Mr. LOGAN. I leave my hon. friend to study the doctrine which was propounded by his leader.

Mr. HAGGART. He never advocated anything of the kind.

Mr. LOGAN. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) will not deny that his leader went to the country in 1904 on the plea of building and owning a railway from ocean to ocean.

Mr. HAGGART. What is that you say?

Mr. LOGAN. I will give the hon. gentleman up and pass on.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman said that my leader stated he was in favour of government ownership of railways.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HAGGART. I never heard of it before.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. You were not in Halifax.

Mr. HAGGART. I don't believe that even a Halifax newspaper stated that.

Mr. LOGAN. I have not the precious document known as the Halifax platform with me just now, but if it is still extant I will get a copy and send it to my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart).

Mr. HAGGART. You had better read it yourself.

Mr. LOGAN. I have read it.

Mr. HAGGART. You will find nothing of that kind in it.

Mr. LOGAN. Very well I will leave that subject for the present. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) has referred to the Intercolonial Railway as the great national highway of our country, and he has spoken of it in a spirit of hopefulness which all Canadians should well appreciate. I have been endeavouring in my own humble way to impress a number of people in this country, some of whom sit on this side of the House, that we have at the present time in the Intercolonial a very well equipped railway giving a very efficient service.

I admit that in the old days there was a slow freight service and a miserable passenger service on the Intercolonial. and the grass almost grew between the rails of that road. That was before 1896. At the present time we have magnificent trains, large locomotives, and a fast freight service between the cities of Halifax and St. John and the city of Montreal. Last session I showed to the best of my ability, by quoting from officials and others who were well acquainted with the transportation system, that the freight service on the Intercolonial had been brought up to a standard that enabled it to compete with the lines via Portland, Boston and New York in the markets of Toronto and Hamilton. I may be prejudiced in favour of the Intercolonial Railway, but I am firmly convinced that that road at the present time gives a freight service as good as the freight service of any road in eastern Canada. I do not say that it pays. I do not say that the two fast freight trains running between the cities of Halifax and St. John and the city of Montreal, and going at the rate of thirty or forty miles an hour, stopping only at a few points, pay; but I do claim that they give a quick service. Therefore you can imagine my feelings Mr. Speaker, when, following the speeches delivered last autumn by the hon. leader of the opposition in Ontario, I found him referring to the Intercolonial Railway in the terms which I am about to quote. My hon. friend comes from the maritime provinces—from the city of Halifax—and is well aware of the difficulties under which the Intercolonial Railway has laboured; he is or should be as well aware as I am of the improvements made in the service of the railway, and he should be the last man in the world to represent to the people of Ontario that it is a poor service. Why, Sir, he should have been a missionary to proclaim to the people of Ontario the religion of a government-owned railway in eastern Canada, and to tell them that their ideas about a slow freight service on the Intercolonial Railway were mistaken. But what do I find? Speaking at Owen Sound on the 9th of September last, he used these words—and I desire to commend them to his friends in the maritime provinces. He became very facetious, and applied an old story to the Intercolonial Railway in these words:

> A car of lumber was moved by it; when it at last reached its destination it was found that a bird had built her nest in it, had laid her eggs, had hatched them, and had reared the young ones almost to maturity by the time it had been delivered.

That was the kind of missionary talk the hon. leader of the opposition indulged in last summer in the province of Ontario, where there is needed at the present time a little leaven in regard to this great government work, in spite of the fact that last session I proved by actual figures that the freight service on the Intercolonial Railway had become a fast service. On that occasion I quoted in the presence of the hon. leader of the opposition a letter from Mr. Tiffin, the traffic manager of the Intercolonial Railway, in which he showed that freight from the 'Virginian,' the 'Ionian' and other vessels was carried over the Intercolonial Railway and was delivered in Montreal in about two days. Yet the hon. leader of the opposition, ignoring the improved conditions of the road, as proven by those figures, went to the province of Ontario and told the people that the freight service on the Intercolonial Railroad was so slow that birds could build their nests on a train and hatch their eggs and raise their young before the freight reached its destination. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp) laughs. I do not blame him for laughing. At the same time, to those of us who have more interest than he has in the Intercolonial Railway it is no laughing matter to find statements of this kind made throughout the length and breadth of Canada.

The Minister of Railways this afternoon said some very kind words with reference to the employees on the Intercolonial Railway. They deserve those words and I know that they will appreciate them. The men employed on the Canadian government railways are as loyal, as gentlemanly, as honest and as courageous a lot of men as can be found in the employ of any railway in the world. Outside of the regular employees, my hon. friend has in his employ some men of whom we have a very high opinion. I know his appreciation of the gentleman who occupies the position of deputy Minister of Raialways. My hon.

friend has not been Minister of Railways very long, but the deputy minister has been there for two or three years, and during that time I believe he has displayed the ability which goes to make the very best kind of a deputy minister. The staff that surround my hon. friend are in most cases of a good railway character. While the employees of the road are a good class of men, and while the wages paid to-day are much better than those paid in 1895, I do not suppose that anybody will complain that these men are overpaid, on the contrary a large number of them are seriously underpaid. There are in the offices at Moncton, men who are seriously underpaid. When you find in the offices at Moncton, men who are stenographers or fairly good accountants working for $30 or $35 a month, I do not think you can charge that they are overpaid; you must admit that they are miserably underpaid. These are cases to which I would like to direct the attention of the minister, in order that the services of these employees may be better rewarded. All along the line we have capable men who have been working for 20 or 25 years as baggage masters or freight handlers, and only receiving $40 or $50 a month. These men are certainly underpaid, and the inequality should be rectified. I hope my hon. friend will go further. I believe the time has arrived when the government should establish a shorter day for its employees. I believe the government should lead in this matter, and not follow, and should establish nine hours as a legal working day for men employed by the day on the Intercolonial Railway. That change is bound to come, Mr. Speaker, and if the government would grapple with this question and reduce the hours in the shops at Moncton and to the men on the line who are working by the day, it would be I believe eventually in the interest of the railway and in the interest of the country.

My hon. friend the Minister of Railways has suggested certain things that should be done. One is the acquirement of the branch railways in the maritime provinces. Notwithstanding the objection of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), I venture to say that is a project which will appeal to all people in Canada. My hon. friend knows that every other great trunk line acquires branch lines as feeders. We who live in that part of Canada know that these branch lines are not feeders to the Intercolonial Railway, but feeders to other railways; they send their freight for the west not by the Intercolonial, but by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Is this good policy for the Intercolonial Railway ? I say it is not. We do not claim that these branch lines should be purchased at an extravagant price. But he said that if the roads could be acquired, not according to what they had cost, but according to what they are paying at the present time, and the prospects of their paying for the future, then the purchase or lease of these roads might be considered. I believe that this is a good policy in connection with the government railway—if we are going to maintain the Intercolonial as a government railway.

In another part of his speech the hon. minister intimated that it was proposed to double track the road from Moncton to Halifax. I think that should appeal to every man who has the interest of this country at heart. We are helping to build a great transcontinental railway for three or four thousand miles down to the city of Moncton with maximum gradients of four-tenths of one per cent on east bound traffic. Yet, when you reach the city of Moncton, you find that on the 200 miles of line to Halifax, there are grades three times as high as that. Now, the weakest link is the strength of the chain. If we are bringing trains of western traffic to Moncton over a four-tenths of one per cent grade, surely we must find some way to strengthen this last link of the chain. In other words we must reduce the grades and better the curves on the Intercolonial from Moncton to Halifax.

For political considerations—I do not think that any one will deny that—the Intercolonial was built over the Cobequid mountains, so-called. The survey made by Sir Sanford Fleming favoured the running of the line around the southern part of the mountains near Parrsboro'. But, because of political pull on the east and on the west, the line was built, as I have said, over the Cobequid mountains. The result is that we have very heavy grades. Also we are confronted with the serious difficulty of the heavy snowfall in those mountains, sometimes making the road impassible for days at a time. I am glad to hear the minister state that he has in mind, when double tracking the road between Moncton and Halifax instead of building along the old line over the mountains, to build around the southern part of Cobequid mountains and so reduce the grade to the standard of a maximum of four-tenths of one per cent as on the Transcontinental. Another advantage of this double-tracking from Moncton to Halifax will be to relieve the congestion that very often exists on that line. The minister has told us that already the double-tracking is going on, at one end of the line from Halifax to Windsor Junction and at the other end from Moncton to Painsec. This is but the beginning of a work that must be carried to completion within the next few years if we are to accommodate the great traffic that will be brought down over the Transcontinental. These hints of what the minister has in mind for the development of the road are hopeful indications for us who live down by the sea. The Intercolonial has often been referred to as the bond of confederation. Yet, it has sometimes occurred to me that the time may

come when we might curse that bond. For, if it must be held as a sacred thing, a thing not to be touched, it might easily become a detriment to the people of the maritime provinces. Many parts of those provinces badly need railway accommodation and many of the branch lines already constructed are poorly run. If the policy of the country be that we are not to acquire branch lines and that we are not to build lines to compete with the Intercolonial, our outlook from a railway standpoint is but a dark one. The policy should be—and, as I understand it, the policy of the government is—that, where railways are needed, they shall be built; and, whether we believe in the principle of government ownership or not, so long as the Intercolonial remains a government road, that policy is the true and proper one.

My hon. friend the Minister of Railways has spoken of making this a great national highway. We desire that that should be the thought in the minds of all the people in this country. The Intercolonial is not for the benefit of the maritime provinces alone. It has been stated and proven in this House beyond all contradiction that the benefits derived from the Intercolonial are divided between the maritime provinces and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec whose producers send their goods to the maritime provinces for sale. I am glad the hon. minister has spoken of this railway as being one in the interests of Canada, and that its benefits are not confined to us who live along the line.

I agree with the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) that the great problem before this country is transportation. I believe that, outside of the problem of the Intercolonial, the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Haggart's) ideas on transportation are good. I still hope that, some day, my hon. friend will come down along the Intercolonial and I am sure that when he sees the improvement that has been made since the time of his regime he will come to the conclusion that this road, of which he seems to have such a small opinion and such slight hopes, has become a great factor in the development of the eastern part of Canada. I agree with my hon. friend that only by improved transportation facilities and cheap freight rates can we thoroughly develop this country. If we cannot bring the east and west closer together, we cannot hope to inculcate the great national idea, and have that idea permeate the whole country. I hope that we in the maritime provinces, though we may have kind thoughts of the Intercolonial, are not provincial and that we will not set our face against other projects for the development of Canada. I am as heartily in favour of building the Georgian Bay canal—and have said so in this House—as my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart), if it can be built at a reasonable cost. I believe that by means of communication between east and west we are cementing this confederation of which we are so proud. I hope to see branch lines of the Intercolonial acquired and built in the maritime provinces. But I hope also that this government line will be extended into the province of Ontario as a regulator of the freight rates in this province. And when this is done, I trust the time will have arrived when it will be considered expedient that the great undertaking of the Georgian Bay canal should be helped along by the government, the government even undertaking it if necessary and if it can be built at a reasonable cost. The Intercolonial is our great national railway and what we do for it is not for the maritime provinces alone, not for the province of Quebes, or the province of Ontario, but for the whole Dominion. It may be that some of us do not, in practice, carry out what we preach in reference to this road. I am sorry to find so many shippers in Ontario who insist on sending their freight to the maritime provinces over the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not know why this should be so, as they do not get better service. Many travellers between the east and the west, instead of patronizing the people's line, travel by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have hope in the Intercolonial. We glory in the thought that has been enunciated here this afternoon by the distinguished Minister of Railways. We believe that the future of this road is a bright one, we believe it is bound to go forward and that it will improve from year to year in spite of all the doleful moanings of the hon. tleman, the former Minister of Railways, (Mr. Haggart), who seems to have lost faith in the eastern part of Canada and to have centered all his hope and devotion on the Georgian Bay canal.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member made statements in reference to my leader and referred me to the Halifax platform. The only reference to be found in the Halifax platform to this question is:

> The operation and management of our government railways by an independet commission, free from personal control or influence.

Mr. LOGAN. My hon. friend should read his leader's speech on that occasion.

Mr. HAGGART. He said I would find it in the Halifax platform.

Mr. LOGAN. I am not supposed to be so conversant with the platform as hon. gentlemen opposite; but I have been reading the speeches of the leader of the opposition in Ontario and in every speech he made there, it was plain to see that he was advocating not government management but government ownership of railways.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) congratulates the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) on his great statement upon the Intercolonial Railway. He says it is the speech of the rising sun. So far as I am concerned, I was a little disappointed in the speech of the Minister of Railways; I did not think he was in his usual form. However, I think that after the speech we have just heard, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) will be well qualified for one of the vacancies on the Railway Commission that the minister will soon be filling.

Mr. LOGAN. He is not an applicant, thank you.

Mr. J. D. REID. He also complained of the inadequate salaries being paid to employees of the Intercolonial Railway, referring particularly to the accountants being paid $35 a month and saying that they were good men, well qualified for any accounting position. I hope that when he returns to the maritime provinces he will not tell these accountants what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) pays his accountants when he brings them from the American side. He pays $35 per day instead of per month and makes an allowance of $5 per day for board. That is the least he pays; some he pays $70 a day. Why did not the hon. gentleman use his influence to have some of these Intercolonial Railway accountants brought up to the Marine Department and have them given a chance there? They could earn enough in a year to retire on; one year at $35 a day would be about $10,500 instead of $420 now paid them. The hon. gentleman was really unkind to the accountants on the Intercolonial Railway, and I hope that when the Minister of Marine requires any more accounting the hon. gentleman will use his influence to have those accountants brought up from the maritime provinces; if other departments require accounting to be done I hope they will give the men on the Intercolonial Railway a chance.

The Minister of Railways said that the Canadian canals had so far cost about $120,000,000. I believe this money has been well spent, there is no doubt that the canals have been of great advantage to the people of this country. I concur in what he has said as to the scenery along the Rideau and St. Lawrence canals. However, the scenery is not all we care for. We have to consider the great advantage that these canals afford to the people of Canada. The minister stated that last year 25,646,800 bushels of grain were carried through the canals. The saving to the people of Canada owing to the difference in freight rates on these canals was enormous. I remember that years ago, before the Welland and other canals were enlarged, the freight from Chicago east was between 12 and 14 cents a bushel; but immediately the Welland and other canals were enlarged the rates were reduced, simply because the vessels passing through these canals were able to carry much larger cargoes; and to-day the rate between Fort William and Montreal, during the season of navigation, is only 5 cents a bushel. In other words, the vessels now running between Fort William and Montreal will contract from the opening of the season to the end of navigation for a through rate of 5 cents a bushel. That has been done, if not last season certainly the season before last; I know one large forwarding company that contracted for their vessels at that rate. But in addition to the great advantage of this low rate on the grain, coal and other freight carried by water, there is the advantage derived from the cheaper rate on grain and other freight passing via. Midland, Owen Sound and other points on the Georgian Bay, carried partly by rail and partly by water, owing to the competition of these through vessels. If we had not the canals the rate on grain by rail from Fort William to Montreal, instead of being 5 or 5½ cents, would be at least 10 cents a bushel.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would that 5 cents be f.o.b. ocean ship Montreal?

Mr. J. D. REID. That would include f.o.b. vessel in Montreal or delivered in elevator in Montreal. It would include f.o.b. ocean vessel in Montreal if the ocean vessel was ready to receive the grain, because the vessel that comes from Fort William to Montreal must discharge it. The vessel that comes from Fort William to Montreal must discharge into the floating elevator, and that elevator will discharge into a sea-going vessel at the same rate as the vessel would put it into the elevator. So the rate would be 5 cents a bushel from Fort William delivered in the vessel at Montreal, if the vessel is ready to receive it. But the great difficulty is that when the vessel gets to Montreal with a cargo of grain, the steamer in Montreal is not able to receive it and the cargo has to go into an elevator, and that makes a difference of 1 cent per bushel. The reason of that is this, if it is in an elevator in Montreal, it has to be taken out into barges and floated to the sea-going steamer and then elevated in again and that makes 1 cent a bushel added. The elevator in Montreal, which was built by the government, was intended to save that 1 cent per bushel. In addition it was intended to take these cargoes from Fort William and allow the vessels to proceed back without being detained in Montreal. But I understand the difficulty is this that there is some defect in the elevator, owing to which it is not safe to put the grain in. In addition I understand that, for some reason or other, the machinery to take the grain out of the elevator and put it into the vessel is not perfect. There is something wrong with

the elevator. Therefore to say that it is the management of the government which is at fault, I do not think is right. I think the blame should be put on the elevator. There is no reason why that elevator should not be managed as well by a government as by an individual. There is not the slightest difficulty. Simply taking in the grain and putting it out and charging one-half cent a bushel for doing that. The whole trouble is with the elevator. As regards the elevators at St. John and Halifax, the reason they do not get any grain is because the Intercolonial Railway does not make connections with anything that will deliver them grain. The Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway will not give them grain, and they have no connections down by vessels so it is impossible for them to get grain, That is the reason these elevators do not pay.

In so far as this canal system is concerned, I remember when the work at Port Colborne was proposed by the then Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). At that time these vessels carrying 200,000 and 300,000 bushels of grain were to go to Port Colborne, and the steamers were to connect at Port Colborne and take the grain to Montreal, and the grain was to get through at three and a half cents a bushel. I opposed the scheme and advocated the enlargement of the Welland canal. I made the statement at the same time that vessels could go to Buffalo and experiment in that way. There was no reason why then, or within the last fifteen years, vessels could not go to Buffalo and take the grain down to Montreal and save the expense of the elevator at Port Colborne. But it was useless, the minister had that idea and the elevator was built, and I venture the prophecy that you will never see a bushel of grain go into the elevator at Port Colborne except in the fall of the year when the freights are up four to six cents a bushel. A vessel carrying 150,000 bushels will then go to Port Colborne and run part of its cargo into the elevator. The elevator will load it on to cars which will cross it over to Port Dalhousie by rail, and there the same vessel will take it to Kingston. But if the freights are low, it will not pay to elevate the grain into the elevator, and there will never be a bushel going into it. It will simply be another useless elevator added to the list at St. John, Halifax and Montreal. The solution of this transportation question is to be found in the enlarging of the Welland canal. Make that canal large enough to accommodate a vessel of 700 or 800 feet long. The time will come when you will see vessels that length. Those vessels can go to Kingston or Prescott. The vessels that go on to Kingston can go just as well to Prescott. If there were twenty feet of water in the Welland canal, they could go right to Prescott, and Prescott is the foot of navigation in so far as the great lake system is concerned. The boats going now down to Montreal are as large as they can possibly be at any future time. The reason is this. Between Montreal and Prescott there are very swift currents. Where there are no canals the river is winding and the channel winding, and these large boats cannot steer themselves. There is not a time now during the season of navigation when some of these vessels do not go ashore on account of their being unable to take care of themselves in the swift water. For that reason you have to consider that Prescott is the foot of navigation. Now the rate from Fort William to Buffalo has been as low as one cent a bushel. One and a half cent is a good rate to Buffalo. You can get vessels at the very outside to bring grain to Prescott for two cents a bushel. I know that even these small sized vessels, if they came to Prescott from the opening of navigation to the end of the season, and were paid two cents a bushel, could come out at the end of the season with ten to fifteen per cent interest on the investment. That is on the present sized Welland canal vessel. But if you could bring down a vessel of 300,000 bushels at one and a half cents or two cents a bushel, you would make a fortune. From Prescott to Montreal the rate is one and a half cent per bushel. The minister knows that in the olden times the capacity of the barges was 15,000 to 25,000 bushels and the rate two cents a bushel. To-day these barges are taking down 70,000 to 100,000 bushels. They are flat bottomed barges, built specially for the river. At one and a half cent a bushel and 70,000 bushels they would have $1,000 freight coming down, whereas in the olden times they would only get $400. And there is only a little more expense for towing, while with one and a half cent freight from Prescott to Montreal and a two cent from Fort William to Montreal, they deliver right into the vessel at Montreal, if the vessel is able to take care of it at that time, and all for 3½ cents per bushel. If not they deliver it into the elevator for same rate.

There is another great trouble with this transportation question and that is at Montreal. I am told that the harbour and other dues and the insurance is a very serious matter, in so far as the freight to Montreal is concerned. If we can get grain for three and a half cents to Montreal I believe that even this disadvantage at Montreal will be overcome. They cannot possibly compete with us going down from Buffalo to New York with so much canal transportation. Then, there is another advantage in so far as the St. Lawrence route is concerned. There are a great many shippers who buy grain and who do not want to ship it to Montreal. They want to keep it as near the vessel as possible so that when there is an advance in price they have the grain ready to load in the vessel. When grain

is in the elevator at Prescott, within twenty-four hours they can have it in the vessel at Montreal. The man who has grain to sell knows that twenty-four hours is quite sufficient to enable them to get the grain to the vessel's side. I only repeat what I said before that I am not in favour of the Port Colborne scheme; I think it will prove a failure and that the only solution is the deepening of the Welland canal. With the present St. Lawrence canal system from Prescott to Montreal I believe there is no doubt at all but that grain will be carried from Fort William to Montreal for three and a half cents a bushel.

The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals stated in his speech that the public have been accustomed to large expenditures and that they are willing to undertake anything that is worthy of consideration. I believe they are. The only difficulty is that the people are finding fault with the way these large expenditures are made. The people know the government are not making them in a fair way. Even in the minister's own department I have seen where tenders have not been awarded to the lowest tenderer. If the minister will go through the books he will find that the expenditures in so far as the canal system is concerned are greatly in excess of what they were in 1896 during the time of my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). The minister is familiar with the canal system. He was born and raised right along the canals. He knows that the canal system is new and that it should not require any repairs. He knows that there is the same number of locks, and he knows that the operation of these canals should only take the same number of men. Let me give a comparative statement showing what the cost of running these canals is now as compared with what it was in 1896. He will see where the money is going to and he will be able to judge whether the people are satisfied with these large expenditures or not. In 1896 it cost to manage the canals —for staff and repairs—$501,442.65. For nine months of the last fiscal year it cost $947,222.66, and if we add three months more, in order to make comparisons with the previous year, we get an additional expenditure of $315,740.82. So, it took $1,262,-963.48 to manage the canals last year, or an increase of $761,520.83. Let me just refer him to one of the canals he knows well—the Williamsburg canal. That canal should not require any more men to operate it or any larger expenditure for repairs than in 1896, because, as the hon. minister knows, it is a new canal. In 1896 the Williamsburg canal cost, for staff, $9,588.51, and for repairs $9,036, making $18,588 in all. That was as much as it had ever cost. It had averaged $18,000 a year. In 1907 the Williamsburg canal cost $16,222 for staff and $35,542 for repairs, or $50,000 for staff and repairs as compared with $18,000 previously to this government coming into power. It has gone up steadily each year. The minister will ask: Why is that? Why is it that he has doubled the number of men employed? It does not require any more men than it formerly did, and yet he has this large additional number of men on. In addition he buys the supplies and material without tender, without putting them up to public competition and the result is that this canal is now costing $50,000 a year. In 1896 the Cornwall canal cost $15,472 for staff and $25,000 for repairs, or $40,000. In 1907 the Cornwall canal cost $38,253 for repairs and $56,544 for staff, or $85,000 as compared with $40,000 in 1896. That is the way that these canals are being managed. They are costing over double as much as they did in 1896. If the hon. gentleman will look into that and have it put right he will save $700,000 to the people in one year in the management of the canals.

The next subject that the minister referred to was the Railway Commission, and I agree with him that the chairman of that commission was one of the ablest and finest men that we have ever had in Canada, and I deeply regret his death. He was a great friend of mine and I agree that it will be hard to fill his place. He certainly did a great deal of good and if he had been spared I am satisfied that he would have done a great deal more good for this country. He brought the commission up to a state of perfection and his loss is greatly to be regretted. The commission, I believe, is a good institution. I think it was a most commendable thing to establish that commission, and I am satisfied that it will do a great deal of good.

As far as the Grand Trunk Pacific is concerned I do not intend to say much upon that subject. The minister stated this afternoon that 955 miles of the road between Edmonton and Prince Rupert is under contract and that it would cost $42,000,000. At that time I saw the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) smile because he had stated that $13,000,000 was all that it was going to cost.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend, when he speaks of $13,000,000 is referring to the part of the road between Moncton and Winnipeg that the government is building.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. gentleman spoke of the portion of the road between Edmonton and Prince Rupert.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend does not want the House to believe that the right hon. premier said that with reference to the cost to the Dominion of Canada of the piece we will have to build?

Mr. J. D. REID. Will the minister state that the portion between Winnipeg and Moncton, 1,806 miles, is only going to cost $13,000,000? As I understand over $30,-

000,000 have already been voted and paid out by this government in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend does not mean to be serious in trying to make himself or any person else believe that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister meant that the piece we have to build will cost $13,000,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is what the Prime Minister stated. The Prime Minister said that $13,000,000 was all that the people of this country would have to pay for the building of this road.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is mixing up principal and interest.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will the Prime Minister now state what he meant ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It has been thrashed out again and again.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understood the Prime Minister to say that the people of Canada would never pay more than $13,000,000 for that part of the Grand Trunk Pacific which the government were to build. And Mr. Blair resigned and said the road would cost $150,000,000 and not a man supporting the government would agree that Mr. Blair was right. The Grand Trunk Pacific was to be built before 1910 but to-day, five years after the Bill was passed, there is only 85 miles completed. The Intercolonial was an agreement at confederation and the people were and are satisfied with it, and I think on the whole they believe as I do that it should be owned by the government and should never pass to a private corporation. But the Intercolonial should be managed differently; it should be managed economically and run in the interest of the country which it is not now. In 1896 the capital charge against the Intercolonial Railway was $55,267,044 and since then we have bought the Drummond County and the Canada Eastern at a cost respectively of $1,464,000 and $800,000. So that the total charge capital charge against the Intercolonial including these purchases would be $57,531,044. We had 1,145 miles in 1896 and now we have 1,448 or 303 miles more than we had then and the capital charged up to the Intercolonial at the present time is $82,744,937. This gives us an increase on capital account since 1896 of $25,213,893, and if we add to that the deficits amounting to $2,696,300.31 the increased capital account of the Intercolonial Railway since 1896 is $27,910,193.31, for only 303 miles additional. But, as the minister has stated there has not been one cent added for interest and if interest at 3 per cent were added we would have another $18,000,000 to go to the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway. It is strange that the Intercolonial should have been operated for so many years and not be able to make ends meet. Of course it labours under the difficulty that it starts from Montreal where it has no connection with roads that could supply it with freight. I was much amused to-night with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) when he stated the day would come when the Intercolonial would be extended not only into Ontario but over the whole length of Canada.

Mr. LOGAN. I did not say that. I said we would see the day when the government road would be extended into Ontario.

Mr. J. D. REID. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) opposed that proposal when the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill was being discussed. The Conservative party proposed to purchase the Canada Atlantic and extend the Intercolonial to the Georgian bay but the hon. member was one of those who laughed at that proposal. Now, had the Intercolonial been extended to the Georgian bay, its lake connections would enable it to compete for the grain from Chicago, Duluth, Fort William and all western points. The Canada Atlantic was then carrying 15,000,000 or 20,000,000 bushels of grain per annum and had it been purchased by the Intercolonial Railway, through rates could be quoted from Liverpool or London to Chicago or San Francisco via Deport Harbour and the lake connections with the western roads.

Mr. TALBOT. Was not that proposal to purchase the Canada Atlantic coupled with the proposition that the government should buy the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Winnipeg ?

Mr. J. D. REID. No. It was proposed to secure running rights over the Canadian Pacific Railway between North Bay and Winnipeg and thus extend the Intercolonial Railway through to the west. Does it not seem reasonable to suppose that if the Canadian Pacific Railway can operate a line from British Columbia to Halifax and pay good dividends, that a government owned railway properly managed and controlled should be able to pay a fair return to the country? In adition to that the fact that we should be able to pay a fair return to the country. In addition to that the fact that we had a government railway extending through Canada would control the freight rates charged by the other railroads. We all know that the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern will sit down together and fix their rates and the people of Canada will have to pay them.

Mr. TALBOT. That is not argument, it is mere supposition.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is not supposition at all. I understood the Minister of Railways to say that the people along the Intercolonial Railway were getting cheaper rates than the Canadian Pacific Railway charged.

Mr. GRAHAM. I made no comparison. I said the rate per ton per mile on the Intercolonial was less than the rate per ton per mile on any other road.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the minister did not make that statement he will find that his predecessor said last year that the people on the Intercolonial were paying less freight rates than the Canadian Pacific Railway charged through the same territory. Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway is not only paying a dividend of 7 per cent but they are making a net profit of 15 or 16 per cent and I am quite sure that the people of the country will be satisfied if a government owned road met its obligations and returned an interest of 3 per cent. And in addition to that the people of Canada would get the benefit of competition right through from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. It is my own private opinion that if we had a government railway right through the country managed by a commission like the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario it would be of vast advantage to all people of Canada and would result in cheaper freight rates.

Mr. TURRIFF. Does the hon. gentleman not acknowledge that we have now the control of the rates on the different railways through the Railway Commission ?

Mr. J. D. REID. I admit that the Railway Commission can control the rates ; but at the same time when a railway company, such as the Grand Trunk Pacific, goes before that commission in order to have its rates approved, what is the result ? It says to the commission : There is $50,000,000 of stock which the people of this country have bought, and we have to earn dividends upon it ; you should not put the rates down so that we cannot earn those dividends. As the hon. gentleman knows, not a dollar has been paid for that $50,000,000 of stock, and the people of this country have to pay dividends on $50,000,000 of watered stock which they would not have to pay if the railway were built by the government, and honestly built. Will the hon. gentleman name one road that has not a certain amount of watered stock ? If the Intercolonial Railway was extended to British Columbia, its earnings would not have to pay dividends on watered stock, and the rates could be kept down to a fair basis.

Mr. TALBOT. Has the Canadian Pacific watered stock ?

Mr. J. D. REID. It has a certain amount.

Mr. TALBOT. How much ?

Mr. J. D. REID. $25,000,000.

Mr. GORDON. When the Railway Commission scaled the rates down and fixed them on a basis proportionate to the rates from Chicago to the sea-board, did they take into account watered stock ?

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not know what they did, because I have not seen their report ; but if the hon. gentleman were on that commission and knew that the watered stock was in the hands of the public, as a fair-minded man he would have to figure on the railway earning a dividend on that stock.

Mr. GORDON. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in his contention. The rate from Chicago was represented as 100 per cent, and the rates fixed for the different sections were proportionate to that rate, and they were fixed irrespective of any watered stock.

Mr. J. D. REID. They had to figure on a basis that would pay a fair remuneration on the capital as it existed. I am not complaining that the people along the line of the Intercolonial Railway are getting low freight rates. I am glad to see them getting them, and I would be glad if it were possible for them to get lower rates. I do not even want to see the Intercolonial pay any interest on its cost ; I think the people of the maritime provinces are entitled to have an advantage from the Intercolonial Railway, because they have contributed to the canals in the other provinces. But I contend that the Intercolonial Railway does not get its proportionate rate on any freight it gets from the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway ; it has to take whatever these railways choose to give it. This is the way in which the Intercolonial Railway loses money. Then, the operating expenses of all railways last year were 70·7 per cent of their earnings. The operating expenses of the Canadian Pacific Railway were 63·6 per cent ; those of the Grand Trunk were 69 per cent ; but those of the Intercolonial were 95 per cent, or 25 per cent more than the average of all other roads, 32 per cent more than those of the Canadian Pacific Railway and 26 per cent more than those of the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does my hon. friend see the weakness of his argument ? That is a comparison between expenses and receipts, and if the comparison does not hold good, on his own argument, it is largely because the receipts from the rates charged are less than those of the other roads, and consequently the charges for management must be proportionately larger.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not understand the hon. gentleman at all. I also want to say, so far as management by a commission is concerned, that the hon. gentleman knows that the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway is managed by a commission, and has been managed satisfactorily. The government does not interfere with it in any shape or form.

Mr. GRAHAM. Nonsense.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. gentleman knows that if there has been any interference, his own friends in Toronto would call attention to it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not questioning the wisdom of the management; but if the hon. gentleman says that a commission of that kind is removed from political influence, his judgment is wrong.

Mr. J. D. REID. Unless my hon. friend can give some instances, I must certainly disagree with him. If the Intercolonial Railway were put under a commission, and that commission were allowed to run it as they thought best in the interests of the country, I believe it would show a different result. I certainly feel that it should be. I am glad that a pension fund has been established for the employees on these roads. They are all good men; they must be good men in order to fill the positions they hold; and men who have served in dangerous positions in the train service certainly deserve to be looked after in their old age. That is a principle to which every one will agree and when the pension fund was proposed in this House there was not a man who objected to it. I hope that next year the minister, or if we have an election, his successor, will be able to make a better statement not only with reference to the railway but also with reference to the canals.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). I should not have spoken this evening had it not been for a rather peculiar position that develops in connection with the speech of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart). The country will be surprised to learn that hon. members opposite do not stand for the principle of government ownership of railways. There has been a great misunderstanding on this point, if the hon. member for Lanark is right to-night. If the leader of the Conservative party (Mr. R. L. Borden) has not since the announcement of his Halifax platform, advocated a policy for his party calling for the construction of a transcontinental railway by the government when he attained power, which involved to the fullest extent the principle of government ownership of railways, there has been a great delusion throughout the country. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) contradict my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) because surely no hon. gentleman here, who is aware of the events of the last nine months, does not know that the Conservative party have been irrevocably committed to the principle of government ownership of railways and the extension or the construction of a government railroad from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The policy of government ownership and operation of telegraphs and telephones was also propounded expressly and clearly.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Do the Conservative party stand for that policy to-day? I regret that the leader of the opposition is not present to inform the House and the country whether or not we have all been under a delusion in this respect or whether, after the period of incubation has passed, it has been discovered that the platform is one which should be abandoned and which the Conservative party do not wish the people to regard as their policy. Although the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) said there were no express words in the Halifax platform stating that the policy of the Conservative party was government ownership of railways and the construction of a government transcontinental railway, surely the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) did not know what his leader had said in regard to this subject, because I am sure no one would accuse of him of desiring to deceive the House. He must have been mistaken. No one can seriously believe after the events of the last six months, that the Conservative party has not committed itself to the policy of constructing within the next five, six or ten years, a railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific which would be entirely owned and operated by the government. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) speaking in Halifax on February 21 last committed his party absolutely to that policy and he has since referred to it frequently at different places throughout Canada. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I beg to read to the House the words of the leader of the opposition at Halifax. He said:

> Whether or not state ownership and operation of railways can be made a success in Canada remains to be determined. State ownership is repeatedly challenged because of incompetent or corrupt administration, and there does not seem to be much argument against it. Let us not forget that all private enterprises afford instances of failure or incapacity. The denial of our capacity to operate successfully a great public railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific seems no less than the denial of our capacity for self-government. Speaking for myself, I believe that state ownership is no more to be condemned for errors of administration than is the general principle of self-government. The remedy is to amend the methods.

Then he deals with the Intercolonial Railway:

> The Intercolonial Railway has suffered from lack of business management, from lack of discipline, from partisan use and partisan interference. The remedy seems an obvious one. Let us place our government railways under an independent commission and select for that purpose the best available person or persons with the requisite knowledge and experience. The commission should be accorded a status similar to that of the general Railway Commission of Canada. It would demonstrate to our satisfaction in a very few years whether

or not operation of government railways can be carried on honestly, efficiently, with proper discipline and by business methods. Personally I do not doubt the issue.

A Canadian has made state ownership and operation successful in Australia. The Ontario government railway commission has a successful record of good business management and business results. I do not overlook the necessity of safeguarding the interests of the whole country by proper provision for the continuance of any existing rates which may be essential for the development and progress of commerce between the maritime provinces and other portions of Canada.

WE STAND THEREFORE FOR: THE OPERATION AND MANAGEMENT OF OUR GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS BY AN INDEPENDENT COMMISSION, FREE FROM PARTISAN CONTROL OR INTERFERENCE.

These words are put in large letters in this Conservative paper from which I am reading; they are capitalized in order to emphasize the fact that the leader of the opposition stood for the government operation of railways. Mr. Borden continued:

In 1903, and again in 1904, we advocated the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the shores of the Georgian bay. We believed that policy sound, and that the government of Canada should have acquired and developed the Canada Atlantic Railway as part of the Intercolonial instead of permitting it to pass into the hands of one of the great railway corporations. That opportunity having passed, I believe it better first to demonstrate the possibility of efficient and successful business management in the operation of the 1,700 miles of state railway which Canada now possesses. When that demonstration shall have been successfully made, and when the interests of Canada, and especially our great west, shall render necessary the construction of another great transcontinental railway, I do not doubt that the country will be ready and the Conservative party then in power will be prepared to extend a successful system of government railways to the great provinces of the west.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I am glad to hear the 'hear, hear's' come from these gentlemen at last, whether it is from the fact that every little rainbow means that they hope to get back to power some day or whether they are hailing the clear announcement of this policy to which I know at least some gentlemen opposite did not wish their leader to commit them, I do not know, but I am glad to see that some hon. gentlemen have come to life since the astounding announcement made by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) in regard to this important subject.

I rose primarily for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the peculiar position taken by that hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) speaking as chief critic of the opposition in regard to railway matters. Apparently the hon. gentleman was not aware that his leader had gone as far as he has gone upon this question. I doubt whether the hon. member for South Lanark would follow his leader that far. Yet, the leader of the opposition has declared himself in favour of the construction of another transcontinental railway by the government of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the road to be operated as a government road. Let us have no further misunderstanding on that question. Here is a clear issue between the parties; and, so far as I am concerned, I am very glad to follow a leader who does not believe that that is the best policy for the country. On this side, we have regard for the investment which the people of this country and other countries have made on the faith of our possibilities and of our railway development. We believe in the encouragement of private enterprise, not only in regard to railways but in regard to other matters. We believe in the proper regulation and control of these combinations of private capital by means of the Railway Commission instituted by this government. That is our position. The contrary attitude is one which would discourage pluck and industry on the part of the Canadian people. I am glad of the opportunity to point out that the issue has been clearly defined by the leader of the opposition. Whether all the gentlemen who sit behind him agree with him on that subject or not, time alone can tell. From every part of the country there are indications that our people believe in the pluck, industry and self-reliance of Canadians working out these things along individual lines, instead of by a paternalism which would ask the government to inaugurate everything for the advancement of the country. Sometimes the Intercolonial is spoken of as a railway built by the government because of admiration for the principle of government ownership. If the Intercolonial is the property of the government, that fact is due to a pure accident of history; it is not because the fathers of confederation thought that government ownership and control was better than private ownership and control. Everybody who has read the history of confederation knows that. The reason why the government provided this means of communication between the provinces down by the sea and central Canada was that it was deemed necessary to bring these provinces into direct communication. The object was not to declare a conclusion with regard to government ownership but to provide a bond for confederation. Since the present government came into power, we have listened, year after year, to the criticisms of details by hon. gentlemen opposite. We are told that the railway is mismanaged, that there have been partisan dealings in the management and many other complaints. One thing is sure—had it not been for the action of this government in

providing the last link of this railway between Quebec and Montreal, the greatest possible handicap on the maritime provinces would have been continued down to this day. Let me give an illustration: It was easy for those living in the western provinces to send their wares eastward, for the Grand Trunk carried them to Lévis and made connection there with the Intercolonial, and the freight rates given by the Grand Trunk to Lévis in combination with those of the Intercolonial were such as to make it possible for the western shipper to send flour and other products to the maritime provinces. But when it came to the Nova Scotia miner who wanted to send his coal to Montreal during the seven or eight months when he cannot send it by water, he had to send it to Lévis and thence by the Grand Trunk to Montreal. But the rates over the two railways were so excessive that it was impossible for the Nova Scotia coal mines to deal with Montreal. And the same was true of our iron industries and others that are the staples of our industrial life in the maritime provinces. But this extension of the Intercolonial that was made soon after the present government came into power enabled our industries in Nova Scotia to do a substantial business with the central portion of Canada. But for this extension made by the government, these industries would have been stagnant. In Nova Scotia the business people recognize that the government have done more in handling the Intercolonial in the interests of the whole of Canada than was done in the history of the country up to that time. While on my feet, I desire to refer to one other point. I know, from examination of the conditions, that the local rates in the maritime provinces along the line of the Intercolonial are higher than those of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway at least in certain classifications. Of course, the rates vary according to the classification. On some classifications the rates for short hauls are lower on the Intercolonial than on other railways and on others they are higher. But, where we have got results as intimated by the minister, is that the Intercolonial has always given to the staple products of the west a favourable rate to enable them to reach the maritime provinces. Go through the freight rates and you will find that the people of the maritime provinces take from Ontario almost all the articles that are brought in and that are in daily use. In the olden times, these things came from the United States. The reason is not so much the tariff as it is that the Intercolonial, recognizing its position, has favoured the carrying of these articles from Ontario to the maritime provinces. The Intercolonial in that way is playing the part intended by the fathers of confederation. The result is that the freight rates on the long hauls are less than are paid on the other railways. But in most of the short hauls in the maritime provinces, the freight rates are relatively higher.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not so on wheat. I remember a calculation which was made here some years ago—I think in 1904—when it was figured out that the Canadian Pacific Railway was charging a higher rate for carrying grain 400 miles than the Intercolonial was for about 900 miles.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. That only proves what I am saying. We do not ship wheat in the maritime provinces. The only wheat that comes there from abroad, comes from the western provinces, and it is these provinces which have the advantage of this rate and the encouragement of interprovincial trade. We hear now and then various panaceas suggested—the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the wheat fields of the west and all that kind of thing. Speaking for myself, I would rather see the extension of the great transcontinental railways into the province of Nova Scotia. We have the Canadian Pacific Railway at St. John and will have the Grand Trunk Pacific at Moncton in a year or two, but in my province we have only the Intercolonial Railway, and I would rather welcome the extension of these big transcontinental lines down into the province of Nova Scotia, which is the front door of this country, and to which these great lines ought to come. The people of Nova Scotia look forward to an early time when these great transcontinental railways will make use of the ports and harbours in our province for transhipment of the trade of the west across to the old world. I must apologize for taking up the time of the House at this late hour. I congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Railways on the very able, clear and interesting presentation of facts in connection with his department which he has given us this afternoon.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I am not going into any argument to show how far either party has committed itself to government ownership or that one party is in favour of and the other against it, but what I want to point out is that the whole presentation of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Macdonald) was in favour of government ownership. He has maintained that government ownership, as exercised by the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from Quebec to Montreal, has done great things for his province.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My reason for taking that position was that this extension was simply completing the terms of continuous connection between the maritime provinces and the west

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And also destroyed the ruinous freight charges which until then prevailed and which the extension of the Intercolonial Railway did away with. Another suggestion he broached was that the great transcontinental lines, which he imagines originated in the west, should be extended to the maritime provinces. But I would adocate the converse of that. Why should not the Intercolonial Railway be extended to the west? Years ago I pointed out that the Rainy River road should have been kept for the Intercolonial and that the Canada Atlantic should have been acquired and linked with the Mackenzie and Mann system as a government system. Had that policy been adopted, the Intercolonial Railway would years ago have been well into the west and accomplished the very things the hon. gentleman wants. The hon. gentleman pointed out how a railway could be a political road and be of great service in binding together the country. In that he suggested that the state should own the railway. The best railway service in the world is a railway service that is national. I shall be able to prove that in a very little time. But before proceeding to do so, I wish to refer for a moment to my venerable friend or perhaps I should say my antediluvian friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart). I did not like to hear him repudiate government ownership in railways, especially as he at one time administered the Intercolonial Railway. The position he took in that respect is not in accord with his views regarding our canals. He said that our canals were the great regulators of freights and in this way were of great importance in connection with the solution of our transportation problem. But he must know that the improvement of our waterways has been opposed at all times by the private owned railways and the great impediment to the extension and building up of our canal system has been the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. These companies have been the enemies of our canals, and no man ought to know that better than the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart). But in those countries where there are state owned systems of railways, the railway system is complementary to the canal system. The hon. member for Lanark spoke about canals being built in Germany. It is true that Germany is building a great canal system. Eight hundred miles of canals are being built in Germany to-day but they are being built in conjunction with a state owned system of railways. The only way Canada will solve the transportation problem will be on the lines of a national ownership of railways. When the hon. member for Lanark said he was in favour of state owned canals, he should, to be logical, have said that he was in favour of state owned railways as well, and the two working together will give the best system of transportation. Many hon. gentlemen in this House to-night have repudiated the nationalization of railways but I did not hear the Minister of Railways do so. He did not propose to abandon the Intercolonial Railway or turn it over to the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have not heard any one propose to do away with the national ownership of the Intercolonial Railway; but if we are not prepared to do away with it, we are justifying the principle. I am not here to justify the principle of the public ownership of the Intercolonial Railway for any political reason but on the ground that it is a great force in the solution of the transportation problem and it ought to be extended and kept alive on that basis. As regards this question of nationalization, which so many hon. gentlemen seem afraid to touch, it was up in the British House of Commons less than three weeks ago. That proposal was made in the British parliament and the Rt. Hon. Lloyd George practically accepted the principle. He agreed that the motion should go through. It was adjourned after debate, but, as a matter of fact, a representative of the government, one of the most progressive men in England and a Liberal at that, practically admitted that the great question in England to-day is the nationalization of railways and that the time has come when a commission must be appointed to investigate that question and to lay all the facts before the country. I am going to read a few of the things that was said in the House of Commons in that debate. My extracts will be short. They are from the 'Times' of February 12. What came out in that debate will throw a lot of light on the transportation problem on this country and on the attitude of hon. gentlemen in this House who not only denounce public ownership but regard it as some kind of a heresy that all honourable men ought to avoid.

Mr. W. ROCHE. Which railway is it proposed to nationalize?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Every line of railway in Great Britain. The gentleman who introduced that motion was Mr. Hardie and this is his motion:

> That in view of the widespread complaints on the part of traders, agriculturists and the general public in regard to railway charges and facilities and particularly with regard to the preferential treatment of foreign goods, the time has come to consider how far these evils can be removed by state ownership of railways as foreshadowed by the Regulation Act of 1844.

I purpose reading just a few sentences from the speeches which were delivered in that debate. Mr. Hardie said:

> A preference was given to foreign producers which handicapped our farmers terribly. Meat, dairy products, fruit and vegetables from France and Denmark were conveyed to our markets at something like a third of the charges made to home producers, and in addition to that, rates generally were higher in

Great Britain than on the state-owned railways of Europe.

That is to say that the rates are immeasurably lower and that a comparison between private and state-owned railways is altogether in favour of the state-owned railways. This applies to the producer and the consumer alike. The prices of food products to consumers have been greatly reduced by reason of the cheap rates which the state-owned system has given.

Mr. W. ROCHE. Are any railways enumerated ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, I will come to that in a short time. Then Mr. Lloyd George, in discussing this question, said :

Who were the men who had nationalized the railways in Germany? The man who had nationalized the railways hated and fought socialism. Prince Bismark was not a member of the labour party. Prince Bismark considered the question purely from the point of view of the state of Germany. The thirty years of experience of Germany had proved his plan a colossal success.

The President of the Board of Trade, Lloyd George, on the responsibility of his office, speaking in England, where men, had arisen in the House of Commons to protest against the high rates that prevailed there cited the case of Germany where they had nationalized the roads and had made it an immense success. Germany has the cheapest and best system of transportation in the world and it is because it has been nationalized, because it has been made complementary to the water and canal systems of the country. We have here the President of the Board of Trade making the confession in the British House of Commons that Prince Bismarck, who was no socialist, who was the enemy of socialism but who was a far-seeing man had the foresight to regard the transportation question from the national point of view and that Germany, following his leadership, had agreed to make it national in every sense of the word. They have made it the cheapest and best system of transportation in the world and a system of transportation which in practice has been in the highest interest of that country.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Has my hon. friend any of the freight rates which are charged on these German roads?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am purposing now to give some quotations from this speech.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I would suggest that while the hon. gentleman is doing that he should give some particulars as to the wages paid to the employees.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. My hon. friend might let me make my own speech. He can give the facts that he wishes to have brought out. I am going to deal with this question from the point of view that presents itself to me. I do not wish to be uncomplimentary to the hon. gentleman but I wish to present the case in my own way. Lloyd George went on to say :

In Germany the railways have been used as an instrument for the developing of German industry and fighting foreign industry. It is a formidable weapon, much more formidable, in his judgment, than the tariff.

There is another thing that the nationalization of railways has done for Germany. German goods to-day hold the leadership in many foreign markets and it is because the German railways are used to encourage the export of German goods and to give a preference to the raw products of other countries that are necessary for the building up of the industries of Germany. All this has been brought about by this national policy in regard to railways. Germany to-day is the terror of other manufacturing countries and especially of England. Every day the cry in England is the success of German trade in other countries. They have these national railways in Germany, they have the lowest freight rates and the government, controlling railways, use them to hold up, Germany's foreign trade. There is this other consideration which I mentioned in a recent argument I made on state-owned railways and it is that there is no discrimination wherever there is a state-owned railway system. The great evils that are prevalent in the United States to-day in regard to over-capitalization and in regard to monopolies in certain of the great necessaries of life have been created by the discrimination of railways. The nationalization of railways in all these countries of Europe has prevented discrimination. There is no discrimination in these countries. There is no discrimination against some special town or interest or anything of that kind. In the United States railway discrimination has ruined certain industries and certain sections of the country, but where there is nationalization of railways there is absolute equality and there can be no taint of discrimination of any kind whatsoever. Then Mr. Lloyd George went on to say :

Germany and other countries have been mentioned. The Italian railways were a bad example in regard to nationalization. There was room for improvement at the time that these railways were nationalized.

There is an hon. member in this House who came back from a trip to Italy and who said : Maclean, when I was in Italy I was over the national railway system there and I never saw such an abominable system. The fact is that Italy only nationalized her railways quite recently, and the abominable roads that have just been taken over were the roads this gentleman was travelling on. There has been a marked

improvement in the railway system of Italy since the railways were nationalized. Mr. Lloyd George concluded by saying:

It was forty years since the last inquiry and he thought the time had come for another inquiry into the whole question.

And in that statement the President of the British Board of Trade had the support of his party. Mr. Lloyd George has more recently stated that all the arguments are in favour of a reduction of rates and in favour of state owned railways. That has been the experience the world over. European countries are reaping a large income from their railways. When a man gets up in this House and says that state ownership of railways is a heresy, I say the facts are all against him. The solution of the transportation problem in Canada can only come from at least one national railroad competing with the others. I hope the day is not far distant when the Intercolonial will be extended to the west and will reach Toronto, the Niagara river, the Detroit river, and the Georgian bay where freight originates. There are a lot of very clever friends of public ownership who say that they believe in the principle but they always take good care to see that public ownership gets the lean end. In this country we have a certain amount of nationalization of telephones and telegraphs, but it is always at the lean end where there is no business and where the intention is to accommodate shipping or something of that kind. We have aided in the experiment of an imperial cable service across the Pacific, but why don't we have a national cable between Canada and England where it would pay ten times over. We tried the nationalization of railways at the lean end down in the maritime provinces and for a political reason. Let us try it for a commercial reason and you will see how we will succeed. True the Intercolonial Railway was built for a political reason but let us administer it on business principles. There is no reason why we cannot apply business principles to a railway which has been built for political reasons. I hope the Minister of Railways will try that. If the Intercolonial is extended to Toronto or to the Niagara river or the Detroit river or the Georgian bay and gets in touch with the canal system of Canada, it will be a paying proposition and it will be regulative of the other railways. Those who throw stones at the idea of state owned railways have not the facts on their side. The growing idea of the word is the nationalization of railways. Lord Salisbury epitomized the whole question when he said that all diplomacy and all politics to-day centred in the railways because railways were turning the whole world upside down and making all the changes in existing civilization. No country that has adopted state owned railways has abandoned the principle; every country is extending it. And so it is with the nationalization of telegraphs and telephones. The appalling demoralization which exists in the United States to-day is due to the great financial errors committed by men who sought to control the railway systems of that country and not to serve the people. Government ownership of railways is based upon the principle of giving service to the public; private ownership of railways is based on the principle of aggrandizement and of paying dividends on watered stock. Railways should be developed with the idea of giving service to the state and not for the creation of great fortunes and great families and great industrial monoply by the discrimination which railways have been allowed to practise. I tell the Prime Minister and I tell the House that Canada was committed to state ownership of railways in the National Transcontinental system. The Prime Minister is building a railway from Winnipeg to Moncton as a state owned proposition, and while I don't propose confiscation or repudiation I hope to be a member of this House when the Grand Trunk Pacific is made part and parcel of our state owned Interoclonial Railway, and the two linked together. The greatest move in the solution of the transportation problem in Canada would be that the state should acquire, at a low price, the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway that is kicking around the London market to-day. It will never be lower than it is now and for a few million dollars Canada could buy that common stock and own the Grand Trunk Railway. It is not the men in London, it is the Canadian people who use the railroad and who pay the dividends and who furnish the money for the operation of the road. A great national policy for Canada to-day is the acquirement of the common stock of the Grand Trunk Railway and using it not only to control the Grand Trunk but the Grand Trunk Pacific as well, and to consolidate them with our Canadian national system, the Intercolonial Railway. Then we would have a great national system from the Atlantic to the Pacific, one which the people of this country from one ocean to the other would endorse, and which they would gladly pay any taxation that might be imposed upon them to obtain. That is the proposition of the twentieth century. If Canada is the country of the twentieth century, it must adopt twentieth century ideas, and the twentieth century idea in connection with transportation is the nationalization of the Grand Trunk in conjunction with the Intercolonial system and the making of the waterways complementary with a state system of railways. If we had that, we could accomplish what the hon. member for South Lanark spoke of to-night, when he said that the people of the northern half of the continent should control the destinies of

the continent because we had control of the transportation of the continent.

Just for a moment I want to take up another question which has been referred to to-night, that is, the question of passenger rates. The hon. Minister of Railways was good enough to tell us that on the Intercolonial Railway we had 1¾ cents per mile, and on the other railways 2 cents per mile as the average rate. That is a misleading argument, and I will deal with it later on, when the question of passenger rates come up. It is not the average passenger rate that you must consider. I touched the point when I asked him whether that included the free travel. Take an example: A man travels fifty miles and pays 2 cents a mile, while another travels fifty miles and pays nothing; but the average is 1 cent a mile. It is not an average rate of cheap travel that the people of this country want; it is a low maximum rate, which is what the people have in every country in the world where they have state ownership of railways. With a state-owned system of railways the whole object is service and reduced rates. Under that system the unnecessary duplication of railways is avoided. The railways are distributed systematically over the country, and are made a part of the defence of the country. This is the case in Germany. By means of Germany's national system of railways the army can be mobilized, the invader kept out, and the country defended; and at the same time the people get low rates of travel. I do not care who repudiates government ownership in this House. I may be only a single voice on the question or I may not, but I believe I speak for my fellow countrymen from one end of the country to the other when I speak in favour of a new national policy based, not on an immediate nationalization of all the railways, but on keeping the roads we have, extending them when we can, linking them up with the canals of the country when we can, and not being afraid to extend these national roads to the west or to the east. If there are any branch roads in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick that can be linked up to the Intercolonial, I have no objection to that being done. I am bound to accept that principle, especially on the ground laid down by the minister, that it must have a business reason behind it. I am not afraid to increase the amount of capital invested in our national railways. I am ready to expend the money of this country for extending and improving those railways, but they must be administered on business lines, on the principle of giving service. A railway is not to be used to aid a political party or to aid individuals who may be friendly to a political party. Let us use the Intercolonial to improve the service and to give the people of the maritime provinces a better service than any other railway gives. Apparently the evidence is that it does give a better service, and if so, let us extend that service, and extend it across the continent.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to go into a general discussion of this question, but I wish to bring a few questions to the attention of the minister at this time, in the hope that we may have a remedy this session. The minister has brought in a Bill to enable him to increase the number of railway commissioners, and I understand that he is about to bring in legislation to enlarge to some extent the powers of the board and to amend the Railway Act. I want to call his attention to a few points that particularly require amendment. One difficulty experienced is that the railway board does not seem to have according to its interpretation of the statute, the power to make connections between all of the railways in the country, notably between Dominion railways and provincial railways. Such difficulties sometimes arise on electric railways, but it is the same with all railways under provincial jurisdiction. On the ordinary highway, we can go from township to township, from county to county and from province to province, without obstruction, and we should have the same facility of movement on the highways provided for the people in the shape of railways. Where two railways pass through a town, one a provincial and the other a Dominion railway, there should be connection between the two railways and interchanging facilities should be provided. On the Galt, Preston and Hespeler electric railway there are five towns and through each of these towns either the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway passes and while the citizens have facilities on the Dominion railways they desire to have a complete connection between the electric system and the two trunk lines, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. The railway board is doubtful as to their power to order connection between the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific Railways and this electric railway system. I want the minister, in amending the Railway Act, to see that efficient provision is made to enable the board, either singly or in conjunction with the provincial railway board, to compel connections between such railways and to afford to the people proper opportunities for shipping their freight. The sections dealing with the question are 228, which provides for action by the railway board in regard to some of these matters, and section 8 which provides what shall be the effect of one railway crossing another. Very slight amendment to these two sections would probably bring about the desired remedy.

Then the railway board does not appear

to have sufficient scope in regard to the prevention of accidents. A great many accidents occur on our railways. The present Act provides that when an accident causing personal injury or loss of life occurs notice shall be given to the board and the board may investigate. It also provides a penalty in case the railway company does not give prompt notice of such matters. But the Act does not provide any means by which the board can compel a remedy. Unless the board have the means of bringing about a remedy or making regulations which will prevent these accidents the present regulations are of very little benefit. Accidents caused by broken rails have been amazingly frequent in the last few years; we constantly read of disastrous consequences from this cause. This may occur through a variety of causes, one being, the greater weight of modern locomotives and trains. Something should be done, either by inspection or regulation to prevent such accidents. I have here the first annual report of the Public Service Commission of the state of New York. This commission refers to accidents caused by broken rails. They say :

An investigation by the former Board of Railway Commissioners in 1897 disclosed a great increase in the number of rail breakages on the main line of the various railroads within the limits of this state. Two recent accidents occurring by reason of such breakage has impressed upon the commission the necessity of continuing the investigation with thoroughness and in great detail. Railway companies will, at an early day, be required to give detailed information regarding their rail specifications, purchase of rails, proposed changes in specifications, and all other matters which will afford information to the commission upon this topic.

I submit that power should be given to the board, upon this among many other matters, in regard to the proper equipment of the railway. Not only should the board have power to compel the railway companies to furnish them with specifications as to the kind of rails used, &c., but provision should also be made for an inspection of rails. This is becoming very serious and unless some very decided action is taken these accidents will continue to occur. On the other hand, if the board was given power to appoint some one to inspect these rails, to require that certain specifications should be complied with as regards certain lines of railway, and generally to exercise a proper supervision of this and other matters that might be referred to, such as the ordinary derailment, we would have fewer accidents. Derailment may occur through broken rails or many other causes. The commissioners, referring to investigations they have made as to derailments, say:

Such investigations as this commission was able to make, in view of the time which had elapsed, indicated defective maintenance of track as a primary cause of these accidents, and correspondence with the railways involved showed that the railway officers had themselves reached the same conclusion. In some cases an increase in the track force had already been made, and in other cases the necessity of greater attention to track maintenance was suggested by this commission, and a higher standard of maintenance has been enforced in the localities where derailments have been reported. The result has been that no derailments of this nature have occurred during the last four months.

They also point out there has been under this commission, a supervision of the rolling stock generally. I suggest to the minister that the time has come, now that we are enlarging this board, when we should have a general revision of the Railway Act; I do not say very extensive alterations, but one that will bring it up to date and put upon the commission the duty of remedying these obvious difficulties in connection with our railways. I hope that the hon. minister in bringing in an amendment of the Railway Act will submit provisions which will have the effect of obviating the difficulties that are shown to have arisen within the last four or five years.

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

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. Further consideration of the Bill respecting Quebec battlefields, the Bill respecting co-operative societies and then Supply, taking up the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur).

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 6, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Militia and Defence for the last three months of the financial year ending 31st of March last.—Sir Frederick Borden.

### QUEBEC BRIDGE COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask whether or not the report of the commission appointed on the Quebec bridge has been handed in and when parliament will receive it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Soon; it has been handed in to-day.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER. When may we expect the report of the Civil Service Commission; that has now been hanging for a very long time.

Mr. FIELDING. I am assured by the chairman of the commission that the matter is being pushed as rapidly as possible.

MOTION TO ADJOURN THE HOUSE.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to call the attention of the House to an advertisement which I find——

Mr. SPEAKER. A discussion at this stage is not in order.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I move the adjournment——

Mr. SPEAKER. Under the new rule that is not the proper way to bring a matter up.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. LAKE. When may we expect the returns which were ordered on the 29th of January in regard to the sale of certain lands on some of the Indian reserves. I wish to have the return hastened.

Mr. OLIVER. I was under the impression that this return was already down and I will tell the hon. gentleman on Monday.

Mr. LAKE. When will the return be brought down with regard to the appeal to the Privy Council in the matter of the Canadian Pacific Railway exemption from taxation?

Mr. OLIVER. I will give an answer on Monday.

ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS IN COMMITTEES.

Mr. J. D. REID. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior what position we are in with regard to some of the papers in his department. We moved that several files of original papers be produced in the Public Accounts Committee as we want to examine these files. If I understood the minister aright the other day, the only time he would allow us to examine the papers is while the Public Accounts Committee is in session. It is impossible for us to examine them during the sitting of the committee, and I want to know if the minister still holds that view.

Mr. OLIVER. The position I have taken is that the files are under my charge subject to any order of the House or of a committee of the House, and any order of the House or of any committee of the House will of course be obeyed by the officers of my department under my instructions. Otherwise, certainly I do not think I am justified in permitting the examination of the files by those who are not properly authorized.

Mr. J. D. REID. It has been the custom to allow an officer of the department to come over with the files to the committee room and to allow these files to be examined by one of the members with the officer present when the committee was not in session. Will the minister allow that custom to continue?

Mr. OLIVER. If the committee so orders, certainly, but not unless.

Mr. FOSTER. Which committee?

Mr. OLIVER. The Public Accounts Committee. If the committee orders the files to be brought to the committee or if it orders the files to be kept away from the committee, any order the committee chooses to give will be respected. But the order of a private member in regard to the files would not be warranted in taking notice of.

Mr. J. D. REID. I want to ask a further question?

Mr. SPEAKER. There cannot be a discussion raised at this stage.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am not going to discuss it; I simply want to understand it. An order was made by the Public Accounts Committee for the production of the original papers in a certain case. Will the minister allow the original papers to be brought over to the Public Accounts Committee at any time whether the committee is in session or not?

Mr. OLIVER. I take it that the order of the Public Accounts Committee for the production of those papers can only be filled by the production of the papers before the committee. If the Public Accounts Committee have any other order to give, it will be respected when they give it; but I do not propose to interpret the order beyond its wording.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the First Minister whether we are to go through this whole matter again. I for one refuse to be at the order of a majority of the Public Accounts Committee with reference to that matter. I understood that it was entirely disposed of by the First Minister in the case of the Public Works Department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The matter is new to me, and I will have to look into it.

WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I wish to call the attention of the government to an important matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. The matter which I understand the hon. member proposes to

ask leave to move the adjournment in order to discuss is tenders for a new winter boat for Prince Edward Island. I cannot rule that this is a case within the scope of the rule relating to matters of urgent public importance. It is a matter of ordinary departmental consideration.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me to explain, I think you will see the force——

Mr. SPEAKER. The only thing the hon. member can do is to appeal from the ruling of the chair.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to bring the matter up on the motion for the House to go into Committee of Supply during this day.

## CANADIAN BATTLEFIELDS AT QUEBEC.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 111), respecting the Canadian Battlefields at Quebec.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

On section 10—power to be exercised subject to approval of Governor in Council.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I move that the words the 'Governor in Council' in the first subsection be replaced by the word 'parliament.'

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On the preamble,

Mr. FOSTER. Before the preamble is carried, I want to raise the question which I raised before, as to the Ross rifle works. I think we ought to be informed as to the exact position in which we stand with reference to that factory, as to its right on the Plains of Abraham, and as to what is to be done under this Bill with reference to clearing the plains of incumbrance. I stated the several points before, when this Bill was introduced. The first thing I would like to know is how it came to pass that the Ross Rifle Company ever got a place at all on those sacred plains whether there was an application from the Ross Rifle Company for a lease of any portion of those lands, whether the government was in any way interested in having that factory placed there, and used any influence to that end; also as to the quantity of land that was leased, the terms of the lease, and whether the original area has been extended, and, if so, by what authority, to what extent and under what conditions. The reason I think we had better know this now is that the commission appointed under this Bill will take into consideration the expropriation of lands and the clearing of incumbrances from the lands, which will be attended with more or less expense.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not expect to be called upon to make a statement of this kind, though the hon. gentleman did refer to the matter the other evening. My recollection of it is this. For the convenience, I think, of the Ross Rifle Company as well as the government, the factory was placed there, because the Dominion Arsenal, in which a great deal of government work, notably the manufacture of cartridges, has been carried on for years, is situated at Quebec, and a part of the work is actually done on land adjacent to the Ross rifle factory. A place where target practice was carried on to test the strength of cartridges is situated there; and it was believed to be desirable that this factory should be located in that section. I think that the interests of the factory and of the government were common in that regard. If I remember correctly, the Ross Rifle Company, or Sir Charles Ross, in reality, had received offers from other parts of the Dominion of a free site and freedom from taxation. As the government had land in the Cove Fields which were in occupation partly by the Dominion Arsenal, it was thought not undesirable that this factory should be located there. It was thought not undesirable that this factory should be established there and very little of the land granted was on the level. It is on the slope towards the bank of the river. How many acres I do not remember. My right hon. friend the First Minister says nine, but I think it is about eighteen. I answered the question yesterday as to whether any increase of land grant had been made. None has been made and there is no intention to increase and no necessity to increase the extent.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the conditions of the lease?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is a lease for ninety-nine years with renewal—practically a gift.

Mr. FOSTER. It is irrevocable during ninety-nine years?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think it could be taken over for military purposes, but am not absolutely sure. Any land could be taken for military purposes anywhere. As to what would happen in the event of the Crown wishing to resume possession, that would be a question for the courts to determine.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there nothing at all in the lease which relates to that?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not able to tell the hon. gentleman. It is an ordinary lease. The lease has been laid on the table. It is within the power of the Crown, of course, to resume possession of that or any other property. As to the future, I do not think it would be desirable

to make any statement, because the question is one which would probably be determined by the courts. Therefore, it would be undesirable for me or the government to make any statement, particularly as I did not come here prepared to make any statement on that point. I do not know whether any other points were mentioned by the hon. gentleman, but shall be glad to give any information in my power.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. According to the plan, the Ross rifle factory will have to disappear from the Cove Fields at Quebec, and the Quebec people are entitled to know where the factory is going. They were opposed to the factory being put there. But now that it is there the wage-earners would not like to see it disappear, especially if it is not to be placed somewhere else. It is commonly stated in the city of Quebec that if the Ross factory leaves the Cove Fields it will not be built anywhere else. The public of Quebec city are entitled to some guarantee that if the factory disappears from the Cove Fields it will be established somewhere else in that vicinity. Quite a number of families came to Quebec to work in that factory. A number have built houses and a good many left work elsewhere to come there, and it is only fair that before the factory is removed the government should give these people some guaranty that it will be put up again in that city. Otherwise it will be my duty to oppose the removal of the factory.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. So far as the government has the right to exercise any control, the same argument of convenience which existed at the time the work was undertaken exists to-day, and the government would prefer that the operations of the factory should continue at Quebec. We have very large and continually increasing arsenal works, particularly the work done in the cartridge factory in the city of Quebec, and my own idea is that it is very desirable works of that kind should not be carried on in the heart of the city. My view would be that a piece of ground suitable just outside at a safe distance from the city should be taken for these works. That would be my idea, and I think that would be a proper policy to adopt.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I understand that the government will not actually commit itself. The Minister of Militia says it is a matter of convenience, and he would prefer personally to have the factory in Quebec or its vicinity.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What more can I say?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. The government seems to have a sudden access of sentiment. When the Ross rifle factory was put on the Plains of Abraham—if those are the Plains of Abraham—the same sentiment should have existed as prevails to-day. If there were good reasons for putting the factory on the plains then, those reasons still remain against the change. If the government cannot guarantee that the Ross rifle factory is to remain in Quebec, I shall feel it my duty to oppose the Bill on account of the clause authorizing the removal of the factory. There is a practical question involved as well as a sentimental one. It may be all very well to have a park and see the factory disappear from what people call the Plains of Abraham, but which are simply the Cove Fields where no battle took place. But it is now a question of the livelihood of a number of families in the city of Quebec.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All this discussion is premature. There is no disposition to remove the Ross rifle factory, but a disposition to create a commission which will devise plans, and these plans will be submitted to parliament before any money can be expended on them. The commission will determine what property is to be bought. My hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) says that the battle did not take place where this factory stands at all. If it did not, many of us may have to revise our history, but it does not matter at this moment. If that be the case, there will be no necessity for removing the Ross rifle factory. All this will be opportune when the commission makes its report and proposes to do something. If the commission then thinks the Ross rifle factory should be removed, it will be time enough to consider that proposal. Nothing can be done by the commission until they have made the plans and submitted their report.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. When is the commission to report?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say; it is not even appointed.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The government should have had this information before asking us to accept this Bill. The government should have sent an engineer to Quebec to survey the ground, so that we might know how many acres we own and whether we would have to purchase other ground, and whether it is desirable to purchase the Ross factory or not. Parliament should be in possession of all these facts before adopting a measure of this kind. We should also know the probable cost of converting the plains into a park and the cost of maintaining the park. We seem to be entering into a large expenditure with very little information, and certainly until we have more information I shall have to vote against any Bill of this kind. It is desirable that the plains should be converted into a park, but I am not prepared to vote for any measure of this kind until the information I have asked for is laid before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the question can be shifted as easily as the Prime Minister said, and I am not satisfied with the explanation of the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden). I would be glad to have my mind cleared of doubt as to whether an unsightly thing like a rifle factory was or was not to be allowed to remain within the limits of the park.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Or the gaol.

Mr. FOSTER. The gaol, it is in exactly the same category. I have not heard any doubt expressed in the past that if we were to make a park here, these unsightly buildings would be removed; but the First Minister makes one almost fear that we are going to have a large expense for the making of a national park and to then find that we have in it an unsightly factory with all its accompaniments. I do not think the country would care to incur the expense necessary to convert this into a national park with these unsightly buildings within its borders. I think we may assume that the rifle factory will be removed at some cost to the country. The government has put itself into the position of sticking into a great battlefield, sacred historic ground, an establishment to manufacture rifles. I believe it should never have been placed there and the reason given by the Minister of Militia is the most inadequate that could be thought of. You want to test cartridges and therefore want to have a factory near the Plains of Abraham, in order to test the cartridges.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I said there already existed in the Cove fields a portion of the cartridge factory and that there was a rifle range established nearly thirty years ago, when the Conservative government was in power, carrying on the work of testing cartridges, and that it was a matter of convenience that the rifle factory, which would have to test its rifles should be located at that point and also close to the cartridge factory.

Mr. FOSTER. The reason then was that because a part of the cartridge factory and the testing equipment were there you placed the rifle factory there in order to be near these.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I said it was a matter of convenience to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. The matter of convenience is a small consideration, because if the rifle factory was a mile or two miles away the difference would not be sufficient to justify the erection of an unsightly factory here.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There were already there several buildings more unsightly than the rifle factory.

Mr. FOSTER. Then surely the argument would be not in favour of erecting another unsightly building but of removing these. As it is, a costly factory with costly machinery has been erected and a renewable lease of ninty-nine years has been given; you have created a vested right on the strength of which this factory has been erected and equipped and it will be of course necessary to compensate the rifle factory people for the removal of their factory. I do not know whether power has been taken under the lease to get back the lands. You can of course always take land for military purposes, but I imagine not without compensating the individual who has rights.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No sane man would construct a factory on land of which he might be dispossessed at the will of any government without compensation; so it comes to the same thing, he would have to be compensated. The rifle company will have to be compensated if the removal takes place.

Mr. FOSTER. But there is a great difference between having an arrangement between the company and the government conferring a franchise and a favour and going into a court after years have passed and expropriating. It might have been a wise thing to have guarded the government's position in the contract in that way. It might have been a wise thing for the minister to have put that in the contract, and so far the probably greater cost of expropriation would not have to be met. It is at a time like this that it seems to me to be fully shown what an unwise thing was done by the government in having granted to the company the right to eighteen acres of land on any portion of the Plains of Abraham, being government property, and the site of a great battlefield. Now we are face to face with the necessity of paying for taking away this encumbrance. Is it to be paid by the government? Are they to remove this encumbrance in order to get that portion of land again into their hands for the purpose of a national park? Or is the expense to be taken out of the general fund to be raised by contributions from different governments and from individuals? We are face to face with all these difficulties. It is a situation which does not reflect much credit upon the foresight of the government in getting things into this peculiar condition. To my mind a private company never should have been allowed to put its factory on these government lands.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to draw the attention of the government to the fact that some of the citizens of the city of Quebec protested against the establishment of a factory on this property. In the 'Hansard' of 1903, page 2109, on inquiring for a return, Mr. Casgrain, of Montmorency, said:

I wish to call the attention of the government to the incompleteness of the return made some days since, of the papers in connection with the establishment of the Ross rifle factory at Quebec. The return laid before the House does not contain a petition by some of the prominent citizens of Quebec against granting the site. I would like that petition to be included in the return.

I have no doubt that succeeding pages of the 'Hansard' will show where the petition is referred to here. I wish to direct the attention of the minister and the government to the fact that when they proposed to grant this company a 99 years renewable lease of this land, they had a note of warning from some of the citizens of Quebec who entered a protest.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I remember that very well. I did not mention, however, that all the members of the House of Commons, and the members of the Quebec legislature, the then mayor of the city and all the aldermen favoured the granting of this land to the Ross Company, together with tens of thousands of citizens. The particular gentlemen to whom the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) referred as having petitioned against the establishment of the factory there, were a select few who belonged to a golf club in the city of Quebec, including the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who owned a large hotel there and whose guests were in the habit of amusing themselves on these grounds by playing golf. These were the important people—and important they certainly were—and these were their reasons, because they feared that their amusement in playing golf might be interfered with. It had not occurred to anybody at that time that the sacredness of these grounds, as mentioned by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was to be invaded. Of course we have developed a good deal in the last six or seven years in matters of sentiment, and hence the discussion which has taken place to-day. But I want to assure my hon. friend from Peel that there was nothing more serious in that protest than a kick by a disappointed golf club.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I do not think the government were as guilty as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) suggests. The people of the city of Quebec who know their city very well—the only thing they do is to study their past history——

Mr. TALBOT. That is very complimentary to the citizens of Quebec.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I am not talking of the people of Bellechasse, they are acquainted with modern progress. In the city of Quebec the people know very well that when the Ross rifle factory was established on the Cove field there was no question of sentiment, because it is simply a fact of history that the battle never took place there. The battle took place between what is now the Grande Allée and St. John street. The first battle was between these two places, the whole space could be covered by a five or ten minutes' walk. It did not spread out where the Ross rifle factory is situated and where the French had their entrenchments. I am not quite sure if there was not a small block house there which had been abandoned at the time. There were French troops there, but that is not where the battle took place. The battle took place between the Grande Allée and St. John street and extended as far as Salaberry street going west.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is that territory now built on?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Entirely so; it is the most residential part of the city of Quebec.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Then there was no sacrilege.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. The sacrilege was committed so long ago that there is a prescription. The only part left of the original Plains of Abraham where the battle took place is what is now Saint Foye on the St. John road. The second battle took place where what is now called the Monument des Braves, where the Moulin Dumont was, and which was captured and recaptured over and over again by the Highlanders and the French Grenadiers. That is left almost intact. There is still a field there, and there is also a monument, which was erected, I think, in 1854. So the plain which it is proposed to make into a national park is just an ordinary plain where there never was any battle. It is therefore no wonder that the people and government of Quebec, and even the mayor and city council, had no objection to the erection of the rifle factory on this locality, because no battle ever occurred there.

Mr. J. D. REID. This question is now reaching the point which I expected it would reach, namely, that in the end the government will have to purchase the Ross rifle factory. Now, every person knows that the Ross rifle has not given satisfaction, the government has not been able to use the rifle.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Order; are we going into a discussion of the Ross rifle?

Mr. J. D. REID. I am not going to discuss that. I mentioned it in passing. The factory is now in a locality which will have to be expropriated, and the government are going to be compelled to pay, probably, a million or a million and a quarter dollars for these buildings. The hon. member for Montmagny wants a guarantee that this Ross rifle factory will be placed at some other point in Quebec. This factory is

owned by the Ross Rifle Company. If it is expropriated who is going to compel the Ross Rifle Company to put it in some other part of Quebec? If this Ross Rifle Company once gets their money they are not likely to go into another scheme to manufacture rifles after the experience they have had of the government.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And the opposition.

Mr. J. D. REID. The opposition deserve credit, I think, for showing up the actions of the government in so far as this is concerned. If it had not been for that probably there would have been more money lost than there has been. The Ross Rifle Company will be paid and paid well for their property. The government must expropriate it and they must pay them for a tract of most valuable land in the city of Quebec that they own for at least 200 years. It is practically owned in fee simple. They will have to pay them for their factory and to say that the Ross Rifle Company will ever build another factory is absurd. If they leave that place another factory will never be built in Quebec or any other part of Canada by the Ross Rifle Company. If it is coming to a question of voting an amount of money to pay for that factory I am strongly opposed to it, but in so far as the celebration is concerned, I am strongly in favour of it. To commit ourselves to buy the Ross Rifle factory or to pay one dollar for it is something that I shall vote against and I hope we will not be asked by the government to do that. That is what I was afraid of when this scheme originated to make a park of the Plains of Abraham.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was His Excellency in the deal?

Mr. J. D. REID. In the end the amount that will be subscribed by the people will be small and the greater part of the money required will have to be provided by this House. I think it is unfair that the government should ask us to pay out this amount for the Ross Rifle factory.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I was very glad to hear the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) say that the expropriation of the Ross Rifle factory and the gaol were not necessarily included in this plan. I would like to have him go a step further and say that the expropriation of no properties would be included in this plan if a large outlay is involved thereby. The preamble of the Bill not only lays down the proposition that the Plains of Abraham was the historic battlefield but goes on to point out that 'considerable portions of these grounds are already vested in His Majesty,' therein referring to the Plains of Abraham. It is distinctly declared in the preamble that it is desirable in the public interest to preserve this property. I am one of those who would be glad indeed to see the historic battlefields preserved. I think that every patriotic Canadian would be, but at the same time I think we must have due regard to the ways and means, and if it should turn out to be the case that the expense of purchasing the so-called battlefield would be very, very great, it seems to me, that in view of what has been said by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) that this is not the real battleground after all, the people would naturally object to spending a couple of millions of dollars in buying the Ross Rifle factory and the gaol in order that a park may be made on the site of an historic battlefield, when, as a matter of fact, it is not the battlefield, according to the hon. member for Montmagny. It seems to me that we would make of ourselves a laughing stock in this House if we were to take such a course. I think that the government might well hesitate before committing the country to this expenditure for this reason: When the Ross Rifle contract was made with the government, the contract itself shows that the government compelled the factory to be located at Quebec. Not having been present at the time the contract was made I cannot speak with certainty on that point, but I think I may speak with about as much certainty as if I had been present because one clause of the contract is that the company is to erect a factory 'at or near Quebec.' It is perfectly certain that Sir Charles Ross did not put that in and I do not know of any one but the other party to the contract who could do so; therefore, it must have been the government which insisted upon that condition. There is no man who would gratuitously ask to be bound down to put a factory at Quebec. If he wished to put it there he could do so without being bound to do so, and if he did not wish to do so he need not. The evidence is conclusive to my mind that the government compelled him to locate his factory at Quebec. The contract was signed and Sir Charles was bound to locate his factory at Quebec. This contract is dated the 27th March.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. When did the grant of land take place?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am coming to that. This contract was signed on the 27th March, 1902. About a month later, on the 23rd April, that same year, a report was handed in by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) to council, it was received and an order in council passed on the 19th May giving this gentleman 19½ acres of land for the purpose of erecting this rifle factory. I think that the people of the country, whatever they may think of the original contract with the Ross Rifle Company, will say when you made your contract binding Sir Charles Ross to locate his factory at Que-

bec why did you make a present of 19½ acres of land to Sir Charles Ross in fee because I think there are very few who will appreciate any great difference between granting 19½ acres of land in fee and granting that quantity of land for 99 years at a rental of $1 a year renewable on the same terms. Practically it is a lease for ever at a dollar a year which is practically a gift in fee simple. Why should the government have made a present of this most valuable property to Sir Charles Ross? It was bad enough to give our property away for nothing and it was unnecessary that we should give this property away without one single dollar of consideration because the contract had already been signed and if the government had not given Sir Charles the grant of that land he either had to buy land or forfeit his contract. But, if the government, after having made a present of 19½ acres, in a few years come down to parliament with a scheme to buy a battlefield, which an hon. member from the locality says is not the battlefield at all, and if that scheme involves the buying back of the land that they gave as a present, it does seem to me that those who are the true friends of Quebec, those who are really anxious to commemorate the tercentenary, those who would like to see the occasion made a glorious success should not encourage such a project, and I think we may be pardoned if we feel that we are justified in being a little suspicious as to the details of the plan when we find a possibility of the government buying back at an enormous figure their own property which they gratuitously gave away only a few years ago. Therefore, while I am thoroughly in accord with the proposal in regard to the celebration of the tercentenary of the founding of Quebec and in regard to the idea of preserving the battlefields, this is a practical question and I would like to have, before committing myself to this project, some assurance from the right hon. Prime Minister, if the expense is going to be very excessive, as whether we would or would not be compelled to buy back our own property and that too when apparently this is not the battlefield at all.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand that the discussion thus far mainly is as to whether we should or should not vote $300,000 for the celebration of the founding of Quebec. I am quite in sympathy with facilitating the government in obtaining all measures necessary for granting this money but I must say that I am opposed to committing ourselves to the future scheme of acquiring and beautifying a large part of the city of Quebec until such time as the scheme is got well in hand by the government and submitted in an intelligible way for the consideration of parliament. I do not care whether these lands were originally considered parts of the Plains of Abraham or not. I know exactly what was outlined to us a month ago by His Excellency and others who are interested in the scheme and they included all the land upon which this unsightly factory stands as well as what may be called the Plains of Abraham. If it is as certain and can be shown to parliament that this land can be acquired as a national park at a reasonable sum, I am quite prepared to support the measure as I believe it to be very desirable that we should perpetuate the memory of the great events that occurred there. But I do feel that the government should not ask us to commit ourselves in this hasty way to the large scheme they have initiated indirectly by the Bill submitted to us. There has been a good deal of this hasty legislation and of submitting propositions to us without giving us a reasonable time for consideration. You only have to go across the canal here to get an instance of that, when we were asked to deal with the question of alienating part of the public domain for an hotel and at a time when alrealy a fence was erected inclosing the grounds that we were asked to alienate for the west. Again, when we were asked to vote nearly $3,000,000 for a supply of seed grain for the west, the matter was left so late that we had to vote it through in a hurry and it was only a day or two afterwards we ascertained the conditions which were going to surround the distribution of that seed grain. And now we are asked to vote this scheme without practically any information. The Prime Minister is studiously reticent as to what will take place in the future. We are asked to commit ourselves not to the mere matter of voting $300,000 for a celebration in which we are I believe all heartily ready to concur, but we are asked to commit ourselves to the appointment of a commission which will have almost unlimited powers and which can commit the people of this country to a scheme which might be most undesirable in its results. The clause of this Bill which gives the commission power to expropriate lands, says :

> No land or immovable property shall be purchased or acquired by the commission except with the previous authority of the Governor in Council, and no expenditure shall be made by the commission until it has been approved by the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. That has been amended by substituting 'parliament' for 'order in council.'

Mr. LENNOX. I am very glad that has been changed, but what I want to point out is that we should not now be asked to commit ourselves in advance to any larger scheme than the mere matter of this $300,000, until the scheme itself has been laid before parliament. In reference to the lands granted to the Ross Rifle Company, the Prime Minister thought the other day that we had alienated only 9 acres but I find by a return brought down and which

contains a copy of the lease that the quantity of land alienated to the Ross Rifle Company was 19½ acres. There is no power in this lease for the government to determine it in any way; there is the statement that it may be determined as hereafter mentioned, but there is no power taken in the least for determining it in the hereafter mentioned manner. Let us understand exactly what this lease is. It is practically a complete alienation of 19½ acres of this land. We were told the lease is for 99 years, but there is a right given in the lease for a perpetual renewal for periods of 99 years, and if any hon. gentleman can present a reasonable distinction between a fee-simple and a lease at one dollar a year renewable for ever I would like to hear that distinction pointed out. The lease contains a covenant that at the end of 99 years it will be renewable for a period of another 99 years, and then another 99 years and so to the end of time.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that lease ratified by parliament ?

Mr. LENNOX. Not that I know of. There is nothing in the return to show that it was ever even submitted to parliament. The contract appears to have been made with the Hon. Charles Ross, I do not think it was made with the Ross Rifle Company, but anyhow it was made with the Ross Rifle institution and it provided that the factory should be established in the city of Quebec. Then, within a few weeks after that there was an order in council and this lease was executed and so far as I know, nothing was said by the government about it until the members of parliament began to get anxious and make inquiries. A petition has been mentioned by the hon. member for Peel and I have asked the right hon. gentleman to bring down that petition. It would be very much more satisfactory for us to see it than to hear an account of what is in it as we did to-day. I may say that Mr. Casgrain moved for this return several years ago and the return was brought down without this petition. The right hon. gentleman was then asked to bring it down and he said he would see to it but so far it has not been brought down to my knowledge. I understood there was a similar petition presented to the Senate and I endeavoured to get it but I have not succeeded. It would be interesting to know what this petition says. There is another matter about which we should ascertain the facts, and that is, that the government forced the Ross Rifle Company to build just where they have built. It was not a free act of the Ross Rifle Company, and when we come to expropriate this land we will find that will be an important element in determining the amount we have to pay them. I have here in the return a copy of a letter from Sir Charles Ross portions of which it would be desirable for the House to hear. It was written when the Ross Rifle Company were applying to the government for more land, and to sum it all up, I may say the government was prepared to give more land. An answer was given by the minister to that question yesterday but it was not given fully. The government were prepared to give the land but the mayor or premier of Quebec was not prepared to allow it to be given and so the matter dropped. I quote from a letter written by Sir Charles Ross on the 10th of April, 1906:

Ottawa, April 10, 1906.

Dear Sir Frederick,—I hereby beg to apply for an immediate grant of land contiguous to my present factory. The matter has been before you for a long time and it is a matter now of an immediate necessity that I commence building at once.

In addition to this, the ground asked for is essential to enable me to carry out the policy of practical independence of Canada in the manufacture of rifles, and I trust also of bayonets.

Actual financial loss has been caused to me by the delay in granting building facilities.

I attach eleven reasons to this letter why the government should give me immediate building facilities.

I cannot but feel that a refusal to give proper facilities as working a great injustice on me, since I have invested over a million of dollars in my business and so arranged it that practically every dollar is spent in the employment of skilled and unskilled labour in Canada.

So much so is this the case that with the exception of the interest ($45,000) I remit annually and the costs of material purchased out of Canada, every dollar paid to me by the government has remained in the country.

You will recollect that in the matter of the location of my factory I was given no option.

I was definitely assured by yourself, by the Minister of Justice, and by the late Minister of Public Works, that I should be given all the facilities which I might from time to time require.

So that what the government undertook was to give them not only 19½ acres of land, but practically the whole of the Plains of Abraham, if they desired. The letter goes on :

I was approached by other cities than Quebec and offered inducements to locate there. I was debarred from accepting these offers. My location being fixed, Quebec was in a position to refuse to negotiate, and it did.

Twelve reasons are appended for giving Sir Chas. Ross more land :

1. The contractor was given no option in the location of his factory.
2. Other towns offered him more attractive locations.
3. He was assured every facility would be given him necessary to the fulfilment of his contract.
4. He occupies all the ground by itself available for building purposes.
5. The government itself occupies part of his land with buildings.
6. The government should restore an amount of ground equal at least to that occupied.

7. Extra land is necessary to the proper fulfilment of his contract.

8. Almost the entire working population have asked that the contractor be given more land.

9. The enterprise has substantially benefited the people of Quebec.

10. It has increased the property values in Montcalm ward by 19 per cent in three years.

11. Extensions in the form of one story buildings will not be unsightly or in actual view from the Grand Vallée.

12. The railway to be built to the docks will adjoin the property at present held by the contractor.

Now, I hope that we shall not be put in the position of having our hands tied in the future by anything the government or parliament will do now. It must not be overlooked that Sir Chas. Ross speaks of an investment of $1,000,000, and it must not be overlooked that he did not invest one dollar in these 19½ acres; so that above the value of the 19½ acres we shall probably be called upon to expend $1,000,000. It must not be forgotten that on the very day of the meeting of Canadian clubs in the opera house it was announced in the public press that the Ross rifle people had invested about $1,000,000 in that property. I merely wish to enter my protest, as far as it goes, against committing ourselves to any large scheme. I concur in the voting of $300,000, and I am quite in sympathy with the project of reclaiming the fields of Abraham and St. Foy upon the conditions already indicated and doing whatever is necessary to mark the great event that occurred at the city of Quebec at the time of the battle of the Plains of Abraham and in the following year, and as a tribute to the two great men who led the opposing forces at that time, but far more as an evidence of the happy manner in which the two great nationalities which then contended have become cemented and allied, and are working harmoniously together in the upbuilding of the great Dominion to which we belong.

Mr. SPROULE. On the first evening that this Bill was under consideration I made an effort to get some information. I do not know whether I am likely to be more successful to-day or not, but I would like to try. As I said then, this project contemplates putting the country to considerable expense. We know what the initial expense is; it is $300,000. What the subsequent expense is likely to be we are all interested in knowing. In the first place, the Ross rifle factory is located there. I would like to know what induced the government to give the Ross Rifle Company a lease of that location. The answer which the Minister of Militia and Defence gave was that the cartridge factory was near there. That did not seem to me sufficient to justify him in giving away 19½ acres of government land. It seems to me the relationship between the two cannot be such as to make it important to have one located close to the other. I



presume that cartridges could be carted a few rods or a few miles without very much trouble or inconvenience, and arms, when they leave the factory, have to be transported to various parts of the country. So I think we have not yet been given the whole reason why the company were compelled to put their factory there; but I think the House and the country are entitled to it. Then, why was the lease made an interminable lease, which practicaly meant giving away the land for ever? The trifling return of $1 a year for 19½ acres of land on the Plains of Abraham is no consideration at all, and I presume was inserted merely to make the lease legal. Then, what was the object which induced the government to give away that land for ever? It seems to me that information should be given to the House when this question was discussed at the time. I did not take very much interest in it, not being a military man. I left its discussion to others. This government seems to have the unhappy faculty of giving away land for practically nothing, and then buying it back at a high price. A few years ago it gave leases of timber limits for a mere trifle, and made those leases practically interminable. After a while the government decided to set apart forest reserves, and the lands they selected for that purpose happened to be the very lands for which they gave interminable leases. This proposal involves three things, it involves, first, the voting of $300,000 for a celebration. Whether it be wise or otherwise that we should vote this money, our patriotic aspirations and inclinations would induce us to go a long way towards a celebration of that kind and for that purpose. But I venture to say that a large percentage of the people will think it is an enormous sum. Many farmers in my riding will no doubt ask me: Did you think it wise to vote $300,000 for that celebration? I may say: Yes, we are a patriotic people, and the event was one which seldom comes in the history of our country, and we desired to surround it by as much eclat as possible and infuse patriotic spirit and inspirations into our people. But they may put me a great many questions and it will be impossible to give a justifiable answer why I was prepared to vote this sum. But admitting that I give a good defence and justification, they are apt to go further and ask me another question. They will say that there is involved in this, not only the subsidy of $300,000, but a good deal more. There is involved the cost of expropriation of a large amount of property, part of which belongs to the Ross rifle factory, on which the Ross Company puts a great value, and I would be very likely to have some one indiscreet enough to ask me this question: Is this intended as a means to buy out Sir Charles Ross, who has been struggling along doing something that many people think is absolutely of no value? When the government

want to go to a certain point, they never go directly, but travel around in a zig-zag way to reach it. Is this another effort to reach the point of recouping Sir Charles Ross for what has been to him, I am told, a very unprofitable speculation and a great loss to the country? Is that the aim in view? Is it hoped, through the glamour of this great patriotic celebration, to cover up the deal so that the people's attention will not be attracted to it at the moment? They will only think of it later when asked to vote a large amount for the expropriation. I am told that there is a great deal of other valuable property held there. I am told that, in all probability, if we buy out what some claim ought to be purchased for this park as a portion of the Plains of Abraham, it will cost probably half a million dollars to a million to buy out these other people. Is that the case or not? We ought to know something about it before we commit ourselves to this thing. If we could stop at the initial expense, it would not matter so much, but once we begin we shall have to continue and face greater expenditure in future. I am told that our future expenditure will amount to $2,000,000 to $4,000,000. We ought to know that before we pass the preamble of this Bill by which we will be committed to an expenditure of which we have now but a very vague idea. The preamble reads:

Whereas it is desirable, in the public interest of Canada, to acquire and preserve the great historic battlefields at Quebec, restoring so far as possible their principal features, so as to make them a Canadian National Park.

If any of these lands are owned by different people, it may cost us a lot of money to acquire them. That is something we ought to know more about. Then there is the cost of keeping up this park in the future. We are not told what that will reach. We are told it is intended to make a great national park, and it may be intended to build an extensive museum there, play grounds, monuments and other things that will involve great outlay. We ought to have some intelligent estimate of that outlay before committing ourselves to this undertaking. If it was only a question of $300,000 for the celebration, that would not take long to decide. I am inclined to think the House would not object to voting that amount, but we ought to have some estimate of the future expense before passing this Bill. What will it cost to lay out and keep up this park? What kind of monuments will we erect thereon? We are told that we are to have the volunteers from all over the country assembled there. I hope so, but what will the aggregate cost of that be? That is a feature about which we would like to know something. It seems to me that the conduct of the government has been very improvident all through this matter. First of all, they gave away some nineteen acres which they knew belonged to the Plains of Abraham, and which they knew would increase in value as time went on. We gave that away for ever for nothing, without ever anticipating that there would be a time in the future when we would have to buy it back. That time has come, and it has come quicker than was expected. The government are in this matter following the same policy as they have done with regard to the timber lands in the west. The country will ask the question: Is this a device to recoup the Ross Rifle Company for an unprofitable undertaking? Is that the aim of the government; and by consenting to this measure are we to be told afterwards that we committed ourselves to the future expenditure and therefore are debarred from criticising it?

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I think I can remove to some extent the scruples of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and the others who anticipate that this scheme is broader than it purports to be by the Bill. What we are called on to vote is simply a contribution of $300,000. This is given for a certain work and will not be expended until parliament is given an opportunity to pronounce on the plans. It is just as when in ordinary life several friends make a collection of $2 or $3 each for a present, and the choice of the gift depends on the amount collected. I understand, by the plans of the Governor General that the public contribution raised may be as much as $1,250,000.

It is expected that in addition to the amount to be granted by this parliament, the city of Quebec, the province of Quebec, the province of Ontario, and possibly the French government will contribute, besides private subscriptions which are being solicited by several newspapers in Montreal. After a few months of this propaganda the commission will be in a better position to define the Act and scope of the plan, as its magnitude will depend largly on the amount of money available. The commission cannot bind parliament to any unwarranted expense as it will be seen from the Bill that the commission must before entering upon any work of improvement or construction or any work involving the expenditure of money, submit the plans to parliament.

The title and contents of the Bill do not indicate that the tercentenary feast and the converting of the Canadian battlefields into a national park are to be a joint celebration—the tercentenary has been used as a pretext to boost this park scheme. Why a pretext? Last year it was decided to celebrate the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city by Champlain. The appropriation which is about to be granted was then asked for and would have been given had not the Colonial Conference call-

ed away our worthy Premier, so that he was prevented from interesting parliament in this subject. Only within the last few weeks have we heard of this gigantic plan to be termed the Canadian National Park, or as suggested by some zealous persons, King Edward VII Park. Had not this park question mushroomed, the citizens of the Gibraltar of the North would have quietly celebrated their tercentenary. To-day, the scope of the celebration is to be broadened. If so, why not have on the commission about to be constituted to control the joint celebration, a greater number of Quebecers? Quebec city is most directly interested in these two celebrations. Within its walls the first suggestions was made. Why then should we permit the citizens of Quebec to be superseded by parties who shall enjoy the full credit of the ideas, suggestions and humble efforts of my co-citizens? I demand for Quebec city greater representation on this park commission. Have we no archeologists in Quebec? Have we no historic researchers? What about men like Dr. Harper, Earnest Gagnon, Fairchild, Chapais and so many others whom I could name you who are thoroughly familiar with the historical events of our city. Will these men be left in the shade and shall we permit a foreign majority—a majority of outsiders—less qualified for this special purpose, to rule this commission? It is not fair and equitable. Would the city of Toronto permit Quebecers or others than their own to have the last word in the arrangement and planning of a work similar to the one about to be performed in Quebec?

We of the city of Quebec feel a just pride in our origin and are extremely sensitive to any criticism which might arouse racial prejudices. I am most thankful to my honourable friends for their courteous and business-like discussion.

What name will this park bear? I was pleased to hear the right hon. Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) state in introducing the Bill that a change of name would be a national desecration and an act of sacrilege towards Canadian history. That is all very well but as the commission, when appointed, will have practically a free hand, would it not be advisable to place in the Bill before it is read a third time, a condition that the words 'Plains of Abraham' shall be kept in the name to be adopted for this national park.

I stated a few moments ago that the idea of Champlain in this feast has been neglected. I sincerely trust that the commission will give him more prominence than he has had in the preliminary arrangements.

I have used the word 'scheme' in the first portion of my address. This word may not be the proper one to apply to the proposal under discussion, but has it not been used by several speakers? After the disclosures or more properly the charges of Mr. Nesbitt at the Public Accounts Committee public opinion may suspect, that there is under this park celebration a method of doing away with the Ross rifle factory. This suspicion is based on the rumour that the present Canadian government inspector of small arms has been recommended to Canada by the British war office.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order, this is absolutely irrelevant.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is wandering from the subject; we are on the preamble of the Bill.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I am simply stating the reason why public opinion thinks that under this proposal of a park there is a scheme; and as the Ross rifle question was brought in and I am trying to make the point that the Ross rifle factory should be preserved, I do not think I am going too far out of order. It is stated that the manufacturers of the Lee-Enfield rifle, in which Mr. Chamberlain's brother is interested, brought their influence to bear in suggesting the name of that inspector.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER That is out of order.

Mr ROBITAILLE. At all events this was shown by a letter brought before the Public Accounts Committee in which the Lee-Enfield was recommended in preference to the Ross rifle. This gentleman, by his demands for constant changes in the rifle, involving a great expenditure of money by the Ross Rifle Company in experimenting

---

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman is at liberty to discuss the merits of the Ross rifle on this item.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. However, this gentleman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is clearly out of order.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I see no objection to the creating of a park on this great battlefield, but I see no reason why the commission now being appointed should, in the near future, consider the purchase of the Ross rifle factory. An industry like this so closely connected with war, will not mar any battefield site any more than a fort or a powder magazine. The purchase of the factory will take a goodly amount of money out of the celebration funds, as I understand the factory is valued at $900,000. Under present conditions, Sir Charles Ross would feel justified in keeping the cash and not investing any more money in the manufacturing of rifles. If the factory is not disturbed, it means the preservation for the city of Quebec and for many of my constituents of an important industry and

the continued advantage of the $5,000 weekly wage list paid by Sir Charles Ross. Not only would this be an advantage to the city of Quebec, but it would also tend to allay the feeling of suspicion among our friends of the opposition in relation to this plan. I can assure them that I was extremely gratified at the friendly spirit they showed in discussing the Bill. This contribution of $300,000 is granted provided the words 'Plains of Abraham' be kept in the name that should be adopted for this park. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize my adhesion to the scheme and to ardently support the present Bill and its intention. I sincerely hope that the Prime Minister will take note of the suggestions I have made, namely, a more numerous representation of the citizens of Quebec on the commission, the deferring for some years of the purchase of the Ross rifle factory, and the maintenance on the pages of history of the name 'Plains of Abraham.' I take great pleasure in recommending these suggestions to the support of my colleagues from the city and district of Quebec.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to be a foregone conclusion that the Bill almost in its entirety will become law. To my mind it is a very extraordinary measure. I am not surprised at it, because during my parliamentary experience at least we have had nothing like it to serve as a model. Looking at the preamble, it certainly has a very innocent appearance. On this question I differ from a number of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and I assume a great many on the other side, and I note that very few hon. gentlemen behind the treasury benches have expressed any opinion at all. But innocent as the Bill looks, to my mind it is like a serpent, the sting is in the tail. The last clause of the Bill is the one to which I more especially object. I do not think parliament has any mandate from the people of Canada to appropriate $300,000 to be blown up in gunpowder, to make a big blow out to please the citizens of the city of Quebec. I do not believe that the people of Canada really understand this Bill. The right hon. the Prime Minister in introducing it said that it had been discussed in a great many ways, but it seems to me that the question has always been associated with the one expenditure of $300,000, and the people have not yet learned what that money is for. The general impression is that it is probably all the money that will be required to give effect to the provisions of this Bill, whereas we now understand that it will only be a very small portion of it indeed. I am sure I have no mandate from my constituents to support an appropriation of $300,000 for the purpose of the celebration at Quebec. We must bear in mind that the event to be celebrated took place upwards of 150 years before the great battle that was fought on the Plains of Abraham. The two things are entirely separate and distinct. This $300,000 is to celebrate the first event, the founding of the city by Champlain. Now, it is no unusual thing in this country for cities and towns to celebrate their fiftieth or hundredth anniversary, and as a rule I think the money is provided by the citizens of the particular place whose foundation is to be celebrated. I do not know any reason; I have heard none given, and I have listened to all that has been said in this debate, why the people of Vancouver or Victoria, or Winnipeg or Toronto, and other citizens throughout this country should be called upon to contribute to a celebration in the city of Quebec more than in any other city in the Dominion. I think the people of Quebec have just as good a right to furnish the money for their own celebration as the people of any other city in Canada.

Now, the purpose of this Bill seems to be two-fold. First, to acquire and preserve the site of the historic battlefiels of Quebec. I regret that this Bill has been brought forward with so much haste, that the government has not taken more time to mature a Bill which would give satisfaction to the demands of other parts of the country. Why should all this money be appropriated for one particular city, to the neglect of other places where notable battles were fought, some of them perhaps of nearly as much importance as the one that was fought on the Plains of Abraham, and had some of these battles not been fought probably we would not have the Canada we have to-day. These are to be overlooked; these are to be neglected, and this large expenditure, looming up no doubt in the millions, is to be made in and around the city of Quebec, apart from the $300,000 that is to be appropriated during the coming season for celebrating the founding of Quebec by Champlain. The two purposes then are to acquire and preserve these historic battlefields in and around Quebec, and to celebrate the 300th anniversay of the founding of the city. I do not wish to say anything further about it. I may be accused of a lack of loyalty, of a lack of patriotism. But I take this ground, that I have no mandate from my constituents to vote in favour of these appropriations. If the government desires to know the feeling of the country on this question, a wise plan would be to allow the whole matter to go over for one year, during which time no doubt there would be an opportunity for the people to make their opinions known. If they approve of the scheme, the government would then be justified in carrying it into effect. Before this Bill finally passes, if an opportunity is offered me, I shall feel obliged to record my vote against it, with regard to the battlefields as well

as with regard to the appropriation of $300,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. A few years ago the Prime Minister came down to this House with a Bill to build the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, when he assured the country that $13,000,000 would be the total expenditure in connection with that scheme. According to the best calculations that statisticians could prepare, $13,000,000 was to be all that was required for building the Grand Trunk Pacific. I would like to inquire from the Prime Minister how many millions have already been expended on that road? over $13,000,000, and before the work is completed I have no doubt it will reach $150,000,000 or $200,000,000. In my opinion this scheme will be on a par with that. We are to vote first $300,000 for a celebration. I am in accord with that, because the King, although he cannot come himself, is going to send his son, and I think the country should do everything possible to give him a fitting reception in connection with this tercentenary. The preamble of this Bill commits this country to the expenditure of a couple of million of dollars. The first thing we have to do is to dicker with Sir Charles Ross. This government, after having made a contract, compelled him to put that factory in the city of Quebec gave him what is equivalent to a deed of 19½ acres of land right in the centre of these battlefields. Two or three acres would have been sufficient for the purpose. I understand that he came back last year and that the government were prepared to grant him another 50 acres of land for the purposes of his factory had it not been for the protest of the provincial premier or the mayor of the city of Quebec, in consequence of which the government backed down.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. How many acres?

Mr. TAYLOR. He applied for 50 acres.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There are not 50 acres. There is not a word of truth in that statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand that he made that application.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. For 50 acres?

Mr. LENNOX. Tell us how many acres.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think it was acres at all; a few square feet certainly not more than an acre—and as to its being in the centre of the battlefield, it is on the slope just above the river and is not near the battlefield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I understand that the scheme proposed took this in. This Sir Charles Ross has a deed for 19½ acres of valuable land and he can do as he pleases with it, whereas the fact is that two or three acres were all that would have been required for the factory. I know of a great many larger institutions than Sir Charles Ross' factory is which have not more than three or four acres of land altogether. Yet he has 19½ acres of land which, as is foreshadowed in the preamble of this Bill, we commit ourselves to repurchase, and which comprises a portion of the original Plains of Abraham. If the intention of the right hon. Prime Minister is carried out, we shall be obliged to recoup Sir Charles Ross for the return of this 19½ acres of land that the government gave him for a dollar a year, for his buildings and the good-will of his business. No doubt it will amount to a million and a half or two millions of dollars, and there may be other property acquired in the same manner. I think that if any scheme of that kind is to launched the country should know what it is committing itself to and what the cost will be.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It seems to me that once the preamble is passed it does not matter very much about the rest of the Bill. I have had some correspondence with constituents whom I have the honour to represent, and I have been unable to answer the questions that have been put to me. That is the reason why I have anything to say in connection with this Bill to-day. As far as the $300,000 is concerned to assist in the celebration, while some of us who are representing farming districts may have a little difficulty in explaining our vote, I do not hesitate for one moment to record my vote in favour of it. I think I will be able to give a satisfactory reason for the expenditure of $300,000 in connection with this celebration. But I see that the preamble says:

> And whereas it is expedient to provide for the constitution of a commission for the acquisition, management and control, subject to the provisions of this Act, of the said battlefields.

If that commission is appointed by this government and provision is made for the acquisition of this land, to what extent is this parliament obligated?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not one dollar. The commission can make a report, but the commission is not authorized to spend a dollar for the acquisition of property until it has been approved by parliament.

Mr. HENDERSON. Only the $300,000.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I understand they have no power to pay for any land until a Bill is submitted to and approved by parliament. But, in the nature of things, when it has gone that far, and a commission is appointed for that purpose, I think it very likely that this parliament will be asked to vote whatever sum of money is asked for by this commission. The illustration given

by my young friend from Quebec does not seem to me to have been very happy. He says that the kind of present which they would buy would depend on the amount of money collected. It seems to me in this case to be just the reverse—that the amount of money that is granted by parliament or collected depends on the present we give to the Ross Rifle Company, or to whomever we may give this money. It seems to me that in order to vote intelligently on this matter we should know what it is going to cost us to buy the factory which has been erected by the Ross Rifle Company or any other building that may be erected on that ground. But I have really received the information I wanted, so that I will not have anything more to say. What I wanted to understand was the obligation of this House beyond the $300,000, and I have the word of the First Minister that we have no other obligation. Still, for all that, I think it would have been more of a business proposition if he had laid before parliament some estimate of the amount of money that this parliament would be called upon to pay for the acquisition of the Ross rifle factory or any other building which may be on that ground.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I want to offer a few more remarks. While agreeing practically with some of the things said by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), and in which there was a good deal of truth and common sense, I think that the country at large is desirous of contributing to the tercentenary of Quebec, because it is practically, as has been said very rightly, the 300th anniversary of the birthday of Canada. We all know that the foundation of Quebec by Samuel de Champlain was an event of more than local significance, and that the celebration is a national event, and I am sure that the electors of my hon. friend from Halton will be only too glad to support him if he gives a vote in favour of this project. At the same time, I think that the Bill could be improved. If it is going to be a national park and if the Ross rifle factory stands in the way, why not leave the Ross rifle factory aside? There is quite enough ground to make a beautiful and immense park without touching the Ross rifle factory at all. It might be in sight from some parts of the park, but I am sure that there is so much ground that from the centre or opposite end of the park the rifle factory would not be in view.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Where is there any provision in the Bill that the Ross rifle factory is to be expropriated?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I find that especially in the discussion, but I find also that the commission have powers to be exercised subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No; of parliament.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. This commission is going to make a report to parliament. We might simplify the work of the commission, help the passing of this Bill and assist the commemoration of the tercentenary by putting in the Bill that the part of the Plains of Abraham where the Ross factory stands will not be in question at all. I think there will be enough ground left to make a national park on the Plains of Abraham aside from the property occupied by the Ross rifle factory.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Cove fields are not part of the Plains of Abraham. The Ross rifle factory is not on the Plains of Abraham and not near the Plains of Abraham.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. It may be but it is just as much on the Plains of Abraham as where the battles we speak of are supposed to have taken place.

Mr. SPROULE. We were told in this House that the Ross Rifle factory was to be built on the Plains of Abraham.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, never.

Mr. SPROULE. That is my recollection.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, on the Cove Fields.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. The Plains of Abraham are called after one Abraham Martin, a Scotchman who came over with Champlain. Abraham Martin was surnamed L'Ecossais and he was given that land which was situated outside the walls of the city from the cliffs above the St. Lawrence river down to the cliffs above the St. Charles river. Of course the city has been growing and the Plains of Abraham have been contracting until they have become what is left of them to-day. As a matter of fact the Ross Rifle factory is on what is now called the Cove Fields, but it is on what was originally called the Plains of Abraham. I believe that the commissioners should be instructed, either in the Bill or otherwise, that there is enough ground to make a park of what is left of the Plains of Abraham without touching the Ross Rifle factory at all. Then, I have another objection and that is to the title of the Bill, it is called 'An Act respecting the Canadian battlefields of Quebec.' Why not call it an Act respecting the Tercentenary of Quebec. As it is now, the Bill might apply not only to the Plains of Abraham but to the St. Charles valley where there are battlefields and to that part of Beauport and Montmorency where battles took place,

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What about Montgomery's engagement.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Exactly, it would apply to the lower town where Montgomery was defeated, and I might

mention that the part of the battlefield where Wolfe ascended the Foulon has been desecrated by a railway. Why not make the title of the Bill more in accordance with the idea which is amongst the people, namely, the celebration of the three hundreth anniversary of the foundation of Canada. There is another part of the Bill in clause 1 which is to my mind the most objectionable.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That clause has been adopted.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Can I not discuss the principle of the Bill on the preamble.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. You can discuss the principle of the Bill but not clause by clause.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. The preamble states the reason the Bill should be passed and I think I have a right to discuss it. In this part of clause 1 I find that if the government of the United States or if the government of any self governing colony of the Empire contributes a certain sum——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Unless the commission should decide to reconsider this clause, this discussion is out of order.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I am discussing the general principles of the Bill on the preamble.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot refer specially to any particular clause of the Bill.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I have the right to state my reasons why I support the Bill or do not support the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. You cannot discuss it now clause by clause.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. If that is your ruling I will submit to it, but it is a new ruling.

Mr. LENNOX. Although the hon. gentleman may not be able to discuss a particular clause of the Bill he can refer to it for the purpose of illustrating his argument.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. By way of illustration a reference may be made to a clause but the clause may not be discussed.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I am showing why the preamble should be amended. The preamble says it is expedient to constitute a commission for certain purposes and it is provided that if the government of the United States or of any self governing colony of the Empire contributes $100,000 to the purposes of the commission such government shall be entitled to appoint a commissioner. Now, to my mind this commission should be composed exclusively of Canadians, because this celebration is going to be exclusively a Canadian celebration. We are not celebrating the anniversary of the birth of the empire, but we are celebrating the anniversary of the birth of Canada. I think it would be against the municipal liberties of the city of Quebec that a commissioner from any other colony should be empowered to say whether such a building or such a monument in the city of Quebec shall appear or disappear. It is the absolute right of the municipality of the city of Quebec to deal with that, and this parliament has no right to interfere. This parliament has the right to do what it pleases with the ground which belongs to the Federal government but it cannot intrude on land which belongs to the city of Quebec, and it cannot name any commissioners, much less commissioners from outside of Canada, and give them votes to interfere with the municipal rights of the city of Quebec. Another thing this parliament cannot do, and that is, that it cannot take away land which the Crown has given for 99 years to a corporation or individual without paying that corporation or individual an indemnity, and without going before the courts. I trust the preamble will be amended as I have indicated and that the title of the Bill will be changed.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to express my disapproval of the Bill in its present form. I believe it to be hasty legislation on the part of the government. If they had under consideration this celebration at Quebec then they should have given notice of it not later than last session of parliament, and they should have corresponded with the various provincial governments asking their co-operation in making the tercentenary celebration a truly national one. I do not like the clause which says that any provincial government which subscribes $100,000 or more shall be allowed to take part in the celebration and name a commissioner. There may be provincial governments which have $100,000 to afford for this purpose but there may be others equally loyal who cannot spare the money, and they are to be debarred from this Canadian celebration because they are not financially well to do. I am quite willing as a representative of the people that we should contribute towards celebrating the tercentenary of the foundation of Canada and particularly to give a fitting reception to the representative of His Majesty who is coming to take part in it. But to say that we should adopt a measure of this kind is a different proposition entirely. For myself, I am opposed to the Bill, and I wish to express my opposition to it in the most emphatic terms. I say that the government should be condemned for presenting, within a few months of the proposed celebration, a Bill which will entail on the people of Canada very large contributions. I am not going

into the question of purchasing and beautifying the Plains of Abraham; that is a matter for future consideration, under the amended clause as presented to-day. I wish merely to express my disapproval of the Bill. I say the government should have taken all Canada into their confidence befor proceeding with it. Last year they should have entered into correspondence with the local governments with the view of obtaining their co-operation. Instead of that, they practically say to them now: We are going to have a celebration; if you wish to contribute, you can come in; if you do not contribute, you cannot take part. For these reasons I condemn the government for this and some other clauses of the Bill which I need not now discuss.

Mr. BARR. It seems to me that this Bill is a very objectionable one. I presume the promoters of it had a double object in placing it before the House as they have done. In the first place, it asks for a contribution of $300,000 towards a celebration during the coming summer. If that were all, I do not think this House would object to it, although I for one see no valid reason why the Dominion of Canada should contribute towards a celebration which probably is more provincial than federal in character. But that is only the small end of the wedge. The big question behind it, which probably the promoters of this Bill imagine the people of the different provinces would not take cognizance of, is the probability, if this Bill goes through, that as a result of it many millions of dollars will have to be spent in the next few years. Under these circumstances, with the measure sprung upon the House with such short notice, without the different provinces being notified of it, without the free and independent electors having an opportunity to instruct their representatives how they should vote upon it, I feel it to be my duty to vote against it. We have no idea what expenditure it will involve. On former occasions we were told that the Grand Trunk Pacific would be built for $13,000,000, and to-day we know that it will cost $150,000,000. Probably there will be just as much discrepancy between the promised expenditure and the actual expenditure in connection with this Bill. I do not vote against the Bill because it concerns one province more than another; I do so because of the uncertainty behind it. We are willing to vote a small amount to celebrate the event; the $300,000 is not very large; we could accept that. But at this time in the history of our Dominion, when there is a scarcity of money, when factories are closing one after another, when our Finance Minister finds it very difficult to float his loans, I submit that we are not pursuing a wise course in placing upon the country a burden of several millions, the exact amount of which we have no means of determining. I submit that this part of the Bill should be left over for another year, until some estimate can be made of the amount that will be required. At the commencement of this session we heard it whispered around the corridors of this House that the Ross Rifle Company, having been unsuccessful, were going to unload their enterprise upon the country. If this Bill goes through, they will accomplish their object. There is no doubt that they have the government in their grasp, and they can squeeze one or two millions at least out of them, which will probably pay them for the very bad rifle they have produced and the very bad speculation they have got the country into. Under these circumstances, I consider this Bill to be not in the interests of the Dominion, and I intend to vote against it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for the Bill, and yet I am not voting to interfere with the freedom of any subsequent parliament. We all know it is impossible for a parliament to bind a subsequent parliament; and therefore if this parliament passes the Bill, any subsequent parliament can repeal it, discharge the commission, and refuse to vote any money for the object of the Bill. But I vote for the Bill because it commemorates Samuel Champlain, who to my mind is the real hero of Canada. All the romance connected with the early history of this North American continent surrounds his name and those of the pioneers who founded the first colony in Quebec and the names of those other French-speaking pioneers who settled in the country now known as the province of Ontario. Champlain was Canadian to his finger tips. The visions which he saw have in great measure been realized by the legislation of Sir John Macdonald. Champlain was the precursor of Sir John Macdonald, and these two men, the one French-speaking, the other English-speaking, represent the two races in this country; and what they did went further than what any other men have done to make this a Canadian country and a great country. So I believe the people of Canada will willingly vote this money for the celebration of the tercentenary of Quebec and also to recover the battlefields as proposed in this Bill. But I regard the story of the pioneer and the early settler more than I do the story of the warrior. I do not attach so much importance to the commemoration of battlefields as I do to the commemoration of the early pioneers and founders of this country. What my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) said yesterday about there being two kinds of Canadians in this country did not quite commend itself to me. There is only one definition of a Canadian for me, and that is one who is sprung from the Canadian soil, whatever his origin is, whether he speaks the English tongue or the French tongue,

who is proud of having sprung from that soil, and who would have no other birthplace for his children or his descendants. It is because we are sons of Canada, sons of the soil of Canada, that we join together in commemorating the foundation of our country and in commemorating, if we must, any event, even a battle, if it tended to the consolidation of the country and the perpetuation of the ideas we have at heart. I believe that the people of Canada, from one end to the other, will endorse this proposal to commemorate the battle ground and the early foundation of this country and they will do it in a full hearted and generous way and will endorse whatever expenditure may be made in connection with the proposition. On the understanding that any expenditure must be subject to the careful scrutiny of parliament, I most heartily vote for this proposal, and hope that the celebration will be worthy of the occasion and that the commission will see that the work committed to it is discharged in a way that will commend itself to the approval of the country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Before this item passes I wish to say a word. Some years ago, after the Ross Rifle factory was established in the city of Quebec, there was an agitation started for its removal. That was long before this matter was heard of. At that time it was rumoured that the Canadian Pacific Railway wanted the site for an up-town station, and I found no objection among my colleagues at the time to handing it over to that company. That would have removed many of the objectionable features, would have improved the place exceedingly, and have made a very fine up-town station. There is no doubt that the factory is an eyesore. The first time I visited the city of Quebec and the Plains of Abraham I was disgusted to find that that old historic field had been given over to private residences, jails and there was even a fine hen factory surrounded by a picket fence.

An hon. MEMBER. A government factory.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I did not inquire. At all events that was years ago. When the Ross rifle factory was spoken of, I again protested but was told there was no other spot around the city where it could be established. At that time I was opposed to the rifle factory going to Quebec. I wanted it established in some place inland. The United States keeps their rifle factories inland and so does the British government, and I considered that the safest place, the place most remote from liability to capture, should be the one selected as the site for the manufacture of our rifles. However, it was established at Quebec, and whether it was established on the Plains of Abraham or elsewhere, as far as this House was concerned, it had nothing to do with it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN

I heartily approve of the plan formulated by His Excellency to clear the battlefield of buildings of any description that may be upon it. There should not be a solitary ratepayer in the Dominion who would not endorse such a proposition. The fact that the Ross factory obtained a footing there, before this project was mooted, cannot be allowed to interfere. I do not think it alters the condition a particle whether it costs $100,000 or $2,000,000 to get it out of the way. Figures have been gone into at more or less length, and it is estimated a certain sum will be necessary to expropriate all the buildings and carry out all the improvements.

Mr. FOSTER. How much?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My hon. friend must have seen it in the papers as well as I, between $1,000,000 and $2,000,000. The figures were given by His Excellency, and I imagine he knew what he was talking about. If that can be done, I am heartily in accord with the idea, even though the Dominion should have to bear two or three times the cost of $300,000. I do not think that this is the time, at all events, to raise any objection. Under this Bill every act of these commissioners will have to come before parliament and be discussed and debated. If the object be to condemn the government for putting the factory on the Plains of Abraham—and I think we should all join heartily in that—there is a proper time to carry out that part of the programme. I do not see anything to be gained by discussing the matter at greater length on this occasion. The Ross rifle factory or any other buildings, and there are other buildings by the dozen that will have to be expropriated—all that will cost a good deal, but I do not know that the present is the opportune time to discuss it.

As regards the cause of the celebration, I had a few words to say yesterday. I did not then know that an understanding had been reached by the First Minister with the leader of the opposition that the matter would be adjourned until to-day, and I am sorry I did not know of that arrangement or I would have reserved my remarks. But as I have said I heartily agree that no man deserves better to be honoured than Samuel de Champlain. Let me cite an instance in his life which is not generally known. He was the first on record to show that there should be a Panama canal.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. And a Georgian Bay canal too.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He laid the project before the French government in those early days.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. He should have been called Theodore.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In every sense he was a man of great foresight. He wanted

to lay the foundation deep and strong, all along the shores of the Atlantic ocean, clean from the Canadian borders down to Brazil, of a future composed of the best class of free men that could be obtained from the old world in order that this continent might grow up free from the tyrannies and shackles that were crippling the continental nations of Europe. I shall heartily support the motion.

Mr. LENNOX. I was referring a few moments ago to the tenth section. My attention was called to the fact that before I came in that section had been amended and I assumed it had been amended on the lines suggested by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) yesterday. I would call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the advisability of conforming to what was suggested yesterday. I understand that in the fifth line the word 'parliament' was substituted for the words 'the Governor in council,' but the hon. member for North Toronto yesterday also suggested that after the word 'commission,' in the sixth line, some words should be introduced such as 'beyond the said sum of $300,000,' or words to that effect, so that no expenditure shall be made by the commission beyond the said sum of $300,000 until it has been approved of by parliament. That would prevent any misapprehension.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think there is necessity for that. The last clause shows conclusively that the $300,000, if it is spent in connection with the Royal visit, is to be expended under an order in council; but every other expenditure is to be voted by parliament.

Mr. LENNOX. It ought to be stated in so many words that there is to be no expenditure beyond that amount until it is approved by parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would ask my hon. friend to look at the last sentence of the last section:

And that the commission may, subject to the sanction and approval of the Governor in Council, expend and lay out, for the purposes of the said celebration, such portion of the sum of three hundred thousand dollars hereinbefore appropriated as is authorized by the commission subject to such sanction and approval.

Mr. LENNOX. Up to the extent of $300,000 parliament does not want to control the matter, but anything beyond that we want to pass on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They cannot make expenditures except for the celebration without the sanction of parliament.

Bill, as amended, reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the third reading of the Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. LENNOX. Next sitting of the House.

Sr WILFRID LAURIER. No, no; now.

Mr. SPEAKER. The objection is raised.

Mr. LENNOX. I have very strong views on the question of preambles, and I think this should be recast so that it will be more in accordance with the provisions of the Bill. In fact, I think it would be more satisfactory if the whole Bill were recast so as to deal concisely with the one matter of the $300,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I can see no reason why the Bill should not go on. If the celebration is to be held on July 22nd, the commissioners, who have yet to be appointed, will have not a moment to lose. I do not see why the Bill should be obstructed at all.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I have an amendment to propose which I am ready to offer now.

Mr. FOSTER. The fact is, I suppose, if any member objects——

Mr. SPEAKER. That is hardly so. The second reading was passed some days ago, so that, strictly speaking, the Bill can go on unless there is an amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection, as far as I am concerned, to taking up the matter, discussing it and passing the Bill now; but I do not think anything will be lost by thinking it over until Monday or Tuesday, as the Senate is not in session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It will have to go to the law clerk and the Senate, and there is not a moment to lose.

Mr. LENNOX. I have no desire to obstruct the Bill. I understood that, as there was an amendment, if any member objected the Bill could not be read a third time now, but I do not want to take any technical objection. Probably if I express just what I feel I will have done my duty, and I recognize that as the Prime Minister has decided that the Bill must go through, my effort to delay it would not be effectual. This preamble, I feel, goes far beyond what we should express in connection with the matter that we are now providing for. What we specifically provide for is a sum of $300,000 towards the celebration. The preamble says:

Whereas it is desirable, in the public interest of Canada, to acquire and preserve the great historic battlefields at Quebec, restoring as far as possible their principal features, so as to make them a Canadian National Park.

Subject to certain qualifications, that may be quite true, but it is not desirable to commit ourselves to that unqualified proposition that the park is to be acquired upon any terms. I am prepared to join the acquisition of these battlefields if it can be done on

reasonable terms, but if we are to be held up, as it were, by an institution such as the Ross Rifle Company, I think we should pause before committing ourselves to the purchase of these battlefields. The preamble further says :

And whereas it is expedient to provide for the constitution of a commission for the acquisition, management and control, subject to the provisions of this Act, of the said battlefields.

That is probably less objectionable, having the phrase 'subject to the provisions of this Act.' But to sum up, I do not think that we should go one step to-day beyond providing a fund for the proper celebration of the founding of Quebec upon the occasion of the visit of the representative of His Majesty the King. To that extent I am in harmony with the Bill, beyond that I am not. As I say, if in the end it appears that a feasible scheme can be laid before parliament by which we can acquire these battlefields and put them in proper condition at a reasonable price, I for one will be in hearty accord with it. In saying that, I do not desire to obstruct the Bill, nor to say anything more about it, but to leave all responsibility with the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no fault to find with the manner in which the hon. gentleman has presented his views. The preamble says that it is desirable to acquire and preserve the great historic battlefields at Quebec, to restore so far as possible their primitive features and to make them a Canadian national park. I understand my hon. friend approves of this idea, but he says that he is only in favour of it provided it can be done on reasonable terms. If the terms are too extravagant, laudable as the object may be, he would not concur in it. So far also I agree with him. But how do we propose to carry out this idea ? We do not propose to act without information. We propose to appoint a commission whose duty it will be to inquire into the subject and report to parliament what ought to be done for the preservation of the battlefields, what ought to be done to carry out the very objects the hon. gentleman has in mind. If the bill provided that the money should be expended, as is usually the case, upon the authority of the Governor in Council, my hon. friend's objection would be well taken. But the moment that objection was made to me by the leader of the opposition to-day, and that it was preferable to have a plan prepared by the commission and sanctioned by parliament, not by government, I agreed at once ; I was satisfied that should be done. Therefore when we have a report of the commission that, in order to preserve the battlefields, we should have to pay so much, or whatever the sum may be, or two millions, or five hundred thousand dollars, or whatever the sum may be, then it will be for us to determine whether the cost is too heavy and whether we should approve of the plan.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister has rightly said that we should not undertake the responsibility of the acquirement of these lands until parliament has had fuller opportunity to inquire into the question. But is there still a sufficient safeguard ? I am not a lawyer, I do not know what the word 'desirable' means, but I would think that a thing desirable is something that though we may never be able to overtake it on account of its cost, when you decide whether you are to have your desire met, and you find it will cost too much, you have to deny your desire.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. All we commit ourselves to is the appointment of a commission and the spending of $300,000

Mr. SPROULE. My understanding has always been that when a Bill was reported without any amendment, it is to be read forthwith, but if there has been an amendment it is not the custom to read it the same day. Our rules are clear enough on that point. Rule 54 says :

All amendments made in committee are reported by the chairman to the House, which shall receive the same forthwith. After report the Bill is open to debate and amendment, before it is ordered for a third reading. But when a Bill is reported without amendment, it is forthwith ordered to be read the third time at such time as may be appointed by the House.

Now this Bill has been reported with amendment, therefore, according to the practice of the House, I do not think it can be read a third time to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no doubt a Bill can be read a third time at once when there is no amendment. The reason the Chair asks when the Bill shall be read a third time is to test the opinion of the House whether it shall be read immediately or not. If an hon. member asks that it be postponed to a later date, the third reading can be postponed if the House so directs. I think it is quite competent for the House also to order that this Bill be now read a third time, and that is the question now before the House.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I desire to move an amendment which I was not able to do in committee, having been prevented by a snowstorm from reaching Ottawa.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The question is not that the Bill be read the third time, but whether the Bill be now read the third time.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it is desirable to test the question whether the Bill shall be read the third time, I can put the motion in

that way. I thought the House had come to the conclusion that it should now be read the third time.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I move:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be sent back to Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend by striking out paragraph 3 of clause 1 of said Bill.

I do not make this motion for the purpose of obstructing the Bill, because I am heartily in favour of the principle of the Bill. Clause 3 of section 1 provides that the government of the United Kingdom, or any self-governing colony of the empire which contributes a sum of not less than $100,000, shall be entitled to appoint a commissioner, and such commissioner shall hold office during the pleasure of the government which appoints him. Now if this festivity has any special character, it is going to be a purely Canadian festivity, and I see no reason for the appointment of commissioners from the outside. Of course we shall be pleased to see present any representative that the United Kingdom may choose to send we shall be pleased to see from any of the self-governing colonies any representative to this festivity. At the same time, it is going to be a Canadian festivity, whereas this clause gives it an imperial character, makes it an imperial festivity, or an imperial apotheosis. That is not at all the idea of the gentlemen who started this movement. We are celebrating the anniversary of the foundation of Quebec by Champlain, which is indeed the foundation of Canada, and I see no reason why we should beg the other self-governing colonies or the United Kingdom for money to help us celebrate our own national festivity. This is not a festivity in which Australia is concerned, nor any other colony. I think we should be sufficiently patriotic not to go begging to other colonies or to the United Kingdom to ask them to help us celebrate the tercentenary of the founding of Quebec.

We are infringing on the rights of the people of this country in that this legislation would be ultra vires. How can the government of any other colony appoint a commissioner to act in this country? Which government is going to appoint him? Is it the government of any of the other self-governing colonies? Such an appointment would be perfectly illegal. I do not think that the people of this country can appoint a commissioner from the outside and vest him with rights which belong to a municipality or to the province of Quebec. Suppose all these reasons were not good, and suppose that the government had the right to appoint such commissioners, and suppose that the government of India, South Africa or any colony had also the right to appoint a commissioner, I think that our self-respect, pride and patriotism would deter us from putting a clause in this Bill which practically means that we are going begging to other countries and asking them to come and help with the celebration of our national festival. It is not very long ago that this parliament voted $100,000 in aid of the sufferers by the San Francisco disaster and we all remember that San Francisco, while acknowledging the kindness of the Canadian government, refused the money, stating that they were quite able to take care of their own people. I think that on an occasion of this kind the people of this country who are going to celebrate the 300th anniversary should have sufficient pride and patriotism to spend their own money and not go begging to other colonies for subscriptions in connection with these festivities. This is a festivity which will have to be entirely Canadian and national or it will be a decided failure. Therefore, I think the House should accept my amendment to reconsider the Bill and strike out that clause which is certainly an obnoxious and ill-considered portion of the Bill.

Amendment negatived.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to rule 54 which says that:

All amendments made in committee are reported by the chairman to the House, which shall receive the same forthwith. After report the Bill is open to debate and amendment, before it is ordered for the third reading. But when a Bill is reported without amendment, it is forthwith ordered to be read a third time at such time as may be appointed by the House.

Why do you provide that when it is reported without amendment it is ordered to be read a third time at such time as the House orders and when it is reported with an amendment it is open to debate and amendment? What distinction do you make if it is in the power of the House to order in both cases that it may be read when the House so orders? The general custom that we have always followed has been that if any one objected to the third reading of a Bill which had been reported with amendments it could not be read. It could only be advanced one stage that day and must be left over until another day, while, if there were no amendment, the House could order that it be read forthwith.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the rule is the reverse of what the hon. gentleman suggests. It says:

But when a Bill is reported without amendment, it is forthwith ordered to be read a third time at such time as may be appointed by the House.

If it is reported with an amendment, as in this case, it is within the power of the House to determine when it shall be read.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no distinction then?

Mr. SPEAKER. Bourinot, at page 668, lays the practice down in this way:

When a Bill is reported without amendment, the Speaker puts the question, 'When shall the Bill be read a third time?'

The Bill is either read immediately, or on a future day, as the House may decide.

But when a Bill is reported with amendments the Speaker will propose the usual question, 'When shall the Bill, as amended in committee, be taken into consideration?' On this question the only regular amendment is as to the time when the consideration should be taken, and the discussion must be relevant thereto.

Once you dispose of that fact, if there is no amendment, you can proceed to the third reading if, in the opinion of the House, it is desirable to so proceed.

Mr. SPROULE. Then rule 54 does not apply when it says that it shall only be advanced one stage a day?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is when the three readings are proposed to be taken upon the same day. The second reading of this Bill took place the other day.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved: That the Bill do now pass and that the title be as follows: 'An Act respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.'

House divided on the motion of (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Aylesworth,
Barker,
Bergeron,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Boyce,
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Caron,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Copp,
Cyr,
Daniel,
Demers,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fortier,
Foster,
Galliher,
Graham,
Haggart,
Harty,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Lake,
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Lefurgey,
Lemieux,
Lennox,
Lewis,
Logan,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Maclean (York S.),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McColl,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLean (York, C.),
McLennan,
Major,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Wellington),
Michaud,
Miller,
Monk,
Morin,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Paterson,
Paquet,
Parent,
Pickup,
Power,
Pringle,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Schaffner,
Schell (Oxford),
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Sproule,
Stewart,
Talbot,
Taylor,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tisdale,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Walsh (Montreal, (St. Anne),
White,
Zimmerman.—90.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Barr,
Blain,
Christie,
Henderson,
Herron,
Jackson (Elgin),
Lalor,
Owen,
Staples,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington.)—11.

Motion agreed to, and Bill passed.

Mr. TALBOT. I would like to know if the vote of the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) was recorded as often as he stood up to vote.

Mr. BARR. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that I did not stand up at all when my name was called out the first time.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

### PRIVATE BILLS.

### HAMILTON RADIAL ELECTRIC RAILWAY.

Mr. CLARKE moved third reading of Bill (No. 25) respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to occupy the time of the House at length on this Bill, but I desire to say, before it is read the third time, that I think we are making a very indiscreet move in taking possession of a corporation which has been chartered by provincial law and transferring it to federal jurisdiction. It is clearly an interference with provincial rights. We are taking from the province of Ontario its control over an electric railway company, for the regulation and control of which it has provided ample machinery in the form of a railway commission. I do not think the House fully realizes what is involved in this measure. The first section of this Bill provides:

In this Act the expression 'the company' means the body politic and corporate created by chapter 88 of the statutes of Ontario, 1894, and continued by the said amendments thereof.

Now, I take up chapter 88 of the statutes of Ontario, 1894, and I notice certain things that the company is authorized to do:

The said company is hereby authorized and empowered to survey, lay out, construct, complete, equip, maintain and operate iron or steel railways, to be operated by electricity with double or single iron or steel tracks from the city of Hamilton to the city of Guelph, in the county of Wellington, and from thence to the town of Mount Forest, in the said county of Wellington, passing through the townships of Barton, Ancaster, West Flamborough, East Flamborough, Puslinch, Guelph, Nichol, West Garafraxa and Arthur; and also from the said city of Hamilton to the town of Berlin, in the county of Waterloo, passing through the townships of Barton, Ancaster, West Flamborough, Beverly, Dumfries and Waterloo, and from thence through the townships of Waterloo, Woolwich, Wellesley, and Wilmot in a belt line back to the said town of Berlin; also from the said city of Hamilton to the village of Burlington, in the county of Halton, and thence to the village of Mimico, in the county of York, passing through the townships of Barton, Saltfleet, Nelson, Trafalgar, Toronto and Etobicoke; also from the said city of Hamilton to the town of Niagara Falls or Queenston, in the county of Welland, passing through the townships of Barton, Saltfleet, Grimsby, Clinton, Louth, Grantham, Stamford, Thorold or Niagara; also from the city of Hamilton to the city of Brantford, passing through the townships of Barton, Ancaster and Brantford, and the said railways, or any of them, may be carried along and upon such streets and highways as may be authorized by the by-laws of the respective corporations having jurisdiction over the same.

I am not aware that that Act has been either repealed or amended; so that this company has the right to run its railway along the highway so long as the municipality consents to it. The municipality generally consents to an electric railway running along the highway, provided it is kept under provincial jurisdiction and under the authority of the municipality which the provincial jurisdiction provides for. But when we take the railway from that provincial jurisdiction and from the control of the provincial railway board and place it under the control of the federal railway board, what is the result? Section 3 of that original Act provides:

The company may acquire the right to convey electricity required for the working of the railway and lighting the same or otherwise, over, through or under lands other than the right of way of the railways by this Act authorized to be built and to lay conduits under, or erect poles and wires on or over such lands as may be determined by the company, and along and upon any of the public roads and highways or across any of the waters in this province by the erection of the necessary fixtures, including posts, piers or abutments, for sustaining the cords or wires of such lines, or the conduits for such electricity, upon and subject to such agreement in respect thereof as shall first be made between said company and any municipality in which such works or any part thereof may be situate.

Then the Act sets out the powers which the company may exercise and the control held over it by the province with regard to directors, the common stock and several other matters. A very important difference between the provincial railway board and the federal railway board is this, that when the provincial board makes an order that order, under the Act constituting that board, becomes an order of the High Court of Justice, and is enforcible at once, whereas the federal railway board has no such authority. Its orders cannot be made orders of a provincial court, and there is no federal court to enforce them; consequently, the railway company may obey them or not, as it sees fit. The powers of the provincial board is much more comprehensive. For instance, under the Act it has full jurisdiction to inquire into, hear and determine any application by or on behalf of any party interested:

Complaining that the company, or any person or any municipal corporation, has failed to do any act, matter or thing required to be done by this Act or the said Act or the special Act, or by any regulation, order or direction made thereunder, by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the board or by any inspecting engineer, or by any agreement entered into by the company with any municipal corporation, or has done or is doing any act, matter or thing contrary to, or in violation of, this Act, or the special Act, or any such regulation, order or direction, or any such agreement.

That is where a company is partially under the municipal control and partially under provincial control:

The board may order and require any company or person or municipal corporation to do any act, matter or thing which such company or person or municipal corporation is or may be required to do under this Act or the said Act or the special Act, or any such regulation, order, direction or agreement, and may forbid the doing or continuing of any act, matter or thing which is contrary to this Act or the said Act or the special Act, &c.

It goes on and specifies what the board may do. It shall:

Have all such powers, rights and privileges as are vested in the High Court of Justice.

That is the Provincial Railway Board. The Federal Railway Board has not such powers. When the Provincial Railway Board makes an order, that order becomes an order of the High Court of Justice and is enforcible right away.

The decision of the board upon any question of fact, and as to whether any company, municipality or person is, or is not, a party interested within the meaning of this section, shall be binding and conclusive upon all companies and persons and municipal corporations and in all courts.

The relationship of this railway to the municipalities makes it necessary for the board that controls the one to control both. The Federal Board has no control over a municipality, but the Provincial Board has, and it is necessary that the authority which controls the railway should have control over the municipal corporations as well so as to make them both do what is necessary in the public interest:

The board shall have exclusive jurisdiction in all cases and in respect of all matters in which jurisdiction is conferred on it by this Act or by special Act or by the said Act, and, save as herein otherwise provided, no order, decision or proceeding of the board shall be questioned or reviewed, restrained or removed by prohibition, injunction, certiorari or any other process or proceeding in any court.

Without thereby limiting the powers and authority of the board unless this Act or the said Act, the board may make orders and regulations:

(a) With respect to the method and means of passing from one car to another, either inside or overhead, and for the safety of employees while passing from one car to another, and for the coupling of cars;

(b) Requiring proper shelter to be provided for employees while on duty;

(c) With respect to the use on any steam engine of nettings, screens, grates and other devices, and the use on any steam engine or car of any appliances and precaution, and, generally in connection with the railway respecting the construction, use and maintenance of any fire guard or works which may be deemed by the board necessary and most suitable to prevent, as far as possible, fires from being started or occurring upon, along or near the right of way of the railway.

Then it goes on to provide for penalties. I understand the Federal Board has no authority to provide penalties. Certain things it can do. For instance the rates on passengers and freights are submitted to that board and the railway commission may agree or refuse its consent to the rate ordered. If the commission refuses, the rate cannot go into force. That is one of the things the Federal Board can compel a railway to do. In many respects it has not the powers of the Provincial Board. The Provincial Board may:

Provide penalties, when not already provided in this Act or the said Act, to which every company or person or municipal corporation who offends against any regulation made under this section shall be liable, which shall not exceed $100 for each offence. The imposition of any such penalty shall not lessen or affect any other liability which any company or person or municipal corporation may have incurred.

Mr. SPROULE.

In case default shall be made in the doing of any act, matter or thing, which the board may direct to be done by the company or persons or municipal corporation who is required to do the same, the board may authorize such person as they may see fit to do the act, matter or thing, and in every such case the person so authorized may do such act, matter or thing, and the expense incurred in the doing of the same may be recovered from the company or person or municipal corporation in default and as money paid for and at the request of such company or person, and the certificate of the board of the amount so expended shall be conclusive evidence thereof.

The existing orders of the railway company or the executive council of both may be made orders of the court. That is one of the important powers which the Provincial Board has and the Federal Board has not.

Mr. CLARKE. My hon. friend is misleading, no doubt unintentionally, the House when he says that under the Dominion Railway Act there is no power to enforce the judgments of the board and that these judgments have not the force of orders of a court. Let me refer my hon. friend to these words in one section: 'This commission shall be a Court of Record' and section 26:

The board shall, as respects the enforcement, attendance and examination of witnesses, the production and inspection of documents, the enforcement of its orders, the entry on and inspection of property, and other matters necessary or proper for the due exercise of its jurisdiction, under this Act; or otherwise for carrying this Act into effect, have all such powers, rights and privileges as are vested in a superior court.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. gentleman find in the Dominion Act any provision which says that the orders of the Federal Board may be made the rules of a court?

Mr. CLARKE. Instead of making them the rules of a court, it makes the commission itself a court. It says the commission shall have all the powers that the Superior Court has. That is more simple and just as effective.

Mr. LENNOX. The powers of the Federal parliament as regards the creation of courts is very limited. They have only the power given by the British North America Act, and that is the power to establish a Supreme Court and an Exchequer Court.

Mr. CLARKE. That is raising a very important question.

Mr. LENNOX. There is that great difficulty.

Mr. CLARKE. If that were the case, we would have heard a great deal about it. Taking the Act as it reads, there is the most ample power given the board. My

hon. friend is mistaken when he says there is not.

Mr. SPROULE. I said in many respects with regard to many of its orders :

Notwithstanding the repeal of this Act or by the said Act of any Act relating thereto, all orders of the Railway Committee of the Executive Council of Ontario in force at the time of the passing hereof, may be made orders of the High Court of Justice, and may be enforced in all respects, as nearly as may be, in the same manner, as provided by this Act and the said Act in the case of similar orders by the board ; and all penalties, forfeitures and liabilities attaching, under this Act or the said Act, to the violation of any regulation or disobedience to any order of the board, shall apply and attach to any violation of, or disobedience to, any regulation or order of the Railway Committee of the Executive Council occurring after the passing of this Act, in all respects as nearly as may be, as if the same were a regulation or order of the board.

While I admit that the Federal Railway Commission could enforce many of its orders, the great bulk it cannot because it has not the power. When we established the Railway Commission at first, it was declared that we could only give publicity because we had not the authority to confer on the board the powers of a court and give it the power to punish people for disobeying its orders.

Mr. CLARKE. But you did confer that power.

Mr. SPROULE. In some respects we did, in many we did not. Suppose a railway company refuse to obey the orders of the board, the board has not power to impose a penalty except as set forth in the Act.

Mr. CLARKE. It can enter upon the property and take possession.

Mr. SPROULE. We might take possession of the road and close it down for some trifling violation, but I do not think the hon. member will say that is a proper thing to do.

Mr. CLARKE. They have power of enforcement under a section of the Act even without taking possession.

Mr. SPROULE. If I understand correctly, they have power to do certain things, but they have not power to enforce the great bulk of their orders as they cannot make them orders of a court. This would have to be done through a provincial court. For instance, they could not compel this railway to connect with a provincial electric railway. How would they enforce such an order ?

Mr. CLARKE. I could not say offhand just what the procedure would be, but certainly the municipal board of the province could not compel a railway under the jurisdiction of this parliament to connect with a provincial railway.

Mr. SPROULE. No, but the railway board of the province can compel the provincial railway to carry out agreements with municipalities or to do what was to their mutual advantage. The provincial Act provides for a maximum passenger rate on electric roads of 2 cents per mile, but under the federal Act there is no such restriction.

Mr. CLARKE. When did the law limiting the rate to 2 cents per mile come into force?

Mr. SPROULE. I understand when the Act establishing the board was passed.

Mr. CLARKE. If this becomes a Dominion road in 1897, then the 2-cent rate would not apply.

Mr. SPROULE. We are endeavouring to keep it a provincial road.

Mr. CLARKE. If it became a federal road before the 2-cent rate was established, it would not be affected.

Mr. SPROULE. It was the intention of the British North America Act that the provinces should control railways within their own borders; and if we persist in interfering with provincial rights in this matter and assume the right to take everything from the provinces, the provinces will undoubtedly rebel against any such interference.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not a lawyer, but I have read several legal opinions, and I agree with Mr. Clarke that as this railway came under the federal authority ten years ago the 2-cent rate could not apply. The Minister of Railways, a few evenings ago, gave me some assurance that he would bring down a Bill which would relieve any doubt as to the enforcement of agreements between a road under Dominion authority and a municipality. Not having heard from the minister further, and not knowing the merit of his Bill I fear I shall have to persist in moving my amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the discussion now is on an amendment proposed by the member for Toronto (Mr. Macdonell).

Mr. HENDERSON. I understood there was nothing before the chair except the motion for the third reading.

Mr. SPEAKER. As far as the order paper shows, the third reading is the only motion before the Hosue.

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to be absolutely fair ; the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) closed his address by moving an amendment to the effect that this road should be under the Provincial Railway and

Municipal Board and the provisions of the Ontario Railway Act.

Mr. BRODEUR. I see that on the 3rd of March it was proposed:

That the Bill (No. 25) An Act respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company, be now read the third time.

Mr. Macdonell moved in amendment thereto. that the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending section 2 of the said Bill, as follows:

Giving the amendment:

And a debate arising thereon, and the hour devoted to private Bills under rule 25 having expired,

The House went into committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Order Paper seems to be inaccurate; that amendment was before the chair when the hour for private Bills expired, and the amendment is now before the House. The question is on the amendment. Shall the amendment be adopted?

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question now is upon the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. I presume then I can resume where I left off. I am extremely anxious that any rights which have been obtained by the municipalities in the county which I represent and in the adjoining county of Peel should be thoroughly protected and guarded, and it is with a view of safeguarding those rights that I propose the amendment of which I have given notice. I therefore beg to move:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend it by adding to section 10 the following:

Provided that in the event of the company at any time failing to conform to, or to carry out any of the provisions contained in any such by-laws or agreements as are herein referred to, or as may be hereafter made between the said company and any municipality, then the powers of operation granted to the company, or vested therein, shall cease and be null and void, so long as said company fails to conform to or carry out such provisions as aforesaid.

When this amendment was presented to the Committee of the Whole it was argued by the promoter of the Bill, or by the Minister of Railways, that I was defeating the purposes I had in view, in as much as the road would cease to run if there should be any lack of conformity to this agreement. I apprehend that with a provision of this kind the company would be extremely careful not to allow any nonconformity to the agreement, knowing that if they did they would be penalized in a way that would deprive them of any use of their road. I know of no better way to accomplish my purpose than the passage of this amendment, which if accepted will I think protect the municipalities I have the honour to represent.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to endorse the remarks of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) in respect to the agreements that have been made with this road by the various municipalities. The proposed road has a charter in the county I have the honour to represent, and our people are very anxious that any rights they have succeeded in acquiring from the company, some of which have been given freely and others after a contest, should be retained by them, While I listened with interest to the remarks of my hon. friend who is promoting this Bill and have great respect for his opinion, yet in those days of conflict between local legislatures and the Dominion parliament in respect of the powers of railways and of railway charters, it is important that every municipality should take care of its own interests when Bills of this kind are up for consideration. I am in favour of the motion moved by my hon. friend from Halton; I believe it should be embodied in the Bill so that every right the municipalities possess should be retained to the people in those counties, who are so anxious that this road should be constructed, and at the same time that none of their rights which they at present enjoy should be taken from them.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is perhaps out of order to discuss a Bill that is not down, yet I want to say to my hon. friend that I expect to provide in the Railway Bill to be brought down, for what is known as specific performance of contracts, which will, I think, cover the question as fully as it can be covered by legal enactment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. LENNOX. In the absence of the member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) I am requested to move an amendment to the preamble of the Bill, which is as follows:

To strike out all the words after the words 'set forth' in the 7th line thereof down to and including the word 'Canada' in the 14th line thereof.

I think we all admit that we have had a reasonable amount of discussion upon the proper form of the preamble. I have already said nearly all I could say to advantage on this question. I will merely add that it is a principle of law that nothing should be in the preamble of the Bill except a statement of a question of fact, and we should not seek either directly or indirectly to declare what the law is.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

## EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 68) respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

On section 2,

Mr. LENNOX. Is that amended?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In the 15th line the words 'completes and' are inserted.

Mr. LENNOX. I would not be positive, but I think there was some change made in the 11th line, where it says 'from the point on its authorized line.' The language describing the point of commencement seems to be very indefinite. Is the promoter of the Bill here? He does not seem to be here.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think we will have to go back to the rule we laid down, that if the promoter of a Bill does not feel disposed to attend to his Bill, answer questions and give explanations, we will be obliged to let it stand.

Progress reported.

## CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.—Mr. Power.

Bill (No. 77) respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Dubeau.

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. McIntyre (Strathcona).

## VANCOUVER ISLAND AND EASTERN RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Sloan.

Mr. SPROULE. This company is empowered to construct, operate and maintain lines for the conveyance of light, heat, power and electricity, and I notice you have omitted the clause, usual in such Bills, providing that an agreement with a municipality or a by-law with a municipality is necessary before the company erects its wires. Of course, there are no municipalities in that territory now, but there may be in the future.

Mr. GRAHAM. We threshed that question out in the committee, and the conclusion was come to that such a provision was not really necessary in this Bill. If there are any municipalities there in the future, it can be amended I suppose.

Mr. SPROULE. It can, but it won't.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.



## SASKATOON, SASKATCHEWAN, PEACE RIVER AND DAWSON RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

Mr. GRAHAM. When this Bill was last considered there was an opinion expressed that clause 14 gave the company too much power. I therefore move that clause 14 be stricken from the Bill and the following substituted therefor:

14. The company may for the purpose of its undertaking:

(a) Build, purchase, lease or otherwise acquire, manage or control hotels, restaurants and other buildings at any place where the railway is authorized to be constructed, and acquire, purchase, lease and hold the land necessary for such purposes, and carry on business in connection therewith, and afford such facilities as tend to the comfort and convenience of the travelling public, and may let any such building for such purposes;

(b) Acquire, purchase, lease and hold lands required for, and lay out, establish and manage parks and pleasure grounds, and give a lease thereof.

The meaning of that is that we do not give the company power to go into lumbering, mining and all that kind of thing, but confine them in this clause to the building of hotels, a power which we give to all such railways.

Mr. LENNOX. I dare say the amendment may be quite satisfactory, but I would like an opportunity to consider it. It is now nine o'clock.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am glad the minister has taken our advice and that he is prepared to meet our views along the lines I indicated when the Bill was last discussed. My objection was to the principle of combining a commercial Bill and a railway Bill all in one without having it referred to the Private Bills Committee as well as to the Railway Committee. When Mr. Blair was Minister of Railways he took very strong grounds against that practice. I presume the minister has well considered his amendment, and personally I am quite willing to accept it.

Mr. LENNOX. No time will be lost if the Bill stands over.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the event of the minister changing his mind, I would ask that my amendment should stand over, too.

Mr. LENNOX. He will never change his mind.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a little disappointing, after having spent a good deal of time trying to meet the objections of hon. gentlemen, that they should now ask the Bill to stand. However, if there is any objection, I suppose we cannot proceed with it now.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am satisfied that the minister has met us fairly well, but no doubt my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) wants time for consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister should not be discouraged; we are only asking time to look over the amendment.

Progress reported.

## THE CO-OPERATION ACT.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX moved second reading of Bill (No. 5) respecting co-operation. He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I have to add only a few words to what has already been said on this subject. I may say that this Bill has been already introduced on three different occasions by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), but it has not yet reached the stage which I hope it will reach this evening. Last session, when the Bill was introduced by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, it was thought wise by the government to postpone the adoption of the principle of the measure until after it should be reported upon by the special committee to which it was referred. This year the government are of opinion that the Bill should be taken up as a government measure in order that those who believe in co-operation may have an instrument by which the middle as well as the labouring classes may be educated in thrift, prudence and saving. We all know that it is by organized co-operation in the broadest sense of the word that in this country, as in every other country on this continent and on the continent of Europe, the railway system, the telegraph system, the telephone system, and generally speaking all great public utilities, have been created. In a certain sense it is also true that it is by the application of the principle of co-operation that all great enterprises, whether financial or industrial, are able to live. In a more limited sense of the word, our churches, our schools, our clubs, our universities, our fraternal societies and our labour unions are organized on the principle of co-operation. The present piece of legislation is a step forward. It is, so to speak, the blazing or opening of a new pathway to a greater prosperity for the labouring masses of this country. Briefly speaking, the object of this measure is to facilitate, if possible, the formation of societies of citizens to assist each other in agricultural, commercial and financial operations. Canada, I must say, has been left behind in the great co-operative movement which has taken place during the last half century or more. We must not forget that conditions on this side of the Atlantic are not altogether the same as they are on the other side. But as we grow older we learn, and we desire to take advantage of the experience of other countries in this matter. As in every other liberal movement—using the word liberal in a non-political sense—Great Britain has been a leader in the co-operative movement. For fifty years the people of England, Scotland and Ireland have benefited from it. We all know the history of the Rochdale stores, which started sixty or seventy years ago, and which have been a prodigious success. The co-operative movement has spread all over Great Britain, and also to the continent of Europe. In Great Britain to-day there are over 2,402,354 members of co-operative societies, and each co-operator represents at least three members of a family; which means that there are in Great Britain over 9,000,000 people who are deeply interested in this movement, representing one-fifth of the total population of the country. The present annual turn-over of these British co-operative societies amounts to $500,000,000, the yearly profit on which is $50,000,000. Out of this enormous profit of $50,000,000 a year the British people apply yearly 10 per cent for educational purposes; $5,000,000 is taken every year out of the co-operative profits and applied to the education of the people. I have said that Great Britain is the leader of the world in the co-operative movement, and the figures I have given are the best evidence of the truth of that statement. On the continent of Europe the co-operative movement has also been applied with success. In both manufacturing and agriculture, the countries where this movement has been specially aided and successfully applied are chiefly France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy and Denmark. In the banking line, co-operation has been chiefly confined to Germany, Italy and France. In Denmark co-operation in agriculture has been a huge success. When one bears in mind that the total area of Denmark is about two-thirds that of Nova Scotia and its population is about equal to that of Quebec and Ontario combined, we can see that the co-operative system, applied to that small country with a limited population, has achieved wonderful success in agriculture. Since that system has been in operation, the annual exports of Denmark in agricultural products, chiefly cheese and butter, are $100,000,000, $70,000,000 of which are the result of the co-operative system.

In Canada we have been left behind in the co-operative movement. With such a large area, with immense territories sparsely settled, it is not unreasonable that we should expect similar results to those which have been achieved in older countries provided we avail ourselves of the lessons to be derived from their experience. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) patriotically took charge some years ago of this legislation. I think my hon. friend was elected at the same time as myself, in 1896, and not many years after he became a member of this House. He took up this question, and every succeeding session he did his

best, with his usual force and eloquence, to convince the House that such legislation would be beneficial to the middle classes and the labouring classes generally. It is well known that every new legislation, every new departure, must proceed step by step and be impressed by degrees on the public mind, before it can be put into effect. Parliament is generally slow to accept a new principle or a new departure. My hon. friend, however, was very persistent, and I may add that another gentleman, who has made this question of co-operation the work of his life, Mr. Alphonse Desjardins, of Lévis, has also during the last ten or fifteen years done his best to spread this idea of co-operation in the province of Quebec and even in the far west, where of late he has been asked to introduce the Caisse Populaire which he established in the province of Quebec and which has been such a sucess in that section. Last year when my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier introduced his Bill, the government thought that public opinion was perhaps ripe enough to accept the principle and apply it once for all to some of our industries so as to encourage thrift and saving among our labouring classes. A special committee was formed at the request of the government, composed of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux), Messrs. Monk, Sinclair, Smith (Nanaimo), Verville, White and Bourassa. I do not know how many sittings were held, but I must say that no committee did its work more conscientiously than this special committee on co-operative societies. I hold in my hand a copy of the evidence that was taken before it, and I do not think that any one who reads that evidence can fail to be impressed with the importance of the subject. We had as witnesses, who voluntarily gave their evidence, men of the highest standing in our community. First of all, we had His Excellency the Governor General, Earl Grey. Then we had the benefit of the experience of such men as Professor Shortt, of Queen's University; Mr. Mackenzie King, Deputy Minister of Labour; Mr. Perley, M.P., Mr. J. A. Ruddick, an expert of the Department of Agriculture; Mr. Dugas, M. P., Mr. A. McNeill and Mr. Alphonse Desjardins, himself the founder of the first co-operative societies in the province of Quebec. The last report of the committee will be found on page iv of the blue-book. It reads as follows:

Fourth report.
Thursday, April 11, 1907.

The special committee to whom was referred Bill (No. 2), an Act respecting Industrial and Co-operative Societies, beg leave to present the following as their fourth report:

Your committee have had under consideration Bill (No. 2), an Act respecting Industrial and Co-operative Societies, and have agreed to report the same with amendments.

Your committee have held several sittings and taken the evidence of a number of witnesses as to the possible advantages to Canada of legislation upon the lines indicated in above-mentioned Bill, which authorizes the formation of co-operative associations.

From this evidence, derived from persons who have made a special study of the co-operative movement in Europe, it appears clearly that co-operation offers very great advantage to the farming classes, particularly in certain branches of agricultural pursuits, such as dairying, market gardening and fruit culture. Co-operation has also been proved of great use in the purchase by farmers of agricultural implements and fertilizers.

Your committee found that co-operation offers a means for the labouring classes to purchase, under the most favourable terms, the necessaries of life and the articles required for the exercise of any trade. It also provides a system by which the wage-earners can either build or acquire their own homes, by means of small loans from credit and savings societies.

Your committee have given the credit and savings feature of the Bill their special consideration and have arrived at the conclusion that any general movement to foster co-operations destined to provide small loans and means of investment for people whose situation removes them from the sphere of action of our ordinary banks.

In dealing, however, with this feature of the proposed measure, your committee have provided special clauses destined to surround the exercise of the credit and savings power by these societies with all necessary guarantees to prevent any possible abuse.

I may say, in parenthesis, that the Minister of Finance and the deputy Minister of Finance have been consulted as to what have been called—by what I should term a misnomer—the banking clauses of the Bill. When the members examine the Bill they will see that no banking privileges are given to these societies and I wish to draw the attention of the House to this misnomer. The minister and deputy Minister of Finance see no objection to the Bill being passed in its present form, with the banking privileges here given to the co-operative societies. The report proceeds:

The interesting experiment made by Mr. Alphonse Desjardins with the institution known as 'La Caisse Populaire de Lévis,' establishes clearly that this special form of co-operation is productive of the best results and can be carried out without risk, if under proper control.

This control and supervision your committee have sought to ensure in the Bill.

The witnesses heard by your committee are persons well versed in the co-operative movement since its inception.

I may say that His Excellency the Governor General is one of the leading authorities in Europe on the co-operative movement. For years he was, I believe, presi-

dent of the International Co-operative Alliance. The report proceeds :

Their testimony bears out with singular unanimity the conclusion to which your committee have arrived, that the proposed Bill, as amended by your committee, if enacted, would be productive of the best results, and your committee therefore recommend that the government take charge of the measure and have it passed.

Your committee also report herewith their minutes of proceedings and evidence, and the exhibits filed, and recommend that the same be printed, with the exception of exhibits from Nos. 2 to 10, inclusive.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

R. LEMIEUX,
Chairman.

Reference is made, in this final report, to La Caisse Populaire de Lévis. I take pleasure in mentioning that institution because it illustrates so well the working of such institutions in our country if put under proper control and jurisdiction. La Caisse Populaire de Lévis was the creation of my good friend Mr. Alphonse Desjardins, who is the pioneer in this field in Canada, as a public and very able exponent of co-operation, more particularly as regards savings and credit co-operative associations. He organized La Caisse Populaire in the year 1900, at Lévis, near Quebec, where there are no great fortunes, but where there is a thriving population, willing and anxious to save in order to secure such prosperity as is attainable in the working classes, generally speaking. I shall call this Caisse Populaire a bank, but as I stated a moment ago that is a misnomer, because such co-operative banks do not issue paper and do not carry on operations with persons outside of the membership of the society. I shall call it 'bank,' because in England there are co-operative banks doing business with those who are not members of the sociteies. This bank was organized as I stated, in 1900, with 80 members, and in 1907 the membership stood at 980. It was launched with 80 members and with a very small capital, made up of the $5 shares subscribed by the 'societaires.' The first financial statement showed assets amounting to only $240, while in 1907 they amounted to $66,352.24. In the seven years of its existence this popular bank has made loans amounting to $277,000 in the city of Lévis and the vicinity among its members. The loans have been made at a very low rate of interest, and I must pay Mr. Desjardins the compliment of saying that I hope the other co-operative societies will have at their head men as conscientious and as intelligent as Mr. Desjardins. During the seven years, with that turnover of $277,000, not a red cent has been lost, not a red cent. Therefore it is proven beyond doubt that with the proper safeguards and with proper control co-operative societies can be a success in our country, and by the very fact that they are essentially local in their administration, by the very fact that they do not issue paper, that they confine their loans to those who are members of the society, with the check of three boards, a board of credit, a board of administration and a board of audit—by these checks such societies can be of great benefit and can be organized without the least suspicion that their funds can be lost.

The principle of co-operation from the point of view of mutual credit associations carries with it enormous advantages. First of all it reaches a class of the community which, practically speaking, has no access to the larger financial institutions; secondly, it is local in its character ; third, it encourages small loans and small investments, it stimulates thrift and prudence ; it develops business habits and does away with usury. It provides the labouring classes with the necessaries of life, and even with the luxuries of life, at a cheaper rate and does away in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred with the middleman. Now Mr. Speaker, I will ask hon. gentlemen to peruse in their hours of leisure the blue-book which I hold in my hand, the report of the special committee appointed last year to study this question. I may say that the principle of co-operation has not been confined in this country to the Caisse Populaire de Lévis. Since the establishment of this institution several other popular banks of a like character have been started in different sections of the country. We have also the principle of co-operation applied, at least in my native province, and I think also in Ontario, to the butter and cheese industry. We have it applied in other agricultural pursuits especially in the apple trade. With your permission I will quote a few words of the evidence given by Mr. Ruddick, of the Department of Agriculture on this question. As a matter of fact we find the principle of co-operation permeating, so to speak, several spheres of our daily life. On page 33 of the evidence, Mr. Ruddick, says, being asked by the chairman:

Q. Have we not in our province any established on the co-operative principle?—A. The most of the cheese factories in the province of Quebec.

Q. But speaking generally?—A. They contain the germ of the co-operative idea in as much as the farmers consent to bring their milk to one point to have it manufactured.

Further says :

Q. The farmers do not own the factories?—A. In some cases they do. There are some truly co-operative factories, but there are a great many that are purely joint stock companies. The share capital is held by men who do not send any milk to the factories, and they are not strictly co-operative. If the committee would like, I would be glad to give some information that I have concerning co-operation in Denmark and New Zealand where

I have been and looked into these things to some extent.

Now he speaks of Denmark:

I am more familiar with the results than with the methods, but I think there are a few underlying principles in the co-operative societies of Denmark which are well worthy of being looked into. They started first with co-operative creameries in 1882, and now there are over 1,100 purely co-operative creameries in Denmark. In addition to that there are about 200 privately owned concerns.

Further on:

Q. It has been a success?—A. A tremendous success. So much so that the agricultural exports of Denmark amount in round figures to about £20,000,000 sterling per year, and £14,000,000 sterling of this sum come from co-operative societies.

Then he speaks of the principle of co-operation in agricultural affairs:

Q. You were speaking of cold storage and dairying. Would you explain how it is in Canada that you find co-operative societies identified with these two branches of your own department?—A. Well, the manufacture of butter and cheese is quite frequently carried on purely on a co-operative basis. That is to say, the actual cost of manufacture deducted from the value of the produce goes to the members who supply the milk. Then, in connection with the fruit industry there is a very good chance for the improvement of the apple trade inasmuch as the great defect in the apple trade is the lack of organization. If there were organizations on the co-operative basis we could gain control of the packing of the apples whereby the grading could be kept up to a high standard, and we should be able to sell direct to the British buyer instead of through a commission agent. There are judged to be twenty-five associations already established in Canada, and they have worked very successfully during the last two or three years.

On page 35 he gives the names of all these co-operative societies, which I need not mention. It may be a few years before the people of Canada go very deeply into the co-operative system. I do not believe that the people of Canada will do immediately as the people of Denmark have done, although an agricultural community like Canada would do well to look at the results achieved in Denmark through the co-operative system. In promoting this legislation I am glad to say that I have the help of my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House. I believe this legislation will educate the people to the great benefits to be derived from the principle of co-operation, and will place an instrument in their hands which, with proper control and proper check, will confer great advantages on the public. It will be an instrument which will be of great help to the community at large. Before giving the principal features of the Bill I wish to refer the House to the evidence of His Excellency the Governor General that we were fortunate enough to secure before the committee. The report is in the hands of every hon. member, but I want to call the attention of both sides of the House especially to the evidence given by His Excellency the Governor General and by the other experts who were heard last year before the committee. Mr. Henry W. Wolff is quoted as follows:

Wherever there is a people's bank or a village bank established, sufficiently strong, even if it be not of the best of its kind, the small shopkeeper, the artisan, the workingman, the small cultivator, need not miss an opportunity of earning or saving for want of ready money. Should an artisan want to buy materials for his trade, or a new set of tools, or should he have to tide over a period before he can realize the reward due for his work; should a working woman wish to buy a sewing machine to work with, or to purchase furniture or groceries cheaply for cash, instead of at extravagant price for credit; should a peasant desire to purchase a pig, or fertilizers; should a poor man have the ambition to acquire a house of his own—provided that these people can show that they are in a position to take the liability involved upon themselves, all these wishes, all these ambitions, may be easily gratified. The money is available for them; and it is available in the easiest as well as the cheapest way. If their case be a good one, they may make the purchase repay its cost out of its own production or economy, and so are freed of all care with regard to providing the money. There are thousands of examples of this—of articles bought, remaining the purchaser's own, valuable acquisitions, without the purchaser ever having been required to put his hand in his pocket. What an enormous boon this has proved and is proving in a constantly increasing volume to the large mass of people who have to support their life by working and earning, need not be told.

Mr. Wolff in his valuable book on 'People's Banks,' speaking of England, at page 28, says:

It is quite true, as Dr. Johnston unkindly reminded Goldsmith, that it takes 240 poor men's pence to make one capitalist's sovereign. But once the sovereign is so put together, it is a totally different sovereign from that taken out of the rich man's safe. It has behind it 240 wills, 240 pairs of watchful eyes, 240 thinking brains. It has, so to speak, become an animate sovereign, with prudence, energy, vigilance, diffused through all its parts. Every spring, every wire of the composite machine takes a personal interest in the collective doings, watching the other parts, guarding against loss and waste, correcting the slightest irregularity. And the more completely the distribution is carried out, the lower the 'democratizing' organism descends, so as to gather up from the lowest strata all available and useful elements, the more fully, so we see in the practical application of the principle abroad, does it realize its beneficent aim. Not without reason, accordingly, did Commendatore Luzzatti inscribe upon his banner, when he started on what proved to be a triumphal progress of economic success, the apt motto: Aspirare a discendere.

Now, I will not quote any more authorities, but I will merely say that in the Old World it is recognized that co-operation is an essential principle in the life of the middle and labouring classes. The government would have been remiss in its duty, and especially the Minister of Labour, if this question had not been taken up and embalmed so to speak, in our statute-book so as to give the labouring and the agricultural classes a means of saving and to provide means of educating the people at large in habits of prudence and thrift.

What are the principal features of the Bill? By section 4 of the Bill seven persons may form a society. It is a society or a grouping not so much of capital as of individuals. In fact, as Mr. Wolff, the very celebrated co-operator, has stated, co-operation is the capitalization of honesty. It is not the capitalization of money interests, but it is the capitalization of honesty. By section 3, subsection (a) it is provided that each member has only one vote and no proxy will be allowed except for corporate bodies. The Minister of Labour —section 4—will grant or refuse incorporation and notice has to be given in the Canada 'Gazette' for the creation of the society. The capital is formed of withdrawal shares of not less than $1. By section 6 a reserve fund is provided in the case of savings and loan societies, 20 per cent of the net annual profits to accumulate for that purpose. By section 6, subsection 2 no loan is granted to a non-member. The object of the co-operative system is to give the benefit of the aggregation, if I may so speak of it, to members only. Such a society by section 8 can do business only in one electoral district except in a city like Montreal, Quebec or Ottawa where there is more than one electoral district. In such cases it may be allowed to do business in the whole city.

By section 9 a committee of credit is chosen to supervise and grant loans. The members of this committee are not allowed to borrow from the society. By section 10 the general meeting shall from time to time determine the maximum loan allowance to any one individual shareholder. By section 14 the accounts are to be audited at least once every year. By section 15 a board of supervision is to act as a controlling body over all the business of such saving and loan society, and the members thereof are not allowed to borrow from the society. By section 16 the annual report is to be sent to the Minister of Labour. By section 17 the publicity of the affairs of the society is provided for. By section 18 the minister may call for special reports. By section 20 the minister may order, upon request of ten members, an inquiry into the affairs of a society. By section 21 he may cancel the charter of a society. By section 24 the Governor in Council may make regulations.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Such are, briefly, the principal features of the Bill, and I think the House will realize that the proper safeguards are provided. I trust hon. gentlemen will give the several clauses of the measure their best attention, and that the principle will be unanimously adopted to-night.

Mr. BLAIN. Have these co-operative stores been a success in the agricultural districts?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The evidence given by my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) shows that they have been a great success in Scotland and in England, so much so that those who were most interested in the principle of co-operative were afraid the co-operative stores might become a menace to the principle itself. The member for Nanaimo was one of the leading co-operators when working in a mine in the old country, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) will turn to the evidence of Mr. Ralph Smith he will find some very interesting reading. But even if they had not been a success in the old country, I believe that in Canada, with the present legislation, and the control, and the checks, and the safeguards provided, there need be no fear of their failure.

Mr. BLAIN. As a matter of information, I would like to know from the minister from what parts of Canada requests were made to the government for legislation of this kind.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Representations have been made to the Department of Labour from each province in favour of this scheme. Some of the members from British Columbia and Nova Scotia, where they have had co-operative stores, were in favour of it, and the success achieved in the province of Quebec by the banks started by Mr. Desjardins were an incentive. I would ask my hon. friend to read very carefully the evidence given by His Excellency the Governor General, who is enthusiastic on this question as on many other questions, and it is a god thing we have enthusiasts in this world. His Excellency spoke of the success of the movement in Great Britain and Europe. He is one of the leading co-operators, and we were amazed at the wealth of facts and figures which His Excellency presented before the committee. The paper which is published with his evidence is well worth being read by the members of the House, or by any one who takes an interest in the question. I quite understand that we must be somewhat conservative when we start societies of this kind, but we have framed this legislation with a view to protect the labouring classes against themselves, and this will appear more clearly as the different sections of the Bill are considered.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there much evidence taken from Ontario by that committee?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We had from Ontario Professor Shortt, Mr. Ruddick, Mr. Perley, M.P., a very great authority on the question, Mr. McNeill, Mr. Mackenzie King and Mr. H. C. Ellis. From Quebec we had Mr. Beaudry, who opposed the Bill. The principal witness was Mr. Desjardins, who is the founder of these banking institutions in our province, and who has been asked to start these credit and saving societies in the western provinces. We have also the evidence of Mr. Dugas, M.P., who is specially interested in tobacco growing, the counties of Montcalm and Joliette which are the great tobacco growing districts of this country, together with Essex and some parts of British Columbia. Mr. Dugas explained that if the Bill passed the tobacco growers of the counties of Joliette and Montcalm would greatly benefit from this co-operative system. In all, we had eleven witnesses before the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. I ask that question because we had in Ontario many years ago co-operative societies of grangers which ultimately failed. I resided for a time in the western states, where they were very plentiful.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Are they still in existence in the western states?

Mr. SPROULE. No, they died out. I imagine that these co-operative societies might be more useful and successful amongst the labour classes and the mining classes than amongst the farmers. After the grangers we had the Patrons of Industry, which was more a political society than a business society, but it has passed out of existence also. At present we have some co-operative supply stores in Ontario.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Are they successful?

Mr. SPROULE. No, they have generally been a failure. I think the one in my county burst up not long ago. The cheese and butter factories are carried on by purely co-operative societies operating in one line.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The same as in the apple trade?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, pretty much the same, and they have been a success, though they are not very numerous in my part of the country.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And they have raised the standard of the product ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, because they have carried on an educational work. But in commercial life co-operative societies do not seem to be a success in our province. Where they take the form of investment societies or savings banks, they inculcate habits of thrift, economy and industry on the part of the people, and are more likely to be successful than they are in commercial lines. At any rate, from our past experience, I would be inclined to think they would be somewhat of a failure.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, after the very complete explanations which have been given by my hon. friend the Minister of Labour, I feel that it is quite unnecessary for me to go at any length into a discussion of the principle of the Bill. I feel it to be my duty, however, to say a word in unreserved commendation of the action of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour in regard to this particular measure. From the time my hon. friend entered upon the duties of his department he lent an attentive ear to the representations made to him on all sides as to the importance of this measure, and I have no hesitation in saying that without his active concurrence we would have had a great deal of difficulty in gathering together, as the committee which investigated this matter last session did, with a great deal of labour and patience, the extremely valuable data that are to be found in the report of that committee. The government, in adopting the Bill, has undoubtedly done a great service to the country, and has responded to a very general demand, increasing daily for some time past, for the passage of some such measure as this. Indeed, as I have informed my hon. friend the Minister of Labour, during the past year, more particularly since the opening of the present session, I have received an average of over ten communications each week, sometimes more than five letters a day, from labour organizations in various parts of the country praying for the enactment of this Bill. I have more than once invited my hon. friend to an inspection of the mass of documents which I have received on the subject, and I suppose the want of time alone has prevented him from taking communication of what is undoubted evidence of a great demand on the part of the labouring classes throughout the country. This Bill is calculated to be of immense use to the labouring classes particularly. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) seemed to question the utility of such a measure among the agricultural classes. It may be that Grangers and the Patrons of Industry have not proved to be successful organizations. Though I am not familiar with the principles on which these associations were organized, I question very much whether they had the character of co-operative organizations. I think they were formed more for the advancement of agriculture and the agricultural classes. Some objections have been raised to a measure of this kind by retail dealers; but it has been abundantly proved in every country where co-operation has been put into practice that far from being a detriment to retail dealers, it has in the end been a great help to them by advancing the general welfare of the community, by encouraging thrift, in-

dustry and the accumulation of savings. The great detriment to retail dealers has been the creation of bad debts, the stress of circumstances preventing the recovery of their claims from indigent people. It is to put an end to that state of affairs that co-operation has been instituted in all the countries in Europe, and it has been established clearly by statistics that in the end the establishment of co-operative societies, of distribution, of production, and particularly of savings and credit, have promoted rather than impeded the advancement and prosperity of retail dealers. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) has stated that the reasons for this Bill are fully set out in the report of the committee which sat last year. Not only was my hon. friend assiduous at the meetings of that committee and rendered great service by affording every facility for procuring the very best evidence and information, but I am bound to say that all the members of the committee gave the matter their most serious attention; and I think the members of the House will find in this blue-book perhaps the most valuable collection of information on the subject of co-operation that has ever been put together by any investigating committee.

In 1901 the Governor General of India instituted a Royal Commission upon the same subject. That commission was composed of the very highest financial authorities to be found at that time in India and indeed in the British world. Their investigation was extremely complete and the conclusions they arrived at were perhaps more extensive than those to be found in this report. After full investigation, that Royal commission arrived at the conclusion that a co-operative measure, such as the one now before us, should be enacted for the people of India. And in the short experience of that country with its immense population, the co-operative measure there introduced has given the most beneficial results. I mention that because many of those who take a great interest in co-operation have questioned, not the utility of co-operation itself, but the opportuneness of introducing it into this country. Well, if it has produced among the people of India, who are certainly not superior to ours in intelligence, such excellent results, why should we not expect similar results in Canada? We had the advantage of having before our committee the men most conversant in this country with the working of such a measure and most capable of estimating its probable results among our agricultural classes. We had before us men of the very highest authority in the Department of Agriculture. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour has given their names. We had Professor Short, a profound student on economic matters in Ontario, and I heartily concur in everything my hon. friend has said with regard to the extreme value to be attached

Mr. MONK.

to the evidence of His Excellency the Governor General, not only his evidence before the committee, but his active assistance in every effort made in this country to start the idea of co-operation. I should not omit to pay, as my hon. friend has done, a compliment to Mr. Desjardins. Mr. Desjardins, in my estimation, is the pioneer of the co-operative movement in this country. He has devoted fifteen years of his life in the most unselfish way to the propagation of this most important idea and valuable system for the improvement of the condition of our middle classes and more particularly our agricultural and labour classes. Mr. Desjardins does not live in the fierce light of public life as many of us do, but he has like many other men in a more modest condition, rendered a service to the country for which the country will be grateful to him in years to come when perhaps those who are to-day advocating the passage of this measure will themselves be forgotten.

A question has arisen as regards our jurisdiction in this matter. The House is no doubt aware that the province of Manitoba has passed a Bill on co-operation. So has the province of Quebec and so I think has the province of British Columbia. But in all these provinces a very serious obstacle met those interested in this movement. It was impossible for a provincial legislature to enact provisions regarding what I might call the credit loan feature of this Bill, or what might be termed its banking feature. It was possible to organize co-operative societies in the provinces for the purposes of distribution or production and perhaps the purposes also of agriculture, but it was impossible to complete a measure of co-operation by introducing the absolutely necessary element giving co-operators the power of co-operating for purposes of credit and loan or banking, even in the restricted sense of banking under this Bill. That is one of the reasons why those interested in the movement came to Ottawa. They came for that legislation without which co-operation is necessarily incomplete—the power of organizing co-operative societies for the purpose of saving or credit and loan. I might also mention that a movement of this character ought necessarily to be a national or general movement. If it is to be successful it ought to be organized under one law applicable to all the provinces, so that one co-operator, going from one province to another, can join the society in the province where he acquires a new domicile, knowing the rules and knowing the law. It is, therefore, important that we should have the same law throughout the entire country. Co-operation is, in a certain sense, new in this country. It requires a certain propaganda, and the provinces are not in a position to give the movement the impulsion it demands. They

have not the means at their disposal to give that propaganda the character it should have. Here, on the contrary, we have the central power which has the means of diffusing all over the country a knowledge of the advantages of co-operation and giving the movement that general and similar impulse throughout the country which it ought to have. The House will also bear in mind that any general measure for the advancement and welfare of the labouring classes would naturally come under the general provisions in the beginning of section 91 of our Confederation Act, which enable our parliament to legislate in a general way for the good government and order and general advantage of Canada. Under this provision, we have legislated with regard to temperance and other matters affecting the general welfare of the people. The jurisprudence of the highest tribunal of the empire, speaking generally—I do not wish to take up time by quoting authorities—is to the effect that legislation for the general good of Canada is properly enacted by the federal legislature. Most of the co-operative societies formed under this Bill will be societies concerning the advancement of agriculture, and that is a subject with regard to which we have concurrent jurisdiction with the provinces.

From all these considerations it was, I believe, the matured opinion of the Department of Justice that this subject was legitimately and properly brought under the consideration of the parliament of Canada. We do not contend that this Bill is a perfect measure; it is an attempt to permit and authorize the formation, in an easy and inexpensive manner, of co-operative societies having for their object the advancement of agriculture and the co-operation of people of limited means, under conditions which assure to them the control of the societies for all kinds of industrial purposes. At the request of the Finance Department, we have excluded from the Bill, life insurance and fire insurance, although these subjects have been the objects of the formation of co-operative societies in all European countries, and although these societies have rendered immense service to the people in this way. But for the moment, in legislation of this kind, which is to a certain extent tentative in its nature, it has been thought more prudent to exclude life insurance and fire insurance.

Mr. LEMIEUR. At the request of the Minister of Finance I thought it better to exclude all insurance.

Mr. MONK. I have no doubt that this movement will prove highly successful, and that it will produce in this country the extraordinarily good results which it has produced in every other country in the world. I have no doubt that as the movement advances, and the excellent results become evident, parliament will extend the scope of the Bill; because in matters of insurance—fire, life, accident and agricultural insurance generally—it has been productive of very excellent results in other countries. I think the House should hasten the enactment of this Bill, in the belief that it will greatly improve the condition of our agricultural and labouring classes.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (Maisonneuve). I have only a few words to add to what has been so ably said by the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). Much has been said here in respect to the labouring people, and I beg to remind the House that the labouring people throughout Canada have approved of this legislation. At the Labour Congress, held in Winnipeg last year, they passed a formal resolution, which was ordered to be sent to the Minister of Labour, strongly supporting this measure and asking for its enactment.

We should, I think, also consider in connection with this the building of houses for the working people on a co-operative basis. This form of co-operation has been developed to a great degree in England and has proved to be of great advantage to the working people there. In our large cities especially, the question of providing homes for the working people has become an important and difficult one. To-day it is almost impossible for the working people to live in the central portions of our cities, as the manufactories are concentrated in the central districts, and this makes these districts so undesirable to live in that the working people have been obliged to go to the suburbs. A workingman, through small economies, is able to build his own home; but after having invested all his savings in the building of his home, he has almost invariably to borrow a certain amount to complete it, and in many cases it has been shown that the workingman falls into the hands of some note-shaver or usurer, although parliament has legislated against usury. Such laws, however, appear to have but little effect, especially in cases of this kind. To show the extent of this movement in England, I beg to quote from the report of 1906, the statistics in relation to the operations of these societies:

| | |
|---|---|
| Houses owned by co-operative societies.. | 8,530 |
| Houses built and sold by co-operative societies.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 5,377 |
| Houses built by member on advances by societies.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 32,600 |
| Total.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 46,707 |

We cannot, of course, expect to have such a great number in this country; but, at the same time, no member who represents a city and who has many labouring people in his constituency, can fail to see the necessity of such a law for their protection. It is time the labouring people, instead of go-

ing to their next door neighbour or to some business man and saying: Would you be good enough to take care of this $25 for me, because I am not able to take care of it myself, should invest their money in an intelligent way. When labouring men put their money in the bank it is an acknowledgment on their part that they cannot take care of it, and this Bill simply furnishes to the labouring people means to look after their own business. Through the operation of societies formed under this legislation the labouring people in all parts of the country will be enabled to put their savings together and to derive the greatest benefit from them. It is well understood that in the cities there is to-day a great deal of co-operation. The labour unions in Montreal have a membership of 20,000 and those in Toronto of 15,000, and this is really co-operation to some extent. It is important that we should proceed with all possible despatch and care to enact this law. I strongly support it, in the belief that it will do great good, not only to the labouring people of the cities, but also to the farmers of the country. It may, as has been said here, do away with the middleman; but it may be that we have too many middlemen now, and that if we can do away with some few of them it will be better for the community at large. That is why I strongly favour this measure.

Another cause is that the enormous amount of work done by Mr. Alphonse Desjardins, who has sacrificed one-third of his life to that work will bear fruit and better the condition of the labour people of this country.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL (South Oxford). I wish to express my hearty approval of this Bill, which has for its object the promotion of the interests of the labouring and agricultural classes. It is not necessary to discuss the Bill itself. It has been drawn with such care that I do not think it could be improved on. Of course after it has been in operation for some time possible improvements may be discovered. Efforts have been made in Ontario at different times to establish co-operation and while these efforts have not always been eminently successful, I still think there is scope for the successful operation of co-operative societies that will be of benefit not only to the agricultural classes, but also to the labouring classes. At the present time a number of organizations are being formed throughout Canada known as apple associations, which are organized not only for the care of orchards including spraying, but also for the packing and sale of their product. I may say that while efforts in this direction have only been put forth within the last few years, the results already achieved are eminently satisfactory. In fact I think it is established that it is the means of improving the poor classes of fruit that are now being produced in this country. The difficulty of getting a sufficient number of horticulturists to take care of orchards has been very manifest, but where a number of persons unite together with a common object there seems to be a greater incentive to sustained and intelligent action. In connection with our dairying industries there is also a large field for associations of this character. We know that our factory system is organized on the basis of co-operative societies, and the most successful factories in Ontario are operated on this basis. A large number of patrons are organized for a common object, and they produce a better article because they give more attention to their business, they secure better results, both in respect to the output and to the quality of the article, and consequently obtain better prices. I know there is danger of these societies degenerating into retail societies, and in that way failing of the object for which they were organized; but of course difficulties like these will always crop up, and will have to be met. From what we know of the work of these societies in Denmark and other foreign countries, I am satisfied that their introduction into Canada will prove of immense benefit. I am heartily in favour of the legislation proposed in this Bill, and am glad to know that it is being so well supported in this House.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. LEMIEUX. At the request of the Minister of Finance, I move to strike out the words 'life and fire' in the third line, so that insurance business generally shall not come under the provisions of this Act.

Motion agreed to.

On section 46,

Mr. MONK. It has been suggested to me that many retail concerns use the word co-operative, although not organized under this Act or under any provincial Act, and these sometimes become bankrupt and thus throw discredit upon the movement. It has been suggested to me that the Bill be amended by adding to it a clause which has been suggested at the recent co-operative congress in England to the following effect:

No person or body of persons, not being a society registered under this Act or under some Act of a province of Canada, shall be entitled to use the word co-operative as any part of their trade name or designation, and the use of the said word in contravention of the present section shall constitute an offence under this Act.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I have not noticed whether there is a provision in the Bill for calling the annual or any general meeting of the society.

Mr. MONK. That is one of the subjects to be provided for by the rules of the society when organized.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am reminded by the Minister of Finance that there are co-operative establishments already in existence that might be affected by this amendment. Of course, vested rights should be respected.

Mr. FIELDING. I know that in my own province there are quite a number of establishments conducted on the co-operative principle and some of them use the word co-operative. There are societies of that character in connection with the mines and also in the fishing districts. I merely mention that so that my hon. friend may see that he does not penalize any of these societies.

Mr. MONK. I would not like to do that, and I think we might meet the view of the Finance Minister by inserting the words 'from and after the passing of this Act.'

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend from Cape Breton know of co-operative societies which use the name without charters ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Quite a number.

Mr. FIELDING. I take the effect of my hon. friend's amendment to be that if a society has a provincial charter its rights would be respected, but if it has not it would come under the penal clause.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I know one or two which are incorporated, but my impression is that there are others which have no provincial charters, but still use the name and conduct a very extensive business.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know how far this amendment will reach, but I wish to point out that there are in the country co-operative butter and cheese associations which are not incorporated and which use that term. It would be very unfortunate if the amendment should shut them out.

Mr. MONK. It certainly would shut our any concern which without provincial authority or without the authority of this Act used that word. It would apply to those societies mentioned by the hon. member from Cape Breton which are not organized under a provincial Act. But does not my hon. friend think it would be well to perfect societies which are organized under this Act or under a provincial Act?

Mr. JOHNSTON. My impression is that there is not a general Act of the province of Nova Scotia, but that a number of these co-operative societies have received individual incorporation from the provincial legislature.

Mr. MONK. This amendment was suggested at the 38th annual Congress of Co-operative Unions, held at Preston in England in 1907, because it was found that people who were not organized under any legislation used the word co-operative as an advertisement, very often as a last resort before going into bankruptcy and thus brought discredit to the co-operative movement. But if the committee does not think the amendment important, I will not insist upon it.

Proposed amendment withdrawn.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 9, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Royal Commission appointed to investigate the Quebec Bridge.—Hon. Geo. P. Graham.

On motion of Mr. GRAHAM, the report was ordered to be printed forthwith.

### DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 115) to amend the Elections Act. He said : In examining the present election law, with the effort to make improvement where there was room for improvement, I found myself in most instances unable to suggest any substantial betterment. Whatever complaints may have been made with reference to it have been complaints, I think, with reference altogether to the administration of the law, and not to its provisions. It would be difficult to suggest any wider definition of the things which constitute corrupt practices, or to prohibit by any form of language of more general signification than that which is already to be found on the pages of the statute-book, those things which it was the intention of parliament should not be done in connection with elections. The widest and fullest imaginable means for investigating corrupt practices at elections already exist. Not only are there provisions of the Controverted Elections Act under which any elector, by the means there prescribed, may have investigations before the courts of alleged corrupt practices committed in the interest of any particular candidate, whether elected or defeated, but there is also the general law, under which, if no elector chooses to avail himself of the provisions of the Controverted Elections Act or to make complaint in regard to the doings of his opponents at an election, a small number of

electors can have an investigation if in their opinion there has been any general prevalence of improper proceedings at an election, and the results defined by the statute follow. In these circumstances, it has not seemed to me that I could suggest any improvements in the law in these respects, and the amendments which I have framed relate to different minor matters and to some things perhaps of substance. But, speaking generally, they relate to different details in the carrying out of elections under the statute, with regard to which I thought there was some room for improvement. In that connection I gladly acknowledge my great indebtedness to the committee of this House which, the session before last, held an inquiry into this matter. That special committee, consisting of seven members, held a considerable number of sittings during the session of 1906; and although it did not make any formal report, a great quantity of information was gathered together, as the result of which I have framed several amendments which I am now submitting.

I have also had the advantage, within the last few weeks, of examining, not only the Bill introduced in this House by my hon. friend from Prince Edward, (Mr. Alcorn) but also the Bill introduced by the Attorney General of Ontario in the Ontario Legislature. From both these sources I have received more than one suggestion of considerable value. I should say however to my hon. friend from Prince Edward county (Mr. Alcorn) that his mind and mine have been working to some extent on parallel lines. I find in the Bill he introduced provisions with regard to two or three measures—perhaps matters of more importance than the minor details—in regard to which I had some months before prepared amendments, which amendments now figure as clauses in the Bill I am introducing. I have left those clauses untouched as I drew them, but am in no sense wedded to my own phraseology and shall be very glad if in committee the House will consider them along with similar provisions in the Bill of my hon. friend and adopt the language best calculated to attain the purpose we both have in view.

The measure I am now introducing is one I committed to paper some four or five months ago and before the present session; and with the exception of one or two details which remained for further consideration, these provisions had therefore that amount of consideration at my hands and at the hands of the government. One of the features of this Bill is a provision with regard to contributions to election contests. Of late considerable attention has been directed to contributions of that character—contributions which the newspapers, at all events, have found in some instances to reach an unusual size. I am proposing that all contributions from any source to an election contest must be made through the statutory agent and that the agent should be required to make public to the returning officer, in the same way as he now makes public his disbursements of the expenses of a candidate, the amount and the source of all election contributions he has received. To contribute otherwise than to the agent will be illegal, and it will be the duty of the agent to make public the amount and source of every contribution made to him. Connected with that provision of the law, there is a similar or analogous provision prohibiting any company from contributing any amount whatever to an election campaign fund and enforcing that prohibition by heavy penalty upon the officers, directors, shareholders, or legal adviser of the company which trangresses the law. In that connection I may refer to provisions of a possibly minor character but all pointing in the same direction. The circulation of false statements regarding the personal conduct or character of the candidate is something which, is one more or less notable instance in comparatively recent times, has probably worked the defeat of a candidate, necessitating his withdrawal from the contest, although shortly afterwards circumstances seemed to demonstrate that the reports were entirely unfounded. There is a provision in the English Elections Act on the subject; and adapting that provision, I propose to make it illegal to circulate false statements regarding a candidate at an election, and touching his personal character or conduct, if such statements can be shown to have been circulated with a view to affecting his return.

Handbills are sometimes circulated in election contests containing libellous statements and great difficulty is experienced in ascertaining the source of such anonymous handbills or fixing the responsibility for the statements therein contained. As a means of protecting candidates against that form of falsehood I am proposing, in accordance with the provisions of the English statute, that all handbills, advertisements, placards or bills of that character, circulated in connection with an election, should show on their face the name of the printing office where they were prepared.

I am proposing a clause which will forbid the intervention in any of our elections of non-residents of the Dominion unless they are voters in some constituency of the country, thus prohibiting the interference in any capacity—for the purpose of canvassing or otherwise in any regard at an election—of aliens who have no interest in our government or affairs.

The other amendments in this Bill are of possibly minor character altogether. It was stated before the committee to which I have already alluded that in some instances, candidates had difficulties in ascertaining the limits of their polling subdivisions

and what polling subdivisions were established for their riding. To prevent further difficulty on that score, the committee came to the conclusion to recommend such legislation as I am now embodying in this Bill—a provision that a certain number of copies of the proclamation shall be sent by the returning officer or delivered personally to every candidate. And a penalty shall be imposed upon any one who mutilates or tears down a proclamation for an election before the voting has taken place, the reason for that provision being the statement that in some parts of the Dominion, these proclamations had simply been posted up to comply formally with the requirements of the law and had immediately been taken down by the very same person who had posted them up or by some one who had come along immediately afterwards. The clause as drawn, not merely imposes penalties for the tearing down or mutilation of a proclamation so posted up but makes those penalties especially severe if the tearing down or mutilation takes place at the hands of any officer of the law or any person who has a duty imposed upon him in connection with the election. I am also proposing to provide that every nomination paper shall contain an address within Canada for service upon the person nominated, so that any election petition or any paper of any description connected with the election which it might be desirable afterward to serve upon any candidate can be validly served upon him by leaving it at that place.

It is said there has also been difficulty in connection with some recent elections in the province of Ontario—I do not know if a like difficulty has occurred anywhere else—in the form of oath administered to voters—and there has been debate upon that subject in previous sessions in this House. I have examined with all the care I have been able not only the legislation on the subject but the views expressed by different members of this House in the debates I have referred to. I must say I am not able to see a defect, if the provisions of the statute were adhered to and observed. The law as it stands requires the oaths which may be administered to voters at provincial elections to be so modified that they will be appropriate oaths in like cases to be administered in Dominion elections, and then provides that if required any elector may be asked and compelled to take a further oath which is prescribed in form by the Dominion Elections Act. But it has been stated that inasmuch as these oaths have been forwarded to the returning officer and distributed by him to the deputy returning officers on separate sheets of paper, in many cases, in practice, the deputies on being required to administer the oath to any elector, have administered only the one and that one not the form which contained the clauses asserting that the elector had not been guilty of paying or receiving anything in the way of bribery or for corrupt practices, that accordingly electors, after being required to be sworn, had been so sworn without taking any oath upon the subject of bribery. As I have said, I cannot see, if the statute as it stands were observed by the official and by those who require the oaths to be administered, that any amendment to the law is requisite; I think that everything is covered by the statute as it stands at present; but there has been practical difficulty and to prevent the recurrence of any such difficulty I took upon myself the responsibility, prior to the by-elections of last fall, to suggest to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that a special form, incorporating not only the clauses of the oath administered in provincial elections but also the special form of bribery oath required by the Dominion Act should be prepared and sent out to the various returning officers for use in those by-elections. Upon my suggestion and advice a form which was prepared in the Department of Justice incorporating these separate forms of oath was sent to the returning officers by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and so far as I have ever heard there has been no difficulty raised in consequence, at any of the by-elections which took place last fall. While I do not think it is, strictly speaking, necessary that there should be any amendment of the wording of our present Elections Act in that respect, I have thought it would be the part of prudence so to amend the present legislation that the form of oath which without any special authority had been so sent out and used last year should now be the form authorized by the law and I am proposing to insert an amendment in that regard.

I am proposing also a clause with regard to the preservation of the blank ballot papers in the hands of the officials before polling day, a clause which has been prepared in view of statements which were made to the special election committee two years ago that such legislation was desirable.

A provision also appears that a voter whose name may have been omitted in the transcribed list but who was entitled to vote and whose name does appear upon the general list should be enabled to vote upon a special numbered ballot on taking an oath that he is the person named in the general list and that he believes his name has been omitted by inadvertence. Such a provision is or may possibly be of value.

A great deal has been said in different places, a good deal has been said in this House since the general elections in 1904, in regard to the omission in the special lists for different polling places in Manitoba, and perhaps in other parts of the Dominion as well, of the names of voters who were on the general lists and who were entitled to have voted. I am confident, as

the result of listening to the evidence which was given with special relation to charges of that character before the Special Elections Committee I have mentioned, that the circumstances connected with these alleged offences have been very much misunderstood. I am confident that the omissions of such names were few in number and that there was nothing of intentional wrongdoing. However that may be, it is of interest that provision should be made in the Elections Act which will authorize and permit the officers of the law to make that redistribution of names. Under the present system the voters' lists of the province of Manitoba, of the province of British Columbia and of the unorganized portions of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, are not prepared from the assessment rolls, are not prepared with reference to the property which the voter owns and they do not show upon their face any particular place as the residence of each voter; the list contains merely the name of the voter and his post office address. In many ridings, for Dominion purposes in these portions of the Dominion there is not coincidence in territory between the riding for the purposes of the provincial election and the purposes of the Dominion elections, or in the individual polling subdivisions. A riding for Dominion purposes may contain portions of a dozen different polling subdivisions established for provincial purposes and the officials conducting the Dominion elections, have of necessity to transcribe from the general list to a special list for the purpose of that poll, the names of the voters who properly ought to be assigned to the particular poll. I am proposing, in the Bill I have prepared, a clause which will authorize that to be done. It is a thing which there is necessity should be done, without which the election cannot be carried on, and in regard to which, unless there is statutory authority for the doing of it, one cannot expect officials to do the necessary election work and incur the risk of prosecutions, which, although they may be without foundation are none the less annoying to the individual.

I am proposing also to adopt an amendment which was, to some extent, discussed before the Elections Committee I have spoken of, and which is, to my mind a very essential one. I was very glad indeed to notice that my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) advocated a like amendment, because it is one of the justices of which I am fully persuaded and which I urge strongly should be adopted by this House. This amendment provides that no number or mark which the deputy returning officer or other official may put upon the back of the ballot shall avoid that vote at the hands of the man who cast it. There have been at least two notable instances in the history of this House in which the absence from the Dominion Elections Act of any such saving clause has affected the election. Some thirty years ago an election in East Hastings resulted in the return of a candidate by a majority of twenty or twenty-five. But, upon a recount of the votes before a county judge, it was found that the deputy returning officer at one of the polls, at which that candidate had a majority of more than his total majority in the riding, had numbered all the ballots after the manner which then obtained in the province of Ontario. The result was the throwing out of these ballots by the judge, a certificate that the other candidate was elected, an election petition on the part of the candidate who had been counted out, and a new election. Precisely the same thing occurred in the county of Wenthworth at the last general election. And although our statute has, ever since it was first passed, thirty-five years ago, been silent in this respect and left such ballots to be rejected by the returning officer and by the courts, it has always seemed to me that that was a defect in the Dominion Elections Act which ought to be remedied. I do not, however, conceal from myself, and I do not seek to conceal from the House the fact that to remedy this, to permit such numbered ballot or ballots containing marks of identification to be counted, is a radical departure from the whole principle of the Dominion Elections Act. It has been said by learned judges, and no doubt correctly said, that the ruling principle of the Dominion Elections Act is secrecy at all costs, secrecy even at the cost of defeating the will of the people by preventing the counting of ballots which are perfectly good when they leave the hands of the electors, but which may afterwards be vitiated by the deputy returning officer or some other official. If it is a question whether that overriding principle of secrecy is or is not to be encroached upon for the sake of preserving the individual vote and securing a true expression of the will of the voter and of the people, then, in my judgment, the principle of secrecy ought to give way, and not the principle of giving to the voter the means of expressing his true wish at the polls and carrying out that wish in the counting of the ballots.

There are one or two minor provisions in the way of increasing the severity of the penalties which the Act already imposes for the infraction of its provisions. I am proposing that the man who pays money as a bribe, or the man who takes money as a bribe shall be subject not merely to the monetary penalty which the law now imposes and to the penalty of imprisonment which is already provided, but shall, for a period of eight years, be disfranchised and disqualified from holding any office under the Crown or in the gift of the Governor General in Council. My object in suggesting

that amendment for consideration is simply to provide one additional penalty and one which perhaps would be felt by the class of man who pays money for a vote or who receives it at the hands of some one willing to bribe him. I am, in the same sense, seeking, not as something new, but as something to increase the penalty, to make more severe the punishment which the law already provides for the man who tampers with the ballot. However lenient public opinion may be in regard to the man, who, in his need, takes a small sum of money for his vote or even toward the man who pays that money to an elector as a bribe, I think there is one thing in regard to which all parties in this country, all citizens of this country, are agreed, and that is that no penalty can be too severe upon the man who deliberately goes about to thwart the will of the electors generally, or of any elector, by intentionally tampering with a ballot which is cast at the election or diverting it from the purpose with which it was cast by the man who marked it. In that view, I am asking the House to provide more severe penalties in the way of heavier imprisonment, and removing altogether the possibility of a monetary penalty only upon the man who, whether an election official or a stranger, interferes with the ballot after it is marked by the voter and deposited in the ballot box.

These, in general outline, are the provisions of the Bill of which I have given notice, and I beg to move that the Bill be now read the first time.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I know that it is not customary to discuss a measure of this kind on the first reading, but I was not in the House when the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) commenced his remarks and I am not sure whether one point which seems to me important is covered by the Bill. The committee on the election law, a couple of years ago, debated the question of trying to prevent this carting about of voters which now takes place. In the province of Quebec we have a good deal of that. It is very annoying, and I think that hon. members on both sides will agree that if we were to adopt the principle in force in Ontario, one man one vote, it would be a great deal better. Of course, if that is covered by the Bill it will come up for further discussion. As to the form of the oath, I was glad to hear the Minister of Justice say that the Bill would provide that there should be no obscurity about the oath to be administered to the elector. As it is to-day, in every election in which I have taken part for the last five or six years, it has always been a very hard thing to get deputy returning officers to administer the oath as the law provides.

My hon. friend a moment ago said that the law already provided for the oath. That may be true, but it was not accepted in that way by the deputy returning officers. I remember a case in which a deputy returning officer was administering the oath provided by the local election law, which did not amount to anything at all except that the person taking it swore that he was a British subject and 21 years of age. On my reminding the deputy returning officer that that was not the proper way of administering the oath, he told me that the copy he had was the one which he had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. That statement was perfectly true. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery had sent a sheet of paper with an oath which was not an oath at all according to the spirit of the law. This question has been brought before the House two or three times, and the predecessor of my hon. friend promised to change this form of oath. We were told that the oath would be changed, or rather that the attention of the deputy returning officers would be called to the fact that they had to administer such and such an oath. It was not done. In the elections in Nicolet and Stanstead, the last two elections in which I took part, the oath as it should be administered was not administered. I am glad to hear my hon. friend say that the law will make provision so that there will be no misunderstanding as to the oath which shall be administered to the electors. We all understand, if we are to carry out the law, as the minister seems to desire, that the oath must be made in such a way that the elector will know what he is swearing at.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. Swearing to. The swearing at takes place after the election generally, but that is not in the law. Another thing I would like to call my hon. friend's attention to is the fact that the lists are prepared by the municipalities. Unfortunately, that is about the only pledge given by the present government before they came into power that they have carried out, and I think it is a bad thing. The lists are prepared by the municipalities——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And well prepared.

Mr. BERGERON. Not always; and, as to the matter of cost, it is just as costly today as it was before. As my hon. friend said a moment ago, in some counties the delimitations for the Dominion House and for the provincial legislatures are entirely different, and there is a great mixture of names on the electoral lists. But that is not the point to which I wish to call my hon. friend's attention. I desire to call his attention to the fact particularly that the list is prepared by the municipal councils. It is sent

to the registrar and from the registrar it is sent up here to the Printing Bureau. Who is there to see that the lists are printed properly or not? They are sent here, they are printed and there may be mistakes made. I would not insinuate that any printer would do such a thing knowingly, but I repeat there may be mistakes. Whose business is it to revise these lists? How do we know that they are correct when election time comes on? When the lists are sent down from Ottawa as printed, we compare them with the copy that we have at the registrar's office, and they are not the same. There are many names omitted, and there are names on the list that should not be there. They forgot to strike off some names and they forgot to add new names. There should be an officer or a board appointed to go over the list, or to revise the proof, and see beyond doubt that the list that is printed and sent down to us is identically the list that came from the registrar.

Mr. TALBOT. Is it not a fact that the voters are not registered on the lists that are printed, but on the lists that are supplied at every polling place by the returning officer?

Mr. BERGERON. No.

Mr. TALBOT. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know if I understand my hon. friend. If my hon. friend means the list which is used for the election, I would say to him that such a list is sent down from the Printing Bureau at Ottawa. That list may be right and it may not be right. If it is right, well and good; but if it is not right, why should the candidates suffer by it? I call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice to that point. It may be remedied when the Bill comes up for discussion. There is another point, and that is that there is no reason why elections should not take place on the same day. It was a principle of the Liberal party in days gone by that all elections should take place on the same day. We know that when the government last appealed to the country all the elections did not take place on the same day. Provision should be made in the law which would make it impossible for the government to change the date of the election in any county. I make that suggestion again to my hon friend and I hope that he will take this and my other sugestions in good part. I listened to him with a great deal of pleasure, and from what he said I conclude that it is his intention to see that the Election Act is put into such form that elections may be carried out in a more satisfactory manner to all parties than has been the case in the past.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. BERGERON.

## EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. AYLESWORTH introduced Bill (No. 116) to amend the Exchequer Court Act.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the purpose of the Act?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The provisions of this Bill are very simple. The Bill provides simply for an amendment with respect to a case which unfortunately arose in connection with the Exchequer Court two months ago, when the judge of that court became seriously ill. There is a provision in the existing law for the appointment, under such circumstances, of a substitute judge, and under that provision a substitute judge was appointed. Fortunately, the judge who was so appointed was able to dispose, with one exception, of all the matters that came before him during the time that he held the position. Under the statute his authority comes to an end automatically immediately upon the ending of the illness of the judge in whose place he has been appointed; so that upon the death of Mr. Justice Burbidge all authority on the part of the gentleman who was acting as his substitute came immediately to an end. There was one case, fortunately one only, which he had not disposed of. He was without power to dispose of that case, although ready to do so. That necessarily had to stand for rehearing before his successor. I am proposing to amend the Act so as to admit of a temporary judge concluding any work which he has in hand at the time his temporary authority comes to an end. I am at the same time proposing further to amend the Act by authorizing the judge of the court to confer general authority upon the registrar of the court to transact in the judge's name routine chamber business.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## INTERCOLONIAL AND PRINCE EDWARD RAILWAYS EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUND.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 117) to amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. GRAHAM. In the Bill as formerly introduced and passed by the House there was a clause providing that no person who had been dismissed and not reinstated would be eligible to receive any benefit under this Act. In the English version of the statute that portion is stricken out, I imagine by the Upper Chamber, but it was left in the French version. I want to introduce it again because it is very necessary to a pro-

per carrying out of the Act that that should be in the Bill. Men sometimes are dismissed under a misapprehension and new light comes, on account of which they may be reinstated.

Mr. BERGERON. If it is in the French statute would it not be the law all the same?

Mr. GRAHAM. Then, this will not make it any stronger; the English statute seems to be in the hands of a great many barristers.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## PRIVATE BILLS.

### EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 68) respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Turiff.

Mr. LENNOX. I mentioned the other evening when the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill was not present that there is a very vague point of commencement for the line as set out in the Bill. I think it was altered in committee so as to make it more definite, but of that I am not sure. The Bill says it may build from a point on its authorized line, but it does not define the point in any way.

Mr. TURRIFF. This is the way the Bill passed the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of the main line?

Mr. TURRIFF. Some 700 or 800 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very indefinite in a line of that length.

Mr. LENNOX. I don't think the committee passed it in that form.

Mr. TISDALE. I cannot understand the committee fixing the point so indefinitely, there must be some misunderstanding.

Mr. TURRIFF. This is one of the Mackenzie and Mann lines, and it is just an extension of time.

Mr. LENNOX. It is more than that, it empowers the construction of a branch from a point on the authorized line, which is 700 or 800 miles long, and therefore the point of commencement might range over that great distance. It has been invariably the custom of the committee to insist on more definiteness.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. The authorized line spoken of is the Canadian Northern from Edmonton to the coast, and it has not been located yet, so that it would be difficult to determine the exact point from which this branch would be built.

Mr. LENNOX. It should be within certain limits.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The committee will readily understand that in building through such a mountainous country every latitude must be given, and it would be impossible for them until their line was surveyed to say which was the more feasible route. The railway must follow one of four or five river valleys, and if you confine them to one valley it might be found a physical impossibility for them to construct there.

Mr. TISDALE. You might at least say that it should be between some range of mountains and some river. The line is 700 miles long.

Mr. MACPHERSON. That is a mistake, it is about 500 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the Pacific terminus of the main road?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I think it is Kitamaat. This is an old charter and they want to construct down to Vancouver. They will have to construct down one of the river valleys and if you confine them to a definite point it might be found impossible to build from that point after they have made their surveys.

Mr. LENNOX. In the first place it is indefinite as to where the main line is to run, and if you cannot define within 500 miles of where the starting point is to be it would not seem to be very necessary to charter it at all. We will say that this main line runs in a general way east and west and the branches north and south. There certainly should be some definite limit—say 200 miles distant from the coast on the west and 200 miles from Edmonton on the east.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The difficulty is that there is no point that could be named between the Yellowhead Pass and the Pacific coast. The country is unsettled and unsurveyed. There is a river and there are one or two valleys down which a railway could run; but nobody has any definite knowledge of the country, and if the committee should limit the area, it might be found, when the line was surveyed, that the road could not be built according to the limit fixed by the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. The promoters could easily come for an amendment, I suppose?

Mr. GALLIHER. The public will be protected by the fact that the plans for any road proposed to be built there will have to be submitted to the Minister of Railways for his approval. As that country is almost unexplored, certainly unsurveyed, it is impossible to tie the railway down to a definite route.

Mr. FOSTER. The main point that occurred to me was that this was a bad precedent; it was very loose legislation. If

you were going to give a company the right to build branch lines, you should have some fairly definite provision as to the points from which those lines should start. I suppose the difficulties surrounding this case are peculiar; but I should think we might adhere to the precedent by fixing a limit within 100 miles of the coast.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman as to the bad precedent; but we are up against this difficulty, that the committee has not any knowledge enabling it to fix a definite point. It would be absurd to start building a branch line within 100 miles from the coast to the point to which you would wish to build it, without knowing more of the country than we know at present.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SASKATOON, SASKATCHEWAN, PEACE RIVER AND DAWSON RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

On section 14,

Mr. GRAHAM. I move that section 14 be struck out and that the following be substituted therefor:

14. The company may for the purpose of its undertaking:

(a) Build, purchase, lease or otherwise acquire, manage or control hotels, restaurants and other buildings at any place where the railway is authorized to be constructed, and acquire, purchase lease and hold the land necessary for such purposes, and carry on business in connection therewith, and afford such facilities as tend to the comfort and convenience of the travelling public, and may let any such buildings for such purposes;

(b) Acquire, purchase, lease and hold lands required for, and lay out, establish and manage parks and pleasure grounds, and give a lease thereof.

We had this up the other evening. On going through the clauses of the Bill with the clerk of the committee, we decided to strike out clause 14, leaving the parts that refer to hotels and parks. The balance, referring to mining and lumbering, I have moved to strike out. Many other features of the Bill I find precedents for; besides, a good many are in conformity with the model Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to 'a' and 'b' as being now the constituent parts of the section.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that these Bills have to pass an examiner, who marks out the clauses which are not according to the model Bill. Do these clauses, which are objected to by the examiner, go before the committee for consideration?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am inclined to think that the whole Bill is considered by the committee, with notes on the margin by the examiner.

Mr. LENNOX. We do not hear anything about the report of the examiner. The Bill is printed and there is nothing in it to call attention to the fact that it has been passed upon by the examiner.

Mr. BERGERON. Would it not be well to have the Bill as amended reprinted, showing in brackets the changes made, so that we could see how the amended clauses compare with the original?

Mr. GRAHAM. That matter will be attended to in the future. We decided the other day to have the Bills reprinted.

Mr. GALLIHER. I have had one or two Bills before the examiner, and I think the course followed is this. The draft Bill is inspected by the examiner and he strikes out any clauses which are not in accordance with the model Bill. Then the Bill is printed, and the printed Bill is the one which the examiner has passed upon.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ST. CLAIR AND ERIE SHIP CANAL COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 98) respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Blain.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We should have some explanation why these parties are asking for further extension of time when their charter has been in existence ten years. Is it their intention to go on and construct?

Mr. BLAIN. This Bill was placed in my name at the request of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) who was absent, and he will give the necessary explanation.

Mr. TISDALE. The principal difficulty is want of money. As soon as we can raise it, we will go on as rapidly as possible.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THE BANK OF VANCOUVER.

House in committee on Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Bank of Vancouver.—Mr. Macpherson.

On section 4,

Mr. GALLIHER. As I understand it, the names in section 1 are struck out and no other names are substituted. This section as originally drafted declares that certain persons should be incorporated under the title of the Bank of Vancouver. Section 4 merely provides that certain persons should be the directors of that bank. If the names are struck out of section 1 and no others are substituted is that sufficient?

Mr. TISDALE. Section 1 is changed to provide for that.

Mr. LENNOX. But it may not cover the point. Section 1 provides for the incorporation and section 4 provides for the provisional directors of that corporation. We strike out the names in section 1, merely leaving certain names in section 4, which section refers to provisional directors.

Mr. TISDALE. Though the names are struck out of section 1 it says 'the persons hereinafter named' shall be the incorporators.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Certain people applied for a charter for the Bank of Vancouver and others for a charter for the Bank of British Columbia. These two parties got together with the result that the Bank of Vancouver promoters withdrew and allowed the Bank of British Columbia people to take the name of the Bank of Vancouver. There had been a Bank of British Columbia which had been absorbed by the Canadian Bank of Commerce and some objection was raised to that name. The result of the arrangement was that the Bank of British Columbia went ahead, but used the Bank of Vancouver Bill as the one to proceed upon.

Mr. BERGERON. That is, the promoters of the Bank of British Columbia dropped out.

Mr. MACPHERSON. No—the very reverse.

Mr. BERGERON. Two Bills were asked for, and only one is proceeded with and that one the Bank of Vancouver. Therefore the Bank of British Columbia must have dropped out before the Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. MACPHERSON. No, nobody dropped out until the Bills came before the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not see why it was not put in the usual way merely with the change of name.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I quite agree—I do not see any reason for it. But lawyers, at times, have funny ideas, and this seems to be one of those funny ideas.

Mr. BERGERON. The most important point is how the Bill dropped out from the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. GALLIHER. The Standing Orders Committee could not touch that. Both Bills went before the Standing Orders Committee and were reported to this House. But when they went before the Banking and Commerce Committee it was decided to drop the name of the Bank of British Columbia and drop the names of incorporators of the Bank of Vancouver.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If there are any objections to the Bill as reported by the committee I would ask that it be allowed to stand until the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) is present.

Mr. HENDERSON. The whole arrangement was thoroughly understood by the Banking and Commerce Committee. The Bill comes before us in a rather peculiar form—the thing might not occur again in twenty years. But there was no objection raised.

Mr. BLAIN. And the whole thing received the endorsation of the Minister of Finance who gave us the explanation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am satisfied with the Bill, but my point was that if any objection is raised I would like to have the Minister of Finance present before the Bill is proceeded with.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not rise to object to the Bill. It was a mere question as to the form of the measure.

Mr. TISDALE. The counsel of both parties were there and were quite agreed on the subject.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

## QUESTIONS.

### INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUND.

Mr. GAUVREAU—by Mr. Johnston—asked:

1. Is it within the knowledge of the Minister of Railways that the employees of the Intercolonial Railway have been placed on the list of Intercolonial Employees' Provident Fund, although they were no longer in the employment of the railway at the time of the passing of the Act in question, and of its coming into operation?
2. If so, who are they, and for what reasons?
3. Is it his intention to place on the list of pensioners of the Intercolonial Railway, Mr. Joseph Dumas, overseer of the section of St. Eloi, in the county of Témiscouata, who became blind in the service of the Intercolonial Railway a short time before the putting in force of the said Provident Fund Act, and also by reason of an accident for which he nor the railway was to blame?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. All employees who have been retired from the railway service, under the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways 'Provident Fund Act,' were in the employ of these railways at the time of the passing of the Act in question, and of its coming into operation.
2. Answered by number one.
3. The government cannot place Joseph Dumas on the list of pensioners of the In-

tercolonial Railway; he having retired from the railway service on July 28, 1905, and having applied for and been paid the amount of his total disability allowance, in the Intercolonial Railway Employees Relief and Insurance Association; and also because the Act, section 21, subsection 2, provides that 'No person shall be entitled to receive both a monthly allowance under this Act and the total disability allowance from the association.'

PAYMENT OF BOUNTIES.

Mr. HENDERSON asked:

What was the amount paid as bounty on binder twine, lead and crude oil, respectively, in each year ending June 30, from 1903 to 1907, both years inclusive?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

| | 1903. | 1904. | 1905. | 1906. | 1907. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $ cts. | $ cts. | $ cts. | $ cts. | $ cts. |
| Binder twine | ..... | 25,452 04 | 13,789 27 | 15,079 40 | 32,598 86 |
| Lead | 4,380 00 | 195,627 09 | 330,645 12 | 90,196 67 | 1,994 75 |
| Crude Petroleum.; | ..... | ..... | 350,047 17 | 291,157 20 | 385,108 57 |

MATERIALS FOR DETROIT TUNNEL.

Mr. CLEMENTS—by Mr. Blain—asked:

What amount of materials used in the Detroit river tunnel up to March 1, 1908, have been imported from the United States, giving the amounts, separate, if possible, for that portion from the international boundary line to the water's edge, and that portion from the water's edge to entrance of tunnel?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

The value of materials used in the Detroit river tunnel imported from the United States and entered free of duty in Canada up to 1st March, 1908, is $144,527. The customs returns do not specify separately materials for that portion of the tunnel between the international boundary line and the water's edge, from materials in the other portions of the tunnel within Canada.

ICE-BREAKING STEAMERS.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Have the plans for a new winter steamer for the Prince Edward Island service been completed, and has the contract for building the same been let?

2. Is the following report correct?

Studying ice-breaking.

Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, March 3.—Duguid, the British expert employed by the Dominion government for the building of ice-breakers is now making trips between Georgetown and Pictou on the winter steamers 'Minto' and 'Stanley' to observe ice conditions. Duguid is completing his designs for a new ice-breaking steamer for communication between the Island and the mainland.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Plans have been completed and tenders called for will be received until the 16th March, 1908.

2. No.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS IN ITALY.

Mr. VERVILLE—by Mr. Johnston—asked:

1. Has the government any immigration agents in Italy?

2. In what places do they reside?

3. What are their duties?

4. What salary or commission do they receive?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. No.

INDIAN DEPARTMENT—PURCHASE OF BLANKETS.

Mr. CLEMENTS—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What amount of blankets have been purchased by the Militia Department and the Department of Indian Affairs since 1895?

2. What was the colour and price, from whom were they purchased, and were tenders called for the same?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would ask to have this stand as a notice of motion for a return as it concerns two departments.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for return.

EXPENDITURES ON EXHIBITIONS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

What is the total amount expended on exhibitions outside of Canada since this government took office, the place at which the money was expended, and the amount in each case?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (for Minister of Agriculture):

| | |
|---|---|
| Stockholm | $ 1,122.87 |
| Omaha | 7,773.96 |
| Royal Exchange, London | 7,534.14 |
| Paris, France | 316,337.39 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Glasgow, Scotland | $ 70,379.91 |
| Wolverhampton & Cork | 59,786.13 |
| Pan American, Buffalo | 67,058.83 |
| Pittsburg | 11,200.10 |
| London | 5,725.54 |
| Liverpool | 3,243.95 |
| Osaka, Japan | 55,062.29 |
| St. Louis | 317,335.67 |
| Milan, Italy | 130,201.61 |
| Liege, Belgium | 164,152.98 |
| Dublin | 138,270.08 |
| New Zealand | 55,887.86 |
| Edinburgh, Scotland | 245.66 |
| Melbourne, Australia | 605.71 |
| Exhibitions General | 65,853.22 |
| London (Shepherd's Bush) | 90,363.07 |
| | $1,568,140.97 |

REVENUE AND COST OF EXPERIMENTAL FARMS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What is the total amount of money received from sales made by each of the experimental farms in 1906, and the name of each?

2. What is the total amount paid for management and operation of each farm, and the goods purchased in 1906?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (for Minister of Agriculture):

1. As shown in the report of the Auditor General, page D-71, the following amounts of money have been received from sales made by the several experimental farms during the fiscal year 1906-7, covering the nine months ended March 31, 1907:

| | |
|---|---|
| Agassiz, B.C. | $ 705.04 |
| Brandon, Man. | 1,559.96 |
| Indian Head, Sask. | 1,053.86 |
| Nappan, N.S. | 646.58 |
| Ottawa, for seven months only | 2,733.74 |
| | $6,699.18 |
| Ottawa, not in report of Auditor General for 1906-7 (February and March) | 2,338.86 |
| | $9,038.04 |

In considering the revenue from the experimental farms it should be remembered that most of the grain which is grown on them is distributed free to farmers in the form of samples for the improvement of their seed.

2. The figures for all expenditures in connection with the management and operation of all branches of the work on all the experimental farms for the nine months ended March 31, 1907, are as follows, as given in the report of the Auditor General (Page D-29):

| | |
|---|---|
| Ottawa | $54,286.83 |
| Nappan | 8,515.73 |
| Brandon | 8,198.64 |
| Indian Head | 6,300.73 |
| Agassiz | 5,256.83 |
| New farms | 19,996.36 |
| | $102,555.12 |

In the report of the Auditor General all the general expenditures of the farms, which are not chargeable to any one farm in particular, are included in the accounts of the Central Farm. If these general expenses are deducted, the expenditure in connection with the Central Farm is reduced to $36,441.24.

SALES OF INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. How many acres of Indian lands have been sold since 1896?

2. What was the total amount received for the said land?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. 620,434·60 acres of Indian lands were sold from the 1st of July, 1896, to the 31st of March, 1907.

2. $1,525,567.96 was received from the sale of Indian lands from the 1st of July, 1896, to the 31st of March, 1907.

REVENUE AND COST, GRAIN INSPECTION.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What was the total amount expended in inspecting grain in Winnipeg, Fort William and Port Arthur, in the year 1906?

2. What was the total amount received from the inspection of grain in Winnipeg, Fort William and Port Arthur, in 1906?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. $85,655.86 for the calendar year, 1906.

2. $94,603.57 for the calendar year, 1906—grain inspected, weighing, warehouse licenses, samples sold and vessels overtime.

FOREIGN VESSELS IN COASTING TRADE.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

Have any orders in council been passed granting foreign vessels the right to engage in coasting trade under clause six of an Act respecting the coasting trade of Canada?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). No.

LIFE-SAVING STATION AT TORONTO.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the government decided to establish a modern life-saving station at Toronto harbour?

2. Has the city of Toronto recently asked for the establishment of such a station?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. The government has established a life-saving station at the eastern entrance to Toronto harbour with modern appliances and one of the best crews that can be selected. Each year some improvement is being made.

2. An interview was held by his worship the mayor and members of the Toronto board of control with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries relative to the establishment of another permanent and fully equipped life-saving station at the port of Toronto and this matter is now receiving consideration.

WESTERN ENTRANCE TO TORONTO HARBOUR.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Blain—asked:

Has the contract for the construction of the new western entrance to Toronto harbour been awarded? If so, when, to whom, and for what amount?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). No.

DREDGING AT HUDSON, QUEBEC.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What was the total amount expended in dredging during the past season at Hudson, province of Quebec, and was the said dredging executed to improve the channel in the Ottawa river or the approach of the wharf, or for what purpose?
2. Who executed the said dredging at Hudson, and was it done by contract or by day work?
3. Were tenders for the said work called through the newspapers, and was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. (a) $3,596.28.
(b) Widening the channel near the wharf.
2. Dominion Dredging Company, Ltd., by contract.
3. Yes.

DREDGING IN COUNTY OF VAUDREUIL.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. By whom was the work of dredging at divers points in the county of Vaudreuil superintended during the past dredging season?
2. What was the salary granted to the said superintendent?
3. What is the total amount paid to him to date?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1, 2 and 3. At Hudson: A. W. Mullan, $3 per day; amount paid him $108. At Vaudreuil: C. M. Besner; $3 per day; $236.85. At Pointe Cavagnale: Paul Denis; $2.50 per day; $135.50.

DREDGING RAQUETTE RIVER.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What amount was expended during the past year in dredging Racquette river, county of Vaudreuil, province of Quebec?
2. Who executed the said dredging?
3. Was the said dredging done by contract or by day work?



4. Were the tenders publicly called for the said dredging through the newspapers?
5. Was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. $3,086.40.
2. L. Cohen & Son.
3. By contract.
4 and 5. Yes. The Dominion Dredging Company who were the lowest on first call, declined contract; on second call, by letter, L. Cohen & Son were the lowest tenderers.

DREDGING IN COUNTY OF NICOLET.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Blain— asked:

1. Who did the dredging work in the channel opposite St. Pierre-les-Becquets, in the county of Nicolet, province of Quebec?
2. Is that work completed?
3. What is the total amount up to date paid for the said work?
4. To whom was such amount paid?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. The St. Lawrence & Great Lakes Dredging Company.
2. All the dredging called for by the contract has been completed.
3. $5,865.67.
4. The St. Lawrence & Great Lakes Dredging Company.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing the number of seizures made by the Customs Department for the fiscal years 1905, 1906 and 1907; the reason for each seizure; the disposition of each case; the amount received by the government, and by the party seizing or giving information in each case; and the names of the ports at which such seizures took place.—Mr. Cockshutt.

For a return showing what amount has been spent up to February 15, 1908, upon the repairs made to the wall protecting the channel at the entrance of the Nicolet river; and if made by day work or by contract; who the contractor was, and the lowest tenderer; how tenders were called for; the amount of the contract, and the amount paid for extras; name of the superintendent appointed by the government; what amount he received per day, and the total amount paid to him.—Mr. Monk.

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, petitions with signatures thereto, in possession of the government, or any member or official thereof, respecting the removal of a post office from Angus McDonald's place in Pisquid, Prince Edward Island, to Russell Birt's, of the same place.—Mr. A. Martin.

For a return showing how many renewals of placer claims were granted by the Gold Commissioner at Dawson, on or subsequent to August 1, 1906, at $10 each; why the fee of $15, as required by 6 Edward VII., chapter 39, was not collected in these cases; and what shortages were afterwards collected.—Mr. Lennox.

For a return showing how many renewals of placer claims were granted by the Assistant Gold Commissioner at Whitehorse on or subsequent to August 1, at $10 each; why the fee of $15, as required by 6 Edward VII., chapter 39, was not collected in these cases; and what shortages have been collected.—Mr. Lennox.

For a copy of all applications, recommendation of applications, and replies thereto, instructions regarding advertising, and a copy of all tenders and replies thereto, for timber berths Nos. 652, 657, 677, 679, 681, 683, 684, 721, 722, 730 and 743.—Mr. McCraney.

For a copy of all petitions, letters of recommendation, written requests and correspondence with the government in connection with the opening of a post office savings bank in the post office at St. Gabriel de Brandon, in the province of Quebec.—Mr. Monk.

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, reports and recommendations in possession of the government, with respect to the inspection of packing houses, or the Meat Inspection Act, including the appointment of inspectors.—Mr. Armstrong.

## PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—TUNNEL.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, reports, and all other information, not already brought down, in possession of the government or any member or official thereof, in reference to winter communication, and the construction of a tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Canada.

He said: I rise, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents in Prince Edward Island, on behalf of the people of the whole province, and I may say on behalf of the people of all Canada to draw the attention of the government once more to this really important question. It is not the first time that it has been brought up in the House, and I venture to say that unless justice is done to my province it will not be the last time. It is something like the spirit in Shakespeare's Macbeth: 'It will not be quieted'; it will not be quieted unless justice is done to Prince Edward Island. This question is not of recent date; it has been an issue between the province and the Dominion since confederation. The terms of confederation were clear enough; fortunately for the province they were written down in such language that this government or no government of Canada can evade them if they have the proper sense of honour which a government of the Dominion should have. There may be (but I do not know what they are) reasons why the government of Canada did not implement this solemn compact entered into with a small province thirty-five years ago. What is the reasons why the terms of confederation have not been implemented up to the present date? Is it because the province is small? Is the government of this great country going to go back on its obligations because a province with which it entered into a compact is not a large province? I have heard it said by hon. members on both sides of the House—the most of those who said it are on the government side—that one reason was because the government was doing very well towards Prince Edward Island and that Prince Edward Island was a burden on the rest of the Dominion. We might as well have a heart to heart talk now with regard to that, to see if there is a scintilla of truth in that expression of opinion: that Prince Edward Island is a small province and is not bearing its full share of its obligations, and that it is not a contributor as the rest of the provinces are. I am going first to show that Prince Edward Island as a contributor to the Dominion treasury, is doing its full share as one of the provinces of confederation. Take your estimates of expenditure for this year; take your revenue for this year if you like. What portion does Prince Edward Island bear as a province in regard to that revenue or expenditure? Prince Edward Island is the one-fifty-fifth portion of the population of this Dominion and the expenditure of the Dominion this year is up to $116,000,000 or perhaps more, and Prince Edward Island being one-fifty-fifth part she naturally bears her share of that to the extent of $2,000,000 of money. Part of this expenditure is on capital account and the capital expenditure has to be borne by Prince Edward Island as well as any other province of Canada. Her share therefore is $2,000,000 and how much does the Dominion government return to Prince Edward Island yearly? Take it on an average from confederation to the present day and the Dominion has expended in Prince Edward Island since that time something like $500,000 or $600,000 a year. You take $2,000,000 from us and you give us back about $600,000. And yet we will be told that Prince Edward Island is a burden on this great Dominion. I want to go into this matter because I am compelled to on account of some things I hear around this House, and on the government side of the House. It has been said often and often that Prince Edward Island has been more than fairly treated. Now, I am going to show you how fair Prince Edward Island has been I will quote from one of the speeches that has been made down in Charlottetown when we entered confederation; at that time Sir George E. Cartier said:

> We viewed the British North American Colonies, as a portion of our great family, who owed and were bound to pay common allegiance to our noble Queen. This was not a question of bringing foreign elements together; he regarded it in the light of a family arrangement, in which the island is the youngest and smallest member.'

Prince Edward Island was to be the youngest and smallest member of the family and we know that the youngest and smallest

member of a family is always treated with some consideration. I am going to show how the youngest member of the family was treated in this confederation ; how she was treated some years ago and how she is treated to-day. I will give you modern examples first and then I will give you a few more ancient examples. I am compelled to do this because it appears to me that it is not for a political reason but that there is some other reason lying at the bottom of the inaction of the government in regard to Prince Edward Island. Here is a modern example of how Prince Edward Island is treated. We were called upon a few days ago to vote $300,000 for the celebration in Quebec and I believe that was right, though much money has been sunk at Quebec. The King's representative is to be there and I did not oppose it. But I am going to point out one thing about it—the government provided that every province that contributed $100,000 or more would be empowered to appoint a commissioner and would have a share in the commemoration. The great province of Ontario and the great province of Quebec can contribute $100,000 and they are to have a share in the celebration and to appoint a commissioner, but little Prince Edward Island is not to have a commissioner and is to be debarred if she cannot contribute $100,000. Just wait a minute now and I will show you the reverse of that. A few days before we had a question up about exhibitions in the different provinces of Canada. Every province in Canada got $50,000 ; but when it came to Prince Edward Island, we were told : $10,000 is enough for you. When you are asked to put your hand in your pocket, you are expected to pay just as much as the biggest of us ; but when you want to get something, you will get only something about your size. That is what you say to Prince Edward Island. I think the premier understands that. Another matter that came up not long ago was the granting of land to our valiant soldiers who served in South Africa. The land that was voted was mostly land that had belonged to the Hudson Bay Company for which Prince Edward Island paid its share as well as the other provinces. But nobody from Prince Edward Island will get an acre of that land; it is to be given to volunteers in some provinces and withheld from others. I do not think that is treating a young member of the family fairly. We do not want to be treated as children; we want only fair play, and we here have a modern instance.

There is some other heart-to-heart talk that I must not forget. How were we treated in regard to the first question that came up after we entered the union ? Every one in this House acquainted with the history of Canada knows something of the Halifax fishery award. That award was given to

Mr. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.).

the maritime provinces in return for the privileges extended to the Americans of fishing in our waters for a number of years. The fisheries belonging to the maritime provinces, but the amount of award, $5,500,000, was put to the credit of the Dominion at large. My province had a just claim to a part of that award. The treaty was formally signed on the 1st of July, 1873. But previous to that the imperial government and the American government were at loggerheads about these fisheries, and Prince Edward Island was asked by the imperial government two years before that treaty was signed to admit the Americans to its fishing privileges. It did so. The commission sat at Halifax, and the award was based on the use of the fisheries by the Americans not only for twelve years after 1873, but also for the two years previous to 1873. But how did Prince Edward Island stand with regard to the share of that award, which belonged to it on the same basis as the share belonging to Newfoundland ? Because my province entered confederation on the 1st of July, 1873, and the treaty was signed on the same day, Prince Edward Island was left out. If Prince Edward Island had come in a day later, on the 2nd of July, it would have had the same claim as Newfoundland, in addition to its own special claim for fishing privileges for the two years previous to 1873, but neither of those claims were paid to Prince Edward Island.

What was the next question brought up against that small province ? It was the question of representation. When British Columbia was admitted in 1871, you inserted in the Act these words, that its representation should be 'increased' at every decennial census. Why were these words not inserted when Prince Edward Island entered the union two years later ? What words were inserted then ? In place of 'increased' you put in the word 'readjusted.' In the Lieutenant Governor's speech at that time it was predicted that our population would increase to 400,000 ; but from that time you began to cut down our representation year by year until, as the premier said a few years ago, perhaps we would get justice when our representation arrived at the vanishing point.

There is another matter in regard to which Prince Edward Island has not been fairly dealt with. At the time that province entered confederation, it had 200 miles of railway under construction which had cost it $3,144,000. We passed that over as a free gift to Canada. It was a huge mistake, because Prince Edward Island had the railway almost built and had to finish and equip it at its own cost before handing it over to the Dominion as a free gift. There was no expenditure made by British Columbia or even by Ontario or Quebec on railways previous to

confederation. True, the provinces of Ontario and Quebec made a loan to the Grand Trunk, which, if repaid, would amount to-day to over $100,000,000. But the $3,144,000 which Prince Edward Island spent on railways stands against that province from that day to this; otherwise we would have been drawing interest on that amount from the time we entered confederation to the present day. I do not think that was acting very generously towards Prince Edward Island. What we are told is: these were your terms of union, and you must stand by them. I am going to mention a case in which the Dominion government did the reverse. When the terms of union suit the Dominion government, they stick to them; but when they do not suit them, they do not amount to a row of pins; they are made of paper, which you can tear up any minute of the day.

I will come to another modern instance. Take the new Subsidies Bill that was introduced last year, and what do we find? Did you deal fairly by every province in Canada? Did you deal fairly by my province? I submit that you did not. You did not stand by the British North America Act. It went down, because it was going to hurt some of the largest provinces of Canada and was a shield for the smaller ones; and the larger provinces of Canada drove the smaller ones into a net, brought the representatives of these provinces up here and wined and dined them, and what was the result? What is the consequence? You changed the British North America Act to give Ontario an additional subsidy of $629,000 a year and Quebec an additional $429,000 a year. Did the British North America Act authorize you to do that? No; the fathers of confederation knew very well that the expenditure of any province did not altogether depend on its population. Take my own province. Do you suppose it would cost anything more to govern my province if we had 200,000 people than if we had only 100,000 as we have to-day? No; on the contrary, if we had 200,000 instead of 100,000 we could govern it more cheaply, because we would have the taxes of the additional 100,000 people in addition to what we have to-day. The fathers of confederation put a wise clause in the compact. They limited the smaller provinces to 400,000 and they limited the great provinces of Quebec and Ontario to the population of 1861. But you gave to the two great provinces of Quebec and Ontario over $1,000,000 a year. That is, you gave them, capitalized, $35,000,000; and yet you have not got $10,000,000 to fulfil your contract with Prince Edward Island. That is not all. In a few years both of these great provinces will be drawing $2,000,000 of an increase yearly. Then it is not only these increases of $629,000 and $420,000, but they will be drawing $2,000,000, which represents $70,000,000 capital. How much did my province receive? Not one dollar under the per capita arrangement. Thanks to the inaction of this government, thanks to its refusal to carry out the terms of confederation, our people have not increased in the same ratio as they would have otherwise. Had you fulfilled your promise to Prince Edward Island, our population would no doubt to-day be 200,000. But because you have not considered your honour as a country, because you have not kept faith with our province, our population has not increased, and to-day you are trampling us into the dust by making us pay our full share of those large additions which you are giving those two large provinces. Yet these two provinces have surplusses while ours has not. We have been running into debt for years.

You may ask what has that to do with winter navigation. Well, I had to go into this question for this reason. There is no doubt a very strong misunderstanding in the minds of the people. They say to Prince Edward Island: You are getting everything. But I leave it to the House and the premier to say whether my province is receiving the treatment it ought to receive.

Coming to the next part of the question, I am very much pleased to find that the people at large are beginning to open their eyes to the treatment which Prince Edward Island has been getting. I believe that the press of the country is awakening to the fact that we are not getting justice, and from one end of the country to the other there is the cry that justice should be done Prince Edward Island however late. I really think Mr. Speaker that the following papagraph would be in the Governor General's speech this year.

The non-fulfilment of the terms of union with Prince Edward Island, with respect to winter communication is a standing reproach to this great country. It is therefore with much pleasure that I inform you that my government has at last taken steps to fulfil those terms by the construction of a tunnel under the Straits of Northumberland, in order to provide railway car ferriage and connect the province with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of Canada as the terms of union between the province and Canada provides.

We were doomed to disappointment, but we are told that the government are doing something, that they are going to build us a new boat. Well, that boat was promised three years ago. My hon. friend from Queens (Mr. A. A. McLean) asked the minister when that boat would be ready, and I see by the Montreal 'Herald' that the minister only called for tenders on the 18th of February and the tenders are to be opened on the 8th of March. Yet this boat, according to the minister, is to be a special boat, and great care will have to be taken in drawing up the specifications. Does the minister mean to tell me that to call for

tenders on the 18th of February, to be opened on the 8th of March, is sufficient notice to those who may want to tender?

Mr. BRODEUR. Does the hon. gentleman want more delay?

Mr. A. MARTIN. No, I do not; but why was not the minister more alive and if that boat is not to be on the route next season, why such a rush for the tenders? The minister admitted that the boat would not be ready for next season. I think he has taken a very good time to call for tenders, because, on account of the depression all over the world, he will no doubt get a steamer of that kind in England twenty per cent cheaper than he would within the last three years.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Is the hon. gentleman in favour of building the boat in England?

Mr. A. MARTIN. The Minister of Marine is sitting next to my hon. friend, why does he not ask him? The minister told us the other day that England was the only place where such a boat could be built. If the minister intended hastening the construction of the boat so that she could be on the route next season, I could understand his rush in getting in tenders, but the country will be rather suspicious. We know that when the 'Minto' was purchased $30,000 had to be expended on her by the government before she was fit for service, and we may expect something similar in the case of another boat. If the minister is going to have his boat ready for next summer, I would say by all means: Be quick about it. But we find that Mr. Duguid is down in Prince Edward Island making an examination to see if something new should not be put in the specifications.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you something about the press of this country in reference to this vital question for my province. The statements of the press show that there is a change of feeling all over this country with regard to communication with my province. I should weary the House if I were to read even a tithe of the comments of the press that I have before me dealing with this subject. For instance, here is a quotation from the St. John 'Telegraph' of a very recent date:

The tunnel—that will be Prince Edward Island's politics this year, and next, and until the trains run from the mainland into Charlottetown. Politicians who, in private, make light of the island's claims are at once short-sighted and unjust. If fair play and good faith alone were consulted in this matter the Dominion government before this day would have set about the work required to give the islander's that which they were promised in the confederation compact—continuous steam communication with the mainland.

And here is a quotation from an independent paper in Charlottetown—a Liberal paper I may say—the 'Guardian.' I suppose my hon. friend from Kings (Mr. J. J. Hughes) will say that I am introducing party politics and will be inclined to question the classification of this paper as a Liberal paper. He is a good deal like a certain elder in a Presbyterian Church in Scotland who complained to the minister that the congregation was very unorthodox and said that the church must be purified. The minister told him to purify the church and the elder went at the work and soon had almost everybody read out of the church. He came back to the minister and said: Well, meenister, I hae nearly purified the church. There's naebody left but me and my brither—and I'm no verra sure about my brither.' I believe the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. J. Hughes) regards as a heretic every follower he has in Prince Edward Island because they do not all praise the government and is ready to declare that he himself is the only true Liberal, because he praises it in season and out of season.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. And expects that there will be no Conservatives here after the next election.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). Well, I am reading the words on this subject of a Liberal journal. A paper which is very ably conducted by a gentleman who was formerly on the 'Globe':

We give the minister fair warning that Prince Edward Island cannot be kept in the Dominion on such terms, especially under the exasperation of promises of better things, such promses being made only to be broken. This is plain speaking but it is so painfully true and so painfully realized here that the government will do well to heed it.

And here is another extract from the same newspaper:

In the meantime vast and costly public works have been undertaken and others are projected—the Transatlantic railway and the Quebec bridge now under construction, the Georgian Bay canal and the opening up of the Hudson Bay route now pressing for construction. Collectively these works involve expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars, while Prince Edward Island is still waiting for the fulfilment of the union terms by the construction of a work vital to her very existence. Surely this is no time for our provincial government to remain idle spectators of what is going on at Ottawa. We cannot believe that they will do so.

Never before was the tunnel so universally demanded by our people. Never before was this necessity so great, and never before its practicability so clear or so clearly appreciated. It has been demonstrated moreover in these columns that in view of what it will save and what it will earn the tunnel will not cost the Dominion a dollar. Moreover the time to urge it forward is the more propitious from the public utterances of Hon. Wm. Pugsley, the influential and capable Minister of Public Works.

I may explain that this is the same Hon. Wm. Pugsley who attended a meeting not

very long ago and urged this tunnel enterprise. I am sure that his views will have great effect upon his colleagues.

—and from the recent favourable notices of the tunnel enterprise by the leading newspapers of both parties all over Canada.

The matter is urgent commercially and also politically. We are approaching the date of a general provincial election. We have reached the stage when the public man known to be opposed to the tunnel or doubtful in his support to it could not hope for election anywhere within the water boundaries of our province. Conservative members representing the island at Ottawa are urging the tunnel movement forward with all their force. It will not be politic for our Liberal friends to be open to the faintest suspicion of being laggards in the movement.

I am afraid they will. We shall likely hear my hon. friend (Mr. J. J. Hughes) by and by. The 'Guardian' says in another article:

The Dominion must face its obligation in that regard, an obligation signed, sealed and delivered thirty-four years ago with all the solemnity and sacredness of a treaty. The question will not down.

I have said that before—that this is like Banquo's ghost which will not down, and, even though Banquo be killed and his spirit laid, eight other kings will come in succession to fill his place.

This great issue has challenged the attention of Sir John Macdonald, the first premier of Canada, and of Sir Wilfrid Laurier the last who has succeeded him, and more or less all who bore rule in Canada between them.

The hon. gentleman——

I should weary the House if I were to continue quoting from the press. I might quote a very ably written letter from the Toronto 'Globe.' I might quote the opinion of the board of trade of Prince Edward Island. I might quote the opinion of the board of trade of the maritime provinces. I might quote for hours and hours to show that this project is making great progress with the public. The government inertia appears astounding in the face of public opinion concerning this proposal which has been before the public for years and which has commended itself even to our neighbours to the south of us and to such statesmen as the Earl of Granville. I have quoted some of the opinions of the press; I would now quote it some of the opinions of prominent public men. First and foremost I shall quote a letter written by the late Sir John A. Macdonald, then Prime Minister, dated February 6, 1891. Sir John wrote:

I fully appreciate the nature and extent of the obligation incurred by the Dominion to maintain continuous communication between the island and mainland. We have tried to carry this out by the 'Stanley,' but of course, she cannot fight against the elements. So if the cost comes within a reasonable amount, such as parliament feels justified in incurring, I should be prepared to submit the question for their favourable consideration.

(Sgd.) JOHN A. MACDONALD.

The present Prime Minister was then in opposition, but, not to be outdone by Sir John A. Macdonald, he wrote a letter a few days later. He was going to be in the swim. I have here a fac-simile of that letter and I have no doubt the right hon. gentlemen will recognize his own handwritnig when I show it to him, it is so well reproduced. I have no doubt the right hon. gentleman intended every word he then wrote. I shall not enter into a discussion of his motives; it would not be proper for me to do so, and I do not wish to, I think he meant every word of it —but he has taken a little too long to do it. This letter is addressed, not to the governor of Prince Edward Island or to any very important personage in Prince Edward Island, but to the editor of a party paper in Prince Edward Island, no less a person than D. B. Higg, Esq, of the Charlottetown 'Patriot.' His letter reads:

Dear sir,—I have your favour of the 2nd of February, instant. I hardly thought that an expression of opinion as to the construction of a tunnel to connect the Island of Prince Edward with the mainland should be required. Every man who has given any attention to the condition of things and the necessities involved by the island entering into confederation must admit that such a tunnel must be constructed if the thing is reasonably practicable. The first thing to be done is to have an accurate survey and estimates. I am only sorry that it was not done long ago.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER,

I will say this much for Sir John, and I wish from the bottom of my heart that I could say the same thing for the present premier, that he did something to carry out his promise—he undertook a survey. He got one of the most eminent engineers in the world to commence borings for the construction of a tunnel. He secured the services of Sir Douglas Fox who sent his expert here and began the survey. That survey was not carried to completion owing to the season being too short. But why has the premier not moved a hand or a finger to complete that survey? It would not have cost a great deal of money and he has told us, so he was sixteen years ago, sorry it was not done long ago.

I shall quote from other public men, first from one whose name will be a household word in Canada so long as the Dominion lasts. D'Arcy McGee, who said:

I stand here prepared to maintain the allegation of the address that not only as to its substance but as to the mode of its preparation and passage into law, this British North America Act is a glorious and most timely charter for which we all have cause to be

thankful. I stand up to maintain that all its provisions were honestly meant and fairly meant towards every province.

If D'Arcy McGee were here to-day I am sure he would say that every word he then uttered had been filfilled to the letter with respect to most of the provinces. But as far as my province is concerned, what has happened ?

D'Arcy McGee referred to another eminent Canadian whose name is a household word in the maritime provinces, Joseph Howe, of whom McGee said :

He leaves us unabridged our square miles of territory. I trust he will leave us unshaken, what is more essential, the faith of our people in their own future, the faith of every man Canadian in Canada, and of every province in its sister province.

That is that the provinces should look on each other as brothers, and not one of the provinces should have any cause of complaint.

I wish to remind the Prime Minister whose speeches I have always admired, of another incident. I had not the honour of being in the House at that time, but I remember reading with great pleasure his beautiful address in regard to the Northwest rebellion. You, Mr. Speaker, remember that a handful of people in the west were oppressed. It touched the heart of the present Prime Minister who was then in opposition, and I am about to quote the hearty, warm words which he uttered, as he only can, in defence of that handful of half-breeds in the Northwest, and in the effort to protect them in their rights. When I heard him utter these burning words in favour of these oppressed people I felt : Here we have a man who, if he comes to be at the head of affairs in Canada will be sure to come to the rescue of the oppressed and helpless. Here is what the premier said in 1885. I wish to remind him of it to see if it will not warm his heart towards Prince Edward Island :

The hon. gentleman——

Referring to a speech delivered by Sir John Macdonald.

—tells us that the people of Saskatchewan river have no wrongs! . . . They have been denied their just rights and now they are slandered by the same men whose unjust course drove them to the unfortunate proceedings they have adopted since. I say they have been treated by this government with an indifference amounting to undisguised contempt, that they have been goaded into the unfortunate course they have pursued, and if this rebellion be a crime, I say it weighs as much upon the men who, by their conduct caused the rebellion as upon those who engaged in it.

It is because for years and years the government have closed their ears not to hear the complaints, because they have closed their eyes not to see the wrong, because they have acted like the ostrich which buries its head in the sand not to see the danger, this is the reason that we have had an uprising on the Saskatchewan.

Six long years of constant petitioning——

Well, we have been petitioning for thirty-five long years, but six years then was a very long time.

Six long years of constant petitioning had failed to secure justice for these people, but the bullets of Duck lake immediately set the government in motion and immediately brought them to terms. . . . . As soon as they took up their old rusty muskets they brought the government to their knees!

I can understand why these people, goaded as they were by this systematic ignoring of their claims at last resorted to a most unfortunate course. Men have rebelled time and again for less just cause than these people had.

For six long years the people of the Northwest have been petitioning for their rights; for six long years they had used every constitutional means which the law could place at their disposal in order to get justice. They sent petitions; they met in assemblies; they sent delegations.

The petitions remained unanswered; the resolutions adopted in their meetings were ignored.

The delegations were received most courteously——

That is what happened to a delegation from my province not long ago.

The delegations were received most courteously, with sweet smiles and sweeter words, which were put down in writing, but were forgotten as soon as the delegates had turned their backs for home.

That is what happened in regard to Prince Edward Island. A delegation came up here, had a most cordial reception, but the promises which were made to them were forgotten as soon as the delegates had turned their backs for home just the same as the premier said had been done in regard to delegations from Saskatchewan. He also gave them a few sweet words :

All these years they had been petitioning and petitioning, begging and begging, knocking and knocking at the door of the government and the government never lifted a finger to come to their rescue.

Mr. Laurier concluded his impassioned address with these words:

This, I say, and I say it coming from a province where, less than fifty years ago, every man of the race to which I belong was a rebel, and where to-day every man of that race is a true and loyal subject. . . . I say, give these men justice, give them their rights, treat them as for the last forty years you have treated the people of Lower Canada, and by and by throughout those territories you will have contentment, peace and harmony, where to-day discord, hatred and war are ruining the land.

The following year Mr. Laurier, when indicting the government for the execution of Riel, used the memorable exclamation: Too late ! Too late ! Too late !

It is too late ! I am afraid the time will come when it will be too late in Prince

Edward Island. They will never adopt the extreme measures that were taken in Saskatchewan, they are too loyal for that, but nevertheless they have been greviously neglected. The grievances of the white, non-Boer population of the Transvaal were unredressed resulting in the Jameson raid, the Boer war and the loss of thousands of lives and millions of dollars. I wish to take this opportunity of bringing these facts to the House to remind the premier that in days long ago when his heart was warm towards the halfbreeds of Saskatchewan he gave utterance to the words which I have just quoted.

Now, I propose to come down to somethings more practical. I have given the opinions of our public men, of Sir John Macdonald, of our worthy premier and of D'Arcy McGee. If there is any question in regard to the expense of this tunnel I will call the attention of the House to the opinion of such an eminent authority as Sir Douglas Fox. Sir Douglas Fox, a few years ago, made the estimate that the tunnel could be built for $10,000,000. He has written a letter since to the Rev. A. E. Burke, a clergyman who is well known all over Canada, on the subject of the cost of the tunnel. It is as follows :

28 Victoria street,
Westminster, London, S.W.,
November 14, 1906.

The Rev. A. E. Burke,
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

Dear Mr. Burke,—I am in receipt of yours of the 28th ultimo. Since I reported on the proposed tunnel many devices have been introduced for reducing cost and I quite hope, if the matter were again formally submitted to us, we might be able to suggest modes of construction which would considerably reduce cost of the proposed tunnel between the mainland and the island.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) DOUGLAS FOX.

Why was not Sir Douglas Fox again consulted ?

It would not be a very great undertaking. Sir Douglas Fox is one of the most practical engineers and one who has had large experience in the building of tunnels. If the department of railways and canals had applied to Sir Douglas Fox, a man who knows something about tunnels, they would likely have to-day a lower estimate of the cost of the work. But, the government have deferred action. They have done nothing to test the feasibility of the tunnel between my province and the mainland. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) at the end of last session, promised us that the surveys would be completed. I do not think that anything has been done. There has been no report that I know of and nothing has been done. Why ? Is the promise which the premier made to us in 1891 to remain unfulfilled? This question of continuous connection between Prince Edward Island and the mainland has been a matter of interest to me and to the people of my province for years and years and it is vital to the welfare of my province that it should be accomplished.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). Mr. Speaker, when you left the chair at six o'clock I was trying to show the House that there was no reason why the government of to-day should not take hold of this question in a businesslike way and carry it to a conclusion. I pointed out that the province was a paying partner in the union. I pointed out that the contribution of my province to the Dominion, basing it on population, would be something like $2,000,000 a year, and I made the statement, which I think will not be successfully contradicted, that in return for this we received something like $600,000 a year. I went on to show that on every occasion Prince Edward Island was debited with having received a great deal more than was delivered. I pointed out the unfair treatment accorded to the province in connection with the fisheries award, in regard to its representation and in regard to its railway. When Newfoundland was asked to join the confederation the Dominion government offered to pay for the railways, Newfoundland had constructed to the amounted of $9,000,000, while the province of Prince Edward Island had to pay for the construction of its own railways previous to confederation. I pointed out that on that account since confederation the province had been losing $157,000 a year, and in interest alone had paid to the Dominion government over $5,000,000. That in itself, along with the principal, $3,144,214 would be nearly the total cost of the proposed tunnel. I then went on to show how the province had been treated in regard to the new subsidy Bill of last session, giving the opinions of the press and of public men, including the late lamented Sir John A. Macdonald and the present premier. I spoke of the attitude of the province, which could not be said to be due to party feeling, because the local government is Liberal ; and I suppose my hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Hughes) will allow me to say a few words in regard to the attitude of that government without accusing me, as he usually does, of introducing party politics. Here is an abstract from the minutes of the executive council of the province, dated November 28, 1907, with regard to our claims against the Dominion government. It says :

The council deem it expedient that a memorial be prepared and presented to the Governor General at as early a date as possible, setting out all the claims of this province against the Dominion government, in terms

of certain resolutions of the legislature of this province adopted during the session of 1907, particularly with regard to the claim for damages accrued since the settlement in 1901 between said governments for non-fulfilment of the terms of union with respect to the maintenance of efficient steam communication and freight rates between this island and the mainland, and strongly pressing for payment of said indemnity up to the present time; also urging that immediate steps be taken to establish continuous communication by the best means that can be devised.

The following gentlemen were appointed a special committee to prepare said memorial, namely:

The Hon. Messieurs Peters, Hughes, McNutt, Hazard and Captain Joseph Read, M.L.A., and John Agnew, M.L.A.

As this is a matter of great importance the committee are requested to lose no time in preparing the said memorial.

I presume that memorial has reached the government here. What position do they take in regard to it? Every few years a demand is made upon them for damages for non-fulfilment of the terms of union, which were agreed to some thirty-four years ago. Besides, here is a resolution which was adopted by the legislature on the 20th of April, 1906:

On motion of Premier Peters, seconded by Mr. Matheson, leader of the opposition, it was resolved unanimously:

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, praying that immediate measures may be adopted by the Dominion government to fulfil the terms of confederation with Prince Edward Island with respect to continuous communication.

On motion of the same mover and seconder it was unanimously resolved that five members be appointed to prepare the said address, and it was ordered that Hon. Mr. Peters, Mr. Matheson, Hon. Mr. Simpson, Mr. Morson, and Hon. Mr. Hughes do compose the said committee.

Premier Peters on the same day presented the draft of the address prepared by the committee, consisting of 14 sections and two schedules following, and the same was unanimously adopted by the House.

You will see that the legislature of the province, which is Liberal in politics and consequently in sympathy with the government here, has been urging this government to do something, but as yet practically nothing has been done. When I read the right hon. the First Minister the terms of the union on which our claim is based, he will agree with me that a great deal of time has elapsed and very little done to satisfy the aspirations of the province. The terms of the union are these:

The Dominion government shall assume and defray the charges of an efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers to be established and maintained between the island and the mainland, winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of Canada.

Mr. MARTIN (Queen's, P.E.I.).

I give the First Minister's own interpretation of those terms. This is how he described them:

It is a binding and solemn undertaking that the government of Canada will maintain continuous communication between Prince Edward Island and the Intercolonial. There is no provision there that the Dominion of Canada would try to do it; there is no suggestion that there might be too much ice in certain cases.

Let me now quote the words of the late Sir George Etienne Cartier. When we were invited to enter confederation we were asked how he was going to fulfil the promise of continuous communication. His reply was: 'There is nothing impossible to the Privy Council of Canada; try it.' Well, we did take Sir George Etienne Cartier at his word and entered confederation, and the conditions have not yet been fulfilled. I believe that Sir George Etienne Cartier then fully expected he would implement the promise then made.

I have made reference to what the eminent engineer, Sir Douglas Fox, has said with regard to new devices in tunnelling. I might add that I went to New York to see for myself what was done there in the way of tunnelling. After going over four or five of the largest tunnels and seeing the difficulties that had to be overcome, I came to the conclusion, as also did the engineers whom I consulted there, that our tunnel under the straits of Northumberland would present no difficulties at all compared with those I had visited. I went through tunnels in New York which had buildings twenty stories high over them, with perhaps only ten feet of earth between the two. You can imagine the cost of the labour to keep those immense buildings in position and the quality of the work that had to be done. In every engineer's office I saw charts hanging on the walls showing the progress made in the tunnelling from day to day. The progress of each day was marked off in different colours. I asked the engineer how it was that so much progress was made in one day and so little the next. He said, we are blasting the hardest granite, making scarcely any progress for hours; it sometimes takes us days to get over half a foot of it. Compare that work and those conditions with the conditions in tunnelling under the Straits of Northumberland and you will find a great advantage in favour of the latter. You will find beneath the straits hard impervious clay fit for making brick, so that there is no comparison between those tunnels in New York, which are all paying speculations, and a tunnel through the straits under the straits. There is another point I might mention. Of course the expenditure was very heavy in those American tunnels, but most of them had three tracks whereas our tunnel would have but a single

track. I went over the whole of these tunnels and had the pleasure of meeting a number of eminent engineers there. Two of the engineers are Canadians—Mr. Fraser, in charge of one of the largest, a graduate of McGill College, and Mr. J. Kennard Thomson, one of the foremost consulting engineers in New York. These gentlemen accompanied me through the whole of these tunnels. I have here the blue prints open for the inspection of any one interested, but in order to be brief, I shall simply quote a letter written to me by the engineer who accompanied me through each of those tunnels in which he gives his conclusions, as far as our examination into those works went:

Dear Mr. Martin,—In reference to your recent visit here—you will remember that the engineers of the three East river tunnels which we examined together were unanimous in thinking that your proposed tunnel under the Straits of Northumberland would be much less difficult to construct than any of the tunnels here, and they were of the opinion, judging from our experience here, that your tunnel could be constructed at from $1,000,000 to $1,200,000 per mile.

You obtained a printed description of the Battery tunnel with cost of same, and I inclose sketches of this tunnel furnished by Mr. Noble. While the engineers of the other two tunnels did not care to give the cost of their tunnels for publication, they readily compared the actual cost of the work under their direct supervision with the probable cost of your tunnel, of course allowing for difference in diameter, material, &c., with the results as stated above.

The London tube tunnels in clay cost about $15 per cubic yard, or for a 20-foot outside diameter about $900,000 per mile.

The Glasgow harbour tunnel, 16 feet inside diameter, cost about $750,000 per mile.

The St. Clair river tunnel cost about $1,600,000 per mile, and the Blackwall tunnel under the Thames cost about $2,600,000 per mile, but then this is of the largest diameter, 25 feet, built; and is for a double track subway.

The Boston subway tunnel cost $903,000 per mile per track.

The probabilities are that you would be able to get cheaper and better labour than were obtainable for any of the above tunnels; all of which goes to prove that your tunnel should cost less than your estimated $10,000,000.

Trusting that the above will be of some use to you.

Very sincerely,
J. KENNARD THOMSON.

I believe that an economical government could, without injury to the public service, save enough within a short time to pay for this tunnel. I do not wish to detain the House longer. I leave this matter in the hands of the House and hope that such progress will be made with this much needed improvement that it will not be our duty to stand up in this House year after year and complain that nothing has been done. I thank hon. members for their close attention and will close by moving for those papers, seconded by the hon member for Prince.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.) This is not the first occasion upon which I have had the honour of addressing this House upon the subject of communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. In fact from the time that Prince Edward Island entered the union, this subject has been one the discussion of which was forced upon us. Prince Edward Island entered confederation under promises which led us to believe that immense benefits would result. But the terms of confederation have not been carried out and no earnest effort has been made to give us the measure of protection and support that was promised. We entered the union under a number of promises and cajolements, some six years after the main confederation had been brought about. One of the great hopes held out to us was that communication would be maintained winter and summer, with the railway systems of the mainland. We gave up a great deal from our then position to enter into this compact. I want to compare the situation of another part of the empire that was asked at the same time to enter this confederation but held off and still remains outside the union. I refer to Newfoundland. It is an interesting study to note the situation that Newfoundland holds to-day outside of union as compared with the situation of Prince Edward Island which entered confederation under the terms I have shown. Here we have an island in the Atlantic ocean separated from Canada by Cabot Strait. Newfoundland is a colony entirely on her own resources. Her revenues go into her own exchequer and she pays them out for her own purposes. Prince Edward Island, on coming into confederation, gave up customs and inland revenue, gave up postal revenue, gave up everything except the mere right to raise money by the direct taxation of the people, and handed them all over the Dominion. And what have we received in return? As the hon. member of Queens (Mr. Martin) has just stated, we handed our revenues aggregating from $1,500,000 to $2,000,000 and we receive services representing $600,000, or at the very most $700,000. And what becomes of the balance? Why, Prince Edward Island has been helping to build railways from the Atlantic to the Pacific; she has helped to dig the canals in Ontario—to the tune, as the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) reminded us the other night of $120,000,000. We have been helping to subsidize steamers to run from the St. Lawrence to all parts of the world; we have been assisting to pay $5 per head for immigrants to come into the prairie country, two thousand miles away from our own boundaries, although we have lands that might well be filled with agricultural peo-

ple. We have been paying increasing subsides to the larger provinces, and making those provinces more wealthy at the expense of the less numerous population in the little island down by the sea. And, in a number of other ways, our surplus revenue is used to enhance the value of the heritage of the upper and western provinces. The situation in Newfoundland is entirely different. They expend their own revenue, appoint their own judges, run their own services. And, for instance I understand that they have a telegraph system on which they pay only 20 cents for ten words. They have no national debt above their provincial debt, and they have a surplus every year, and all this with a lower taxation than Canada. Their population has increased in forty years from 140,000 to 230,000 while in the same period the provinces of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island together have increased by barely 50,000 people. Newfoundland, by staying out of confederation has escaped having to come to Ottawa, through her representatives, year after year, begging for the fulfilment of the terms of confederation as Prince Edward Island has had to do. Her Finance Minister stated in a recent speech before the Newfoundland House, that he felt:

> Convinced that the best interests of the colony could be secured by paddling our own canoe and directing the energies of our own people through our own parliament.

This, I think, shows a situation well worthy of consideration by the House. Which is the better position, that of Prince Edward Island, coming here begging for the fulfilment of the terms of the union, having gone behind steadily and continually, year by year for thirty-five years, or that of Newfoundland, which having control of her whole situation, has increased some hundred thousand in population and has sufficient revenue from her customs and other sources to supply her wants and make her prosperous and happy. I think that with these facts before you the case of Prince Edward Island well deserves the attention of this House.

As I have said, we contribute very largely to the Dominion revenue; we are largely a consuming population and our imports are heavy. Confederation took away from us the protection which we might have had and which might have encouraged the building up of our own industries, so that now we obtain our supplies largely from the upper provinces. Thus we are very largely an importing centre. Of course in exchange for these imports we send out our agricultural products and we wish in return to get a certain measure of justice and to have reasonable economy in placing these natural products on our natural markets at all times of the year. We contribute very largely towards the support and development of the other provinces of the Dominion and in the development of their resources, and receive in return only a moiety of what we contribute.

If you consider the whole history of the fulfilment of the bond of confederation it will be seen that we have not received that fair treatment that my friend (Mr. A. Martin) has so well stated was contemplated by the fathers of confederation. In every instance Prince Edward Island has got the short end of the horn. Take the case of our railways, to which my friend has referred. We were charged in the first instance, as the hon. member (Mr. A. Martin) has pointed out, for the whole system of railways at the time of confederation, some $3,144,000.

In the matter of representation, the intention was—and this is not disputed by the hon. gentlemen opposite—that Prince Edward Island should have six members in perpetuity, but because that could not be read legally into the bond by the Supreme Court of Canada or the Privy Council, Prince Edward Island was again left in the background and the leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) could not see his way clear to have the British North America Act rectified in this respect. But while the First Minister cannot see his way clear to have the mistake as to our representation rectified, he is very ready to put through a Bill changing the terms of the provincial subsidies and to give to the two great provinces of this Dominion, Ontario and Quebec, large sums of money which were not contemplated by the agreement under which these two provinces came into confederation. Thus it seems that the leader of the House has a mind that is influenced in different ways by similar facts according to the exigencies of the situation. So in regard to the treatment meted out to us in respect to the increased subsidy, the Prime Minister took a position altogether unwarranted and altogether different from the position he took with regard to the other and larger provinces. Ontario receives an increase of some $789,000, and Quebec an increase of some $600,000 and these provinces already with large surpluses each year over provincial requirements, while Prince Edward Island receives a miserable pittance of some $70,000 increase. It was said at the time, that the conference of the premiers at which the island was represented, was satisfied with the $70,000, and therefore this House should not change it. British Columbia, however, was a party to that conference, and not being satisfied, received more, and wants more yet. The right hon. gentleman was very wrathful at the attitude of the leader of the opposition with regard to the claims of British Columbia to an increased subsidy and in claiming that the matter was not a closed book and that British Columbia had a justifiable case to present. The minister stated in the

debate on the address, and it was a poor argument for the hon. gentleman to make, that the conference of premiers had presented their statement to this House and it had been unanimously accepted by both sides of the House. This is another case where the First Minister's memory fails him, because if he looks up the debate of last year on the matter of subsidies he will see that very strenuous opposition was made by myself and the other members from Prince Edward Island to the readjustment of subsidies. Owing to representations from the Prince Edward Island members on this side of the House a change was made in the scheme of readjustment to safeguard the interests of Prince Edward Island with regard to the per capita allowance being given on the maximum population of Prince Edward Island since we entered confederation. We on this side presented an unanswerable case for better treatment and further financial aid from the Dominion treasury when this question of increased subsidies was before the House last year. With regard to the grant to South African veterans the Prime Minister stated that no member on this side of the House objected to the resolution adopted on the motion of Mr. Sam. Hughes, but corrected his mistake on his attention being called to the fact that we had objected. Similarly in this case I would have him remember that very strong objection was raised by the members on this side of the House.

I want to say further that we were never properly represented at that conference of premiers. The men who were sent up here to represent Prince Edward Island at that conference were sent up from their own legislature with a memorandum of what they were to claim and they never even took advantage of the clause in the resolutions of the conference whereby they could put in a special claim for better treatment. When the situation was presented to the legislature, after being passed by this House, the legislature, sitting in Charlottetown, would not, as a body, accept the terms that were given to Prince Edward Island. I could give you instance after instance of indignation meetings being held in different parts of Prince Edward Island showing that the terms that were granted to Prince Edward Island in regard to increased subsidies were not accepted by the people and are not accepted to-day. I venture to state that if the local administration made an appeal to the suffrages of the electors of Prince Edward Island to-day on that one question they would be in the same position as the government of New Brunswick were in the recent elections—hurled out of power. It was acknowledged by the right hon. leader of the House and by others on his own side that the readjustment of the subsidy was brought about for the purpose of doing justice to the provinces under altered conditions, but if our proper situation had been presented to the conference we would have received a fair measure of justice. As I pointed out last year, in discussing this question, $70,000 would not wipe out the annually recurring deficit that we have in Prince Edward Island. The statement of accounts which has just been brought down in the local House shows that with its increased subsidy of $70,000 the island has gone into debt to the tune of $65,000 this last year. What benefit has been derived from that $70,000? We have not been able to implement our services in that country. Our teachers are underpaid, we have no money to spend upon our roads and bridges, and in fact we have not enough money, even resorting to every form of direct taxation, to meet the financial requirements of the province, while every other province of the Dominion almost has an annually recurring surplus to its credit.

Now, in regard to representation, subsidy allowance and railways, we have not had fair treatment since we entered confederation. In regard to representation, I notice that the Australian Commonwealth have a clause in their constitution providing that the smallest of their states shall be represented by at least five members in the federal House. If this parliament will not give us a representation of the six members to which we are entitled under the terms of confederation we ask that the British North America Act shall be ratified and amended so that at no time could Prince Edward Island have less than a certain fixed representation.

Now, there is the fishery award also. As my hon. friend from Queens has pointed out we have a claim there amounting to $1,250,000 in round figures. The Dominion government have had control of that sum of money for a number of years. At four per cent we should be getting $50,000 interest out of that every year. In regard to the fishery bounties we are supposed to be getting a proper proportion of the Halifax award, but while Prince Edward Island has been getting $8,000 a year, New Brunswick $14,000 or $15,000 a year, Nova Scotia has been getting $105,000 or $106,000 a year. Does the right hon. gentleman say that that is fair treatment? Newfoundland got her portion of the award and is drawing interest on it year after year. Prince Edward Island has the right to $1,250,000 of it and therefore she should have the use of the interest on that money amounting to about $50,000, whereas, she is only getting about $8,000 per year.

We had the question of land grants to volunteers up in the House the other day, and here again we found that Prince Edward Island and the maritime provinces came out at the small end of the horn. They have no lands to give away, but they paid their portion of the cost of the lands that were bought from the Hudson's Bay Company and which lands are being given

away to people who happen to be living up in the Northwest. As to exhibitions, we get the small end of it, ten thousand dollars, and the other provinces $50,000 each. As my hon. friend from Queens pointed out, when we are asked to contribute towards any object in other parts of the Dominion we are required to pay our full share otherwise we do not receive equal representation. On the other hand, if anything is to be handed out from the treasury we receive in proportion to our size. We have contributed our fair share towards the construction of the Transcontinental Railway. I have nothing to say against that great project except to ask that we shall be put in connection with such great works. We have no objection to enlarging our canal systems, no objection to building our railways, no objection to subsidizing steamers, no objection to all these great works that are designed to build up this confederacy, but we want a connecting link that will make us part and parcel of this confederation and make us feel that when we contribute towards any of these great objects we shall get our proper and just proportion back. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been expended since confederation and hundreds of millions of expenditure are in contemplation, but we might as well be outside of the confederation as far as any direct advantage we can get out of these works is concerned unless we have this physical link of connection between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. The terms of confederation have not been carried out. My hon. friend from Queens read the statement of the right hon. First Minister who acknowledged absolutely that the terms of confederation had not been carried out. At the time of the increase in the subsidy amounting to $30,000 that we got for non-fulfilment of the agreement in regard to winter communication, the right hon. gentleman, in justifying that payment, acknowledged that the terms of confederation had not been carried out. I do not think that the right hon. gentleman will get up in his place in the House to-night and say that since that adjustment was made the terms of confederation have been carried out. It is true that the government have taken some steps forward. We have had several boats put on, each, I presume, somewhat better than the last. I cannot say that the Conservative party, during their regime, did any better than the Liberal party, but the fact remains that the terms of confederation have not been carried out. It is acknowledged by this side of the House, acknowledged by the government side of the House, and I say that it is up to the government to rectify the wrongs of the past and take some tangible and reasonable step to implement their promises and to see that the terms are properly fulfilled. The $30,000 was given us as full compensation for losses up to 1901, but I want to tell the Prime Minister that $500,000 a year would not compensate the farmers and the merchants of Prince Edward Island for the loss they annually sustain by reason of the non-fulfilment of this term of confederation. Take such years as 1903 and 1905, when for sixty-four days and fifty-nine days, respectively, the province was absolutely cut off from any steam communication with the mainland, and you can imagine what enormous loss there was to the trade and commerce of the island. Not $500,000, not $1,000,000 would compensate the people for such loss as that. This year the conditions have been favourable, and up to the present there has been very little interruption of navigation, but if it were not that Providence favoured us we would have lost the supply of a couple of hundred thousand bushels of seed grain for the west. Prince Edward Island could supply 300,000 or 400,000 bushels of that grain, but if we had a season like last year, or some of the previous years, not a bushel of it could have been shipped, and you can realize what immense loss it would be on that item alone. Take it year in and year out, and half a million dollars would not compensate for the loss the people of the island have sustained, I say the direct and indirect loss to the provinces in matters of transportation is incalculable. But this is not the end of it; the government will never hear the end of this question in parliament until the wrong is righted. At present the provincial legislature at Charlottetown is preparing a memorial to the Dominion government demanding restitution for the loss Prince Edward Island has sustained since 1901, and I earnestly trust that no such puny amount as $30,000 will be accepted as compensation for the loss the province has suffered during that period. We are presenting these grievances to the House to-night so that the Dominion parliament may realize the position in which the island province is. A great many of the grievances which we have pointed out would be rectified if a tunnel were constructed. I believe, Sir, that if a tunnel had been built some years ago, instead of having a population of 100,000 as we have to-day, we would have 250,000 inhabitants in Prince Edward Island and we never would have lost our representation in this House. The area of 2,000 square miles in that province is an area of fertile land, the like of which cannot be duplicated in any part of the world. Last year that fertile province produced, in agricultural products alone, $10,000,000, not counting the fisheries and other sources of revenue, and no similar area in North America can equal that.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). $100 per head of the population.

Mr. LEFURGEY. As my hon. friend points out, the agricultural production repre-

sents $100 per head of the population. Our province is capable of supporting, not 100,000 people, but 400,000 people, and if we had free communication and uninterrupted communication with the mainland and the opportunity to send our products to the markets of the world, as the other provinces of the Dominion have, our population would largely increase. Then, again, the question of our subsidy would have been largely rectified if we had had a tunnel, because our population would have increased and the per capita grant would amount to a much larger sum than it does at present. It has been stated, I believe, that the people of the island are not united on this project, but I want to tell this House that the best thinking people of the province from one end to the other are unanimous in believing that there is nothing else that will satisfy the needs of the island except a tunnel. We have for the past twenty-five years tried steamer after steamer, and we are now told that the government is going to give us a more powerful boat, but if you take the history of delays to navigation in past years you will find that the strongest boat ever built could not get into Pictou harbour at certain seasons, for the ice was absolutely grounded on the bar. Even this year, in the month of March, it may be found that through wind and tide conditions Pictou harbour is liable to be so blocked that no boat could pass either in or out. Some of the people of the island may be pessimistic about the scheme, but that is due to the fact that the government has not implemented the promises of the Prime Minister contained in that famous letter, in which he declared that if he came to power he would at once take up this great question and have it pushed forward to some satisfactory conclusion. The right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has taken no steps to carry out that promise, although every opportunity—through failure of the present service, presentation from this side of the House, memorials from the legislature, delegations and full coffers during his twelve years in power—has been offered; but if Sir John Macdonald had lived, I believe that the promise he made in his letter of 1891 would have been carried out long ago. It is not too late even now for the right hon. gentleman to repent. We know that the general elections will likely come on next fall, and the Prime Minister has yet an opportunity to include a sum of $100,000 in the estimates this year to engage the best engineers in the world to prepare surveys and estimates, which may be submitted to the House. The right hon. gentleman has still time this session to redeem his pledge of 1891. Of course, a great many of the people on the island have lost faith in the right hon. gentleman and his government, but if even at the last hour he submits a vote for preliminary work on the tunnel he may still be able to hold some of his friends down there. Not only are the people of Prince Edward Island unanimous in favour of the tunnel, but we have the support and encouragement of the best business and financial men throughout the maritime provinces, Ontario and Quebec, who are familiar with our situation and who know that the province of Prince Edward Island is a large consumer of the products of Ontario and Quebec. We have also the boards of trade expressing themselves in the same way. The board of trade of the whole maritime provinces is on record as a unit that the tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland should be built. These records are before the government. The tunnel would be a benefit, not merely to Prince Edward Island, not merely to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which would be benefited just as much as Prince Edward Island, but to the whole Dominion of Canada. It is a rounding out of confederation. What did the Minister of Railways say, in speaking of the Intercolonial Railway? He said that we could defend the deficits, that the Intercolonial must be looked upon as a national undertaking. Speaking of the Intercolonial as a regulator of rates, he said :

> If that be an object worthy of the attention of the House, I ask it, when matters come up affecting the Intercolonial Railway, to consider it from a double standpoint, first, from the standpoint of carrying out the pledge which was given to the maritime provinces at the time of confederation, not as a commercial venture, and, from the second standpoint, that the Intercolonial Railway is a great part of the transportation service of this country and what we do not get in rates remains in the pockets of the people of the Dominion of Canada.

In the same way we want you to consider first the pledge made to Prince Edward Island when she came into confederation that you would give us continuous communication winter and summer. As the right hon. leader of the government said in one of his speeches : We did not say anything about there being too much ice or too much of this thing or of that thing, but it was a promise made that should be fulfilled. But we have support not only from these public men, including many members of this House, who spoke last session just as strongly in favour of the construction of this tunnel as did the members from Prince Edward Island themselves, but we have also the support of the Hon. Wm. Pugsley, who spoke as follows in New Brunswick last summer.

> Sussex, New Brunswick, October 25.—The banquet tendered Hon. Dr. Pugsley, Minister of Public Works, by Kings county friends tonight was a great success.
>
> In the course of his speech on Canada's development and the means to assist its growth, the minister referred to Prince Edward Island, 'the gem of the gulf and garden of the

Dominion, which by reason of the Straits of Northumberland separating it from the mainland, is shut out from the sound of the throbbing of the commercial and industrial progress and prosperity of the rest of Canada.'

But her people, too, are waking up and they realize that a greater future would be hers if she could be joined to New Brunswick by a tunnel under the straits.

'I have read the reports in my department,' said the minister, 'dealing with this long talked of project with great care and with much interest, and hope that before I give up the portfolio of Public Works I may be the instrument of inaugurating that work which would mean so much to the island and Canada.

The time may not yet be ripe for undertaking this project; its cost may be beyond what the Dominion can at present undertake.

As to this I at present express no opinion, but I am sure that in the aspirations and hopes of the people of Prince Edward Island I stand for connection with Canada by tunnel.

My sympathies go out to them warmly and heartily.

Expressions of this kind justify us in expecting that the hon. Minister of Public Works will speak in favour of the tunnel in this House and use his influence in the councils of the government to have something tangible done in this regard. A great many of the leading papers are strongly in favour of this great work. The hon. member for Queens has quoted several of the leading papers of Canada in favour of it, and I could quote a number of others, but I will not weary the House. I will merely read a brief extract from a strong editorial on the subject in the Montreal 'Herald,' a supporter of the present government:

Hitherto there have been doubts expressed as to the practicability of a tunnel; but recent developments, whether in the Alps or at New York, taken with the known experience in England, are held to remove that element of doubt, and the delegates who have been urging their case at Ottawa were able to present an offer from one of the very ablest construction contractors in Canada to do the work for ten millions. A careful study of the financial aspects of the matter goes to show that if the tunnel is a physical possibility it would be all right from the investment standpoint. Possibly, also, joining the island to the mainland in this way might lead to a political consolidation of the maritime provinces. The project is one that ought to be taken up seriously, principally because the prosperity of the island seems to urgently demand it, and also because in the confederation compact it was definitely promised, and has only been withheld so far because of the doubts as to its feasibility.

I have extracts in the same strain from the St. John 'Sun,' the Charlottetown 'Patriot,' the 'Guardian' and a number of other leading papers. The legislature of Prince Edward Island, which is a Liberal legislature, has repeatedly presented memorials to this government on this subject. In a memorial adopted in 1905, setting out the claims of Prince Edward Island, articles 13 and 14 are as follows:

13. It is not the province of this legislature to dictate the means by which your government shall carry out the terms of union in respect to 'continuous communication,' but we desire to press upon you that by the construction of a tunnel under the Straits of Northumberland between this province and the mainland, the terms and agreement of union between the federal government and this province may be carried out and this province may receive the same consideration with regard to inter-communication as the other provinces of the Dominion.

14. And we further press upon your government that to meet the immediate needs of our people an ice-breaking steamer of much greater power than the present winter boats should be provided with all possible expedition.

To show how unanimous were both sides of the House on that occasion, I may quote the leader of the opposition, Mr. Mathieson, who said that 'the weight of the resolution would be greatly increased by the unanimous support of both sides.' The House went into committee on the resolution, which was carried unanimously. From almost every point of view we can take, the sympathy and the judgment of the people are with us in demanding this government to take some tangible step forward in the construction of this work. The feasibility of the tunnel is beyond dispute. I do not think any one will seriously argue, in face of the pronouncements we have had upon its feasibility, that the project is impracticable. Even fifteen years ago we had its feasibility demonstrated by men like Sir Douglas Fox, and to-day the most eminent engineers in the United States agree that the tunnel is perfectly feasible and that the cost would be well within reasonable limits and not be a burdensome undertaking to this country. It is only a matter of getting soundings and borings before any reliable estimate can be made further than can be made from the data we have. I took occasion to write a number of these experts. Mr. Kennard Thomson says the tunnel could be built for some nine million or ten million dollars. I quoted his statement last year and Mr. Thomson repeated that statement to my hon. colleague (Mr. A. Martin) in New York this winter. I have here a letter from Mr. H. B. Reed, who was the engineer in charge of the work undertaken by Mr. John B. Macdonald, one of the biggest contractors in tunnel work in the United States. From the data and information I was able to give him, Mr. Reed went very carefully into the matter, and while he did not like to make an absolute statement that the tunnel would be built for ten million dollars, he figured it out in round numbers at some thirteen million dollars. He did this from

information I obtained from the department here and sent to him. His letter, I think, will interest the House:

Hon. A. A. Lefurgey,
Member of Parliament, House of Commons, Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir,—In accordance with the instruction contained in yours of the 4th and 20th instant, I beg to submit an estimate of the probable cost to construct a single rack tunnel, standard gauge, under the Northumberland straits to connect Prince Edward Island with the mainland of New Brunswick, covering a distance from portal to portal of about seven and one-half miles.

I assume from the data at hand giving the test borings of the geological formations through which the tunnel is planned and the depth at which it is located, that the materials to be encountered in the excavation will be impervious to water, and give a reasonably firm and solid roof.

It seems to me that the safest and most practical way to execute this work, located as it is, nearly 160 feet below mean high water, would be by the shield method, with shields so designed as to be able to cope with the difficulties likely to arise in an undertaking of this nature and magnitude.

I do not mean to say that should the excavations be found to be of such a nature that the full hydrostatic pressure would be encountered at any point under the straits, the shield or any method of timbering would be of much use, for in that event at that depth it would be impossible for men to work in the air pressure required.

The approximate estimate of cost is based therefore, on the assumption that the materials to be excavated will be found practically impermeable to water, and on the use of hydraulic shields, with the cast iron-concrete tube type of construction and is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| For seven and one-half (7½) miles of tube, eighteen (18) feet inside diameter, thoroughly waterproofed, including duct banks, drains and track.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $12,950,000 |
| For two (2) permanent shafts with pumps and chambers for ventilation and pumping apparatus.. .. | 650,000 |
| Total for tunnel and shafts complete. | $13,600,000 |

Before the final method of construction is adopted, I would suggest that you take up for consideration the feasibility of building the tunnel on the bed or bottom of the straits in very much the same manner as the Harlem river section of the New York subway was built, and the Detroit river tunnel, now being constructed between Detroit and Windsor.

By this method the tubes are built in sections on shore, floated into position and lowered to their resting place, previously prepared, on the river bottom, after which the sections are bolted together and calked by divers and the final work of the interior finish done under compressed air.

Should it be found that this method could be used, there would be no question as to the success of the project and the work being done for a reasonable price, for the greatest depth at which the tunnel would be placed would probably be not more than ninety (90) feet below mean high water, that being a safe depth at which men can work under pressure.

In order to give you more definite information on this project, I should desire first to visit the site of proposed tunnel, study the conditions and make a thorough examination of the materials secured from the borings.

I return herewith the plans and profile showing location of tunnel, test borings and other data which you sent me.

Yours very truly,
H. B. REED.

It is evident therefore that the best engineers consider the tunnel perfectly feasible, and it only remains to have a complete investigation made in order to put the House in possession of the most reliable data and estimates. Mr. Reed in the letter just read suggests that if proper investigation were made a tunnel could probably be constructed by other methods at much less cost. Let us have these investigations by the best men obtainable and at once.

From the point of view of an investment, I consider that we have a good claim for the construction of this tunnel. In 1895 I presented to this House a statement showing the saving which would be effected by the building of the tunnel as compared with the cost of keeping up the present unsatisfactory system. I think it would be opportune if I could repeat that statement so that hon. members may see what the service now costs them:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Subsidies to summer steamers.. .. .. | | $ 12,500 |
| Loss on Prince Edward Island Railway | | 100,000 |
| Maintenance of ss. 'Stanley and Minto,' as per minister's statement.. | | 95,000 |
| Cost of steamer 'Stanley'.. .. | $145,000 | |
| Cost of steamer 'Minto'.. .. .. | 190,000 | |
| Insurance on cost at 10 per cent | 335,000 | 33,500 |
| Depreciation in value and interest, estimated at 10 per cent.. .. .. .. .. .. | | 33,500 |
| New boat.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $500,000 | |
| Insurance at 10 per cent.. .. .. .. .. | | 50,000 |
| Maintenance.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | | 50,000 |
| Depreciation in value and interest, at 10 per cent.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | | 50,000 |
| Ice-boat service.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | | 10,000 |
| Telegraph service.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | | 7,000 |
| Total.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | | $441,500 |

So that, without taking into account any further expenses in connection with the machinery or keeping up a large staff here and a large staff at the other end in connection with administration by the department, the expenses amount to $441,500. The people of this country do not realize that there is an indirect loss and a direct expenditure of that amount of money to keep up the present service. So that, even from a financial point of view, the government would be absolutely justified in constructing this great work. Not only would you make this expenditure unnecessary, but you would wipe out the annual deficit of $100,000 on the Prince Edward Island Railway. Not only would you take by the tunnel all the traffic in the winter, but you

would take a great share of the traffic of the summer. You would get the benefit of all the traffic from every part of the Island on the Prince Edward Island Railway to the tunnel and you would get also the benefit of the distribution on the traffic going through the tunnel and routed to different parts of the island. You could use your rolling stock not for a part of the year only, but throughout the year. Then the Intercolonial Railway would benefit easily from $100,000 to $200,000 added profit from distribution on the mainland. These are the results which would accrue immediately on the construction of the tunnel. But, within twenty years after the tunnel was finished, you would have at least 200,000 more people in Prince Edward Island and every producer on the island would be raising twice as much as he does at the present time, for he would be always sure of a market.

I do not think it is necessary to enlarge on these figures. I think the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and members of the House can see what an advantage this great work would be to the Dominion and especially to the maritime provinces. We certainly need now some better means of transportation than we have. When the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Préfontaine, was in Prince Edward Island, he promised that he would immediately go to work at the construction of a new boat. And to this day that promise has not been fulfilled. As far back as September, 1905, the government had this man Duguid brought from the old country to design a new boat for the island service. And we were told that, in December, 1905, Mr. Duguid had his design completed. The late premier of Prince Edward Island seemed to think that Mr. Duguid knew very little about the construction of ice-breakers. However, Mr. Duguid was said to have completed the plan of a steamer equal in size, capacity and power to the boat for which tenders are now being asked. But, though this design was completed in 1905—would you believe it, Mr. Speaker?—it was only on the 19th day of last month that tenders were called for. And though tenders have been called for, I see it stated in Prince Edward Island newspapers and also in the Montreal 'Gazette,' that Mr. Duguid is going back and forward in the winter boats to get material for further designs for this boat. It is true the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) contended that he knew nothing about such a report, but it certainly was published in the newspapers of which I have spoken. The hon. minister told us also on February 11, when the question of this boat was before the House, that tenders had been advertised for, and even told us the names of the four papers used for this advertising. One of them was the Glasgow 'Herald.' I could not find that copy of the 'Herald' in the reading room. Another was the 'Standard.' But there was no advertisement in the 'Standard' of that date, nor was there up to February 25. The only advertisement that I could find in an English paper is one in 'Canada.' But the advertisement was not in the issue of 11th February, and the only issue in which I could find it was that of 25th February. The only other advertisement that I found calling for tenders for this boat was in the Montreal 'Herald' of February 19—tenders to be in on March 9. That is, the minister gave the great shipbuilding concerns just twenty days in which to get in their tenders for this steamer. I believe the minister received some protests about the shortness of time allowed, because he has told us that the time has been extended to March 16. It seems to me the time is still too short, unless we accept the view that the competition will be between two or three concerns and that the minister knows all about it beforehand.

I am grateful to hon. members for the patience with which they have listened to me. I hope to hear, and hear very favourably, from the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself. It is all very well for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) or the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) to rise in this House and say, 'I am a new man in my department; I will look into this.' But we remember that former Minister of Public Works, Mr. Hyman, said, 'I will report this matter to my colleagues, and trust that there will be an estimate next year.' We would like the right hon. leader of the government to take the responsibility on himself and tell us what he intends to do. If there is nothing to be expected from the Liberal side of the House it would be well that the people of Prince Edward Island should not be humbugged as they have been for many years, but that we should be allowed to know just where the government stands.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). This is a matter that should be easy of solution. It is a matter not of political policy but of contract between the Dominion of Canada and Prince Edward Island. In the month of September, 1864, the premiers of the provinces which afterwards became the Dominion of Canada as at first formed, the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, met in the city of Charlottetown and attempted to reach an agreement for a federation of all the provinces including Prince Edward Island. Certain resolutions were adopted by the conference. Among these resolutions was one which concerned Prince Edward Island, and which was in effect almost identical with the resolution which was finally agreed to in 1873. This conference adjourned to meet in the city of Quebec and

when they met the premier of Prince Edward Island and other prominent men from that province, as well as the leading men from the other provinces in Canada, agreed to form a confederation. The one stumbling block was the terms of confederation for Prince Edward Island. In consequence of the agreement which was then entered into the British North America Act was passed by the imperial parliament, but Prince Edward Island did not come in because she desired to have included in the agreement for consideration a clause that the people of Prince Edward Island should have continuous communication with the railway system of the mainland, particularly with the Intercolonial Railway. A clause was inserted in the British North America Act providing that when any other province wished to come in it could do so by order in council, of the Dominion of Canada and of that province, which would be assented to by the imperial privy council. In 1873 an agreement was entered into between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion of Canada with reference to the confederation and they came in. The part of the agreement to which this resolution refers is very simple. It provides that the Dominion government shall assume and defray all charges of the following services:

Efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers to be established and maintained between the island and the mainland of the Dominion winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion.

This was not only a pledge by the Dominion government, but it was a solemn contract, one which the Dominion government was bound to carry out to the letter. That was the idea of the men who represented Prince Edward Island when they agreed with the representatives of the Dominion of Canada that they should have connection with the Intercolonial Railway of Canada. It might be said: How could they have connection with the Intercolonial Railway of Canada? It might be said that they could do so by having steam connection by vessel. But does that fill the Bill? It might in a certain way, if it was possible to have continuous connection, but it has been demonstrated year after year since 1873 that it is impossible to have continuous connection by steam vessel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Therefore, the only substitute is that this government shall fulfil the letter of this contract and build a tunnel under the Straits of Northumberland, thereby connecting the railway system of Prince Edward Island with the Intercolonial and the railway system of the mainland. Here is the solution of this agreement.

It has been said here by many members that this is simply a matter of political policy, and that when an election is approaching this matter is hearlded abroad in order to gain votes by one side and by the other, but I do not think that is a proper way of looking at this matter. I think that when the government of Canada enters into a contract of this kind they should fulfil that contract to the letter. There is an obligation upon them which is just as binding as the obligation which was upon them when they entered into an agreement with British Columbia. What was the obligation into which they then entered into? They entered into an obligation, a solemn compact, with the people of British Columbia that they would construct a railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and on that understanding, and that understanding alone, the people of British Columbia, in 1873, entered into the confederation of the Dominion of Canada. Did the people of Canada turn around and tell the people of British Columbia after that solemn contract was made that they would not build this railway to connect their province with the east? On the contrary, they entered into obligations with contractors immediately after the contract was made and as soon as it was possible to do so the Dominion of Canada fulfilled the terms of the contract which they had made with British Columbia, so that to-day we find that the agreement made by the Dominion of Canada with British Columbia, so far as that part of it is concerned, has been fulfilled, and they have the Canadian Pacific Railway from Vancouver to Halifax. We in Prince Edward Island contend that we are as much entitled to the fulfilment of our contract as were the people of British Columbia to the fulfilment of theirs. The people of British Columbia, when the construction of the railway was not progressing as speedily as they thought it should, threatened to rebel. They told the Dominion, in no uncertain terms, that if they did not carry out the great work which would be a fulfilment of the terms of union, they would leave the Dominion, and they would have been justified in leaving the union if this contract had not been fulfilled.

It has been said here that it would be improper for the Dominion of Canada to undertake so great an obligation for so small a province. The Dominion government entered into this contract with their eyes wide open, they knew they would have to fulfil some time the obligation which they entered into, that is to connect the railway system of the province with the railway system of the Dominion.

We have had many expressions of opinion from able men in Canada as to the meaning of this contract which was entered into in 1873. We have had an expression of opinion from the right hon. the leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with reference to it. When asked by a prominent Liberal in Charlottetown, in 1891, what his construction of this contract was, he had no hesitation in telling that gentleman that:

Every man who has given attention to the conditions of things and the interests involved by the entering of the island into confederation, must admit that such a tunnel must be constructed if the thing is reasonably practicable.

'Must be constructed if the thing is reasonably practicable.' Did he say that because he was looking for the votes of the people of Prince Edward Island for the party which he then led? No, being a leader of a party he would not stoop to such an ignoble act. He did it because he knew that a contract, a solemn obligation, had been entered into by the Dominion with that province, and for the performance of that obligation he told the people that this tunnel must be built in fulfilment of that contract. There is no other way, there is no other means of fulfilling that contract—and that was the opinion of the leader of this House in 1891. I would like to know if he has changed his opinion since that time. I I do not think the leader of this House is a fickle minded man of that kind; I do not think he is a will-o'-the-wisp, who will change his opinion in that way. I think he is still of the same opinion as he was in 1891.

The probability is that he thinks that because Prince Edward Island is a small province and only returns three or four members it is not entitled to the same consideration as the larger provinces, such as Ontario, Quebec and the Northwest. How did the right hon. gentleman treat the Northwest provinces when they were granted autonomy here two or three years ago? Did he tell them that he would leave the settlement of these great public questions which were agitating the people of those territories until the time when the Dominion of Canada would be in a position to give them better terms? No, although they were in their infancy, although in some instances they were only a few scattered settlements, he put them upon the same footing as that upon which the greater and older provinces stood. He put them into housekeeping right at once. He granted them out of the public chest of Canada large sums of money and he put them in such a position that they would not require to have deficits in the governments of these provinces. I think that probably he did wisely in doing that. He perhaps saw the condition of affairs in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick; he saw that these provinces has not been justly dealt with, and he said: We will put these new provinces in such a position that they will not require to come rapping at the treasury door of the Dominion from time to time as do the older provinces in the east. He gave them what they asked and we find that these provinces to-day have surpluses. Each one of these new provinces last year had a surplus. What is the condition of affairs in the east? The condition of affairs is deplorable in the province of New Brunswick, it is equally deplorable in Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia is not very far behind the other two although it has resources which the other maritime provinces have not. This is a condition which at some time must be changed. Something must be done to put these older provinces in the same financial position as the premier and the government of this Dominion put the new provinces when they created them two or three years ago. What are the people of Prince Edward Island asking of the premier, the government and of parliament?—simply the fulfilment of the terms of the union, and, if we were connected with the railway system of Canada, as this agreement with the Dominion justifies us in saying that we should be, I think I can say with confidence that that is all we would require to ask from the people of Canada. Why? Look at the condition of affairs to-day with respect to transportation. We pay three times as much as any other portion of the Dominion of Canada for transportation. I have on my desk a letter which will give you one simple illustration of this fact. From the city of Charlottetown to the town of Pictou in the province of Nova Scotia, a distance of something like 70 miles, it costs 11 cents to transport 100 pounds of freight. For an equal distance on the Intercolonial Railway it would not cost more than between 2½ and 3 cents. Now, that is a state of affairs which should not exist in the Dominion of Canada to-day. What is the solution of it? We have three short hauls, a haul from Charlottetown to Georgetown, then the haul on the winter steamers to Pictou and then, if we want to go on the Intercolonial Railway, we have another haul. If we had this tunnel there would only be one haul. We would be part of the Intercolonial Railway system and we would have a solution of the difficulty which is imposed upon us by reason of the excessive freight rates which are so oppressive to the people of Prince Edward Island and which must greatly interfere with the trade and prosperity of that province. We are getting a new boat this year which they say is going to fill the Bill. But, will it? Will that decrease the freight rates? Will that put us in any better position than that in which we are to-day? When the winter boat came on and when the summer boats were taken off between Pictou and Charlottetown what did the Intercolonial Railway do? They put up rates on that road and to-day the people of Prince Edward Island are paying twice as much for transportation. The rate on the winter steamer is the same, but it has been doubled on the Intercolonial Railway between Pictou and Halifax, or Pictou and Truro, because the competition by water does not exist as it did in the summer time. Here is an unanswerable argument why this government should fulfil

the terms upon which the province entered into confederation. I am not going to argue that it should be the policy of this government to do so. I am going to ask this government simply to fulfil the terms of confederation. We may be told probably that the Liberal-Conservative party were in power for eighteen or nineteen years and that they did not fulfil the terms by building this railway. I do not say that they did rightly at that time, but they took an initial step. They made a survey and they got some data and information for this House and for the government upon which the government should act. Although the right hon. gentleman who leads this House promised in 1891, before he came into power, that as soon as he came into power he would see that proper facilities were provided in fulfilment of the contract with the province, we find him still resting on his oars and doing nothing. Is that fair to the people of Prince Edward Island? The people of Prince Edward Island are not the only people who are affected by this question. The men who are dealing with the people of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario are affected by it. To-day if you ask me to send from Charlottetown, or any point in Prince Edward Island, a carload of oats what would the freight rate be on these oats?—forty cents per 100 pounds from Charlottetown to the city of Toronto. Just imagine forty cents per 100 pounds or 13⅓ cents per bushel, nearly a third of the price of the oats, and yet, notwithstanding that fact, the right hon. gentleman and the government think that the people of Prince Edward Island have no grievance. It is a very disagreeable duty for the members from that province to be airing this matter from year to year in the House, but it is a serious matter for the farmer who raises his products by hard toil to know that if he were on the mainland he would get his goods carried for one-third of the cost at which the people of Prince Edward Island are able to get theirs carried for. It is a serious matter because it affects their pockets and no matter in what section you meet a native of Prince Edward Island you will find that this is a question which is agitating every farmer, every tradesman, every producer in the province. If you go to the Northwest, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and ask young men—you will meet them from every part of Prince Edward Island—why they left Prince Edward Island—that beautiful little province, so fertile and so productive —they will tell you that it was because they could not make any money there; that all their earnings went for the transportation of their produce. That is what they will tell you and that is what the farmers of Prince Edward Island will tell you today. I venture to say that in ten or fifteeen years there would be saved to the farmers of Prince Edward Island, because of the lessened freight rates they would be charged, almost a sufficient sum to pay three times over the cost for the construction of that public work. When people talk about the tunnel costing too much money let me point to the example of the St. Clair tunnel, completed in 1891, constructed by a Canadian engineer, and which, although about three miles long, cost only $2,500,000. The difficulties to be met with in boring the St. Clair tunnel were greater than would be the case under the Straits of Northumberland, because the strata under the St. Clair river is clay and is difficult material to work, whereas the shale under the Northnmberland Straits is easily worked. Sir Henry Tyler, then president of the Grand Trunk Railway, at a banquet held at St. Clair in September, 1891, said:

> That the St. Clair Tunnel Railway, hardly three miles long, and costing about $2,500,000 was no very gigantic operation, but looked very small as one means of communication between the 14,000 miles of railways in Canada costing $8,000,000,000 and the 165 miles of railway in the United States costing $9,000,000,000.

Now, the province of Prince Edward Island wishes to have connection with the railway system of the Dominion of Canada. I suppose that to-day there must be something like 25,000 miles of railway in Canada, and these railways cost not $800,000,000 but billions of dollars the greater part of which cost came out of the pockets of the people of the country including the people of Prince Edward Island. In view of this I think the terms of the confederation compact of 1873 should be fulfilled and that she should have an opportunity of obtaining access, not only to the railway system of Canada which cost us so much money, but to the railway system of the United States as well. We are entitled to this not only as a matter of politics but as a matter of right and justice and contract. I will ask the right hon. the Prime Minister if he is still of the same opinion as he was when in 1891 he wrote a letter to Mr. D. Higgs, editor of the Charlottetown 'Patriot' declaring that the terms of confederation should be carried out. It was said by Sir George E. Cartier that nothing is impossible to the Privy Council of Canada and although Sir George Cartier was a great man I believe we have a greater man to-day at the head of the Canadian government, especially in the estimation of his own followers, and I think he should go a little further than did Sir George Cartier and carry out that compact of confederation, because nothing is impossible for the Privy Council of Canada. Now Mr. Speaker, if you will consider the situation of Canada to-day and the discontent which exists in a great many quarters you will find that this confederation is not altogether safe even at the present time. We have dissensions in the province of British Columbia leading almost to rebellion against the Dominion. I am not going to

say whether the people of British Columbia are in the right or not and evidently the Prime Minister does not think they are right, but you will find throughout the proince of British Columbia to-day dissatisfaction with the Dominion government in entering into obligations which affect that province injuriously. Then at the other end of the Dominion discontent exists in the province of Prince Edward Island. I can say that notwithstanding that the steamers are running fairly regularly this year there is great discontent at the high tariff rates which prevail in that country and which have the effect of retarding the progress of the province. Not long ago there appeared an editorial in the Charlottetown 'Guardian' which summarizes the discontent prevailing in Prince Edward Island and under the caption 'It is impossible to go on,' it says:

It is said that under fair and just treatment the population of the island would be 142,500 instead of 95,000. But Canada having gained access to our market and fenced it in with tariff walls, has turned her back upon us to exploit the west. . . . Our harbour that was thronged is now vacant; our wharfs that were busy with square-rigged ships thirty-four years ago, are idle or rotting down to-day.

There is a great deal of truth in this editorial. Within the last three or four years about $40,000,000 have been expended in the construction of the Transcontinental railway and probably next year there will be paid out of the treasury something like $30,000,000 on account of that railway. The Dominion of Canada will have paid up to the end of this year $70,000,000 to construct that railway and then hand it over to a private corporation. If this tunnel is built I do not wish it to be handed over to any corporation; I wish it to be controlled by the management of the Intercolonial whether that railway is managed by the government or otherwise. We should have the benefit of the advantages which accrue to the people along the line of railway from Montreal to Halifax because of the lower freight rates they pay than we are called on to pay. Above all, I put the justice of building this tunnel on the ground that it is merely carrying out the contract we have entered into with the Dominion. Without that contract we would not be part of the Dominion to-day, and I think the people of Prince Edward Island will be justified in withdrawing from this Dominion, and I think there is a possibility of such, unless that contract is fulfilled to the letter by the Dominion government. I wish to lay this matter before the right hon. gentleman who leads the House and I would ask his opinion as to whether it is not a binding contract to connect us with the Intercolonial system, and to say if the tunnel is not the only feasible way of carrying out that contract with the province.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). The hon. gentlemen opposite have certainly made long speeches, and the mover and the seconder particularly read a great many extracts, and dwelt on different subjects that could hardly be considered germane to the question before the House. However, that was not a very serious fault. This is a business matter and ought to be approached from a business standpoint, and I question very much the wisdom or propriety of our hon. friends keeping up this continual and eternal fault-finding and simulated indignation which has been given voice to to-night and on other occasions. The question of the construction of a tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland is not new. It is a question that has been before the people of that province for a good many years. It is a question that our Conservative friends have paid considerable attention to and have been pretty warm about on the eve of several elections, but somehow their ardour generally cooled off a little between the elections; but now our friends in opposition manage to keep up the agitation pretty nearly all the time.

There is no doubt that the question of transportation is an exceedingly important one to every province of this Dominion; but it is perhaps still more important to the province of Prince Edward Island because it is an island. The people of this country are pre-eminently a trading people, and therefore anything that hinders or prevents or retards the free ingress and egress of our people and their wares stunts to that extent the individual and national life. Eight provinces of this Dominion can trade freely with one another for twelve months of every year; but one province, the smallest, said to be the fairest, and perhaps the most productive, all things concerned, is debarred from that privilege, partially at least, for three or four months of the year. That is a very great disadvantage, which can only be fully appreciated by the people who have felt it. We have done and are doing great things to overcome the disadvantages of our geographical position in regard to transportation. We have built at great cost to this country the Canadian Pacific Railway; we have constructed a chain of inland waterways, the canals; we have built and are building the Intercolonial Railway, the Canadian Northern and the Transcontinental; we shall, I believe, construct the Georgian Bay canal, and in all probability exploit the Hudson Bay route; at considerable cost we have equipped, are equipping, and will continue to equip, the great national ports on the Atlantic, on the Pacific and at the head of tidewater. From the benefit of these great national undertakings Prince Edward Island, though contributing her quota of the cost, is to some extent shut out, because of her insular position.

Now, can that disadvantage be overcome? Can that province be united physically as

well as politically with the rest of the Dominion by a railway either over or under the Northumberland Straits? Can she be placed in a position to trade as freely and continuously with the other provinces of this Dominion as they can trade with one another and with all other countries of the world? If she can at a reasonable cost and with a reasonable assurance of success, the work should be undertaken. But in my judgment we may just as well understand that no government in this country, Liberal or Conservative, brown, white or black, would undertake a work of that magnitude without the fullest examination and investigation; it would not be justified in doing so. I have tried, as far as my influence goes with the government, to proceed along practical and present lines. I have urged upon the government the advisability of constructing the best and most powerful ice-breaking steamer that can be built, and with some measure of success, I think; because I know that contracts for the building of such a steamer will be let within the next few weeks, and the work will be pushed with all possible expedition, and it is hoped and expected that the steamer will be ready for next winter's service. I have also asked the government to provide all the aid possible for navigation, to enable that steamer to make as frequent trips as possible between the island and the mainland. Now, that is the first and most necessary step. In conjunction with that, I believe the government would be justified in taking measures to secure the best professional information obtainable, to ascertain whether or not a tunnel under the Straits of Northumberland is feasible and practicable, what the cost would be, what the upkeep would be, what the expense would be, and what the saving as compared with the present service would be. I believe that is the proper course to take at present, and if our friends opposite would press that upon the government, I believe it would meet with a fair response. But to imagine that any government would undertake the construction of a work of that magnitude, with the information now available, is I think out of the question. At all events, we can better consider this question when the records that have been asked for to-day are brought down, and all the information available is before us. The hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution is quite right in asking for that information, and if it is not sufficient, all we can do at present is to ask the government to supplement it with the best information obtainable. We must bear in mind that because Prince Edward Island is an island, we have for eight months of the year the cheapest transportation available, that is, water transportation; but for three or four months in the year, when we are shut out from communication with the other provinces, we are certainly at a great disadvantage.

There is a point which I think should be pressed on the government, and which I intend to press still further when I have an opportunity of bringing up a resolution which I have on the Order Paper, that is, that while Prince Edward Island contributes per quota to the cost of the great public works and the great lines of transportation of the Dominion as a whole, it should be placed on an equality with the other provinces, so far as passenger and freight rates are concerned. We have to pay on our outward freight about twice as much as is paid on similar freight carried on the railways in the mainland. We also have to pay heavier freights on our imports because of our insular position. That is hardly fair, and I believe that a request made to the government and the people would be responded to in the spirit in which it would be made. I believe the response would be that the people of Prince Edward Island were not being given fair treatment. Perhaps some additional charge might be made because of the extra handling but the difference should not be so great. I know that the question of making the Prince Edward Island Railway and the Intercolonial pay and of covering the deficits upon the boats is one which presents itself to the officials who are managing these public utilities, and they would find it very difficult, if not backed by a strong public opinion, to reduce the freight rates. Still I believe that if the matter be put fairly and squarely before the people, the representatives of the other provinces would give us a fair show in that direction. With the improved ice-breaking steamer which will be ready in a few months and with the reduction we can fairly ask in our freight rates, we would not have much to complain of, and we could wait until such time as the government can make all necessary and reasonable investigation into the cost of the tunnel and decide whether it can be taken up as a business proposition, or not. If the cost is found to make the scheme impracticable, let it drop. I do not intend to make it a political question. My views are the same as they were a year and two years ago and as they will be on the immediate eve of an election. I would approach this proposition from a purely business standpoint, bearing in mind that the people of Prince Edward Island are entitled to the best transportation facilities they can get and that, above and beyond all things, they are entitled to an equality with the other portions of the Dominion in the matter of passenger and freight rates. That is all I have to say on the subject at present.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). The question we are now discussing is a perennial one. It comes up session after session, and the ground that has been travelled today by my hon. friends who have spoken has been covered frequently by every repre-

sentative from Prince Edward Island in years gone by. In fact ever since the admission of the island into confederation, this question of better transportation facilities has been the subject of debate in that province in season and out of season. On the floor of the local legislature, in this House, on the stump and in the press, the cry has been justice for the island. I have heard the hon. member for Queens (Mr. A. Martin) recounting the disadvantages under which the people of Prince Edward Island are labouring, the great injuries inflicted upon them, how they were burdened, when entering confederation with onerous conditions as regards their railway system, how, in the granting of provincial subventions, they were deprived of their just rights how in connection with the fishery award at Halifax they were cheated out of their proper share and how, even in the matter of representation, they have been treated unfairly. To the present date as I understand him, the island is bled to the extent of two (2) millions of dollars annually in customs and excise and nourished only to the extent of $600,000 in grants and allowances of all kinds. Talk about the wrongs of dear old Ireland but the complaints of the 'Emerald Isle' appear to pale into insignificance compared to the alleged injustice and imposition inflicted upon that other isle 'the garden of the gulf of St. Lawrence.' Last session and the session before there was scarcely a week in which there was not a question on the Order Paper or a resolution proposed by some member of Prince Edward Island the purpose of which was to air the wrongs and ventilate the grievances of that province and all having reference, directly or indirectly to the question of communication between the island and the mainland. The representatives of that province have been indefatigable in their zeal and industry in keeping the 'complaints' of that province to the front; and if we are to interpret their language literally, we must come to the conclusion that the people of Prince Edward Island have already merited the crown of martyrdom and now the time has come when their grievances should be redressed. Some hon. gentlemen not acquainted with our situation may think that the language used by some of the island's representatives this afternoon was inspired by party venom or a desire to attack and harass the government. But I am sure such is not the case. Knowing these hon. gentlemen as I do I can venture the statement that their sole disposition is to discuss this question in a calm, judicial, dignified, non-partisan manner, that they have no desire to make party capital against the government or to influence their electorate in any shape or form.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. When they undertook to discuss this question, I am confident they divested themselves of anything that savored of partisanship and they intended to plead their cause in a most fair, honourable and non-partisan manner. None of the hon. gentlemen opposite would, I am sure, think for a moment, of approaching a subject like this in any party spirit. And if at times they reddened under the collar, you can rest assured, Mr. Speaker, it was because of that intense feeling of sorrow and indignation every patriotic and sympathetic breast feels when one's country's wrongs are meditated upon, and not because they wished to suggest any lethargy or indifference on the part of this government. It is only natural that their souls should be stirred up to such an extent that they could pardonably indulge in language which may seem a little warm. To my mind the people of Prince Edward Island have a grievance. Their complaints are not new and are not brought up for the purpose of making party capital. Whatever may be said for or against the tunnel, we must admit that the people of Prince Edward Island honestly believe they have a legitimate grievance in that connection. Even at the risk of wearying the House, I shall refer to the terms of the union.

But before doing so, I may say that, irrespective of locality, irrespective of politics or any consideration of that kind, the people of Prince Edward Island believe that the terms of union have not been lived up to. And suppose that any of us were for sixty-four days, as happened in 1903, or for fifty-nine days, as happened in 1905, and for shorter periods in other winters, practically isolated from the rest of the world, as the people of Prince Edward Island are, would we not feel that we had a just grievance and one calling for speedy redress? Whether we approve the tunnel project or not, we must all sympathize with the members from Prince Edward Island in the handicap to which they are subjected. Apart from the feeling of isolation, they must experience, under such conditions there is the great commercial loss in the transportation of their products and otherwise to be considered. There may be a disposition on the part of some people to underrate the value of the island. Some may say that the island is not of sufficient importance to occupy so much of the time of the House as has been taken up in the discussion of the evening. I hope that no such sentiment exists in the breast of any member of the House. I trust that no member is so small-spirited as to take that view of the situation. We all recognize that Prince Edward Island is a province of the confederation, and that as such she is entitled to the same consideration and the same treatment as her older and more powerful sisters. Let no one forget the fact that Prince Edward Island has over

five times as many persons per square mile as big, populous and prosperous Ontario has, nearly thirteen times as many people per square mile as much advertised Manitoba has and consider the value of the agricultural products of the tight little island by the sea and her fisheries and compare them with those of the larger provinces and perhaps the contempt (if such exists) for the little girl in the family will quickly vanish. You have heard the story, Mr. Speaker, of the young married couple who expressed themselves to the effect that they would be much happier and better off, if their mothers-in-law had not been born. I hope no one from the newer provinces thinks it would be better for the peace and tranquility of the rest of Canada if the island had never been brought into confederation. The first question is, what is guaranteed by the terms of union ?

Among other things those terms provided:

The Dominion government shall assume and defray the charges of efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers to be established and maintained between the island and the mainland of Canada, winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of Canada.

That would seem to be as clear as English words could make it. The fathers of confederation did not deem it sufficient to declare simply that the government of Canada should establish and maintain communication between the island and the mainland, but they added other words which seems to be tautological because they state that steam communication should be maintained 'winter and summer.' Evidently they had in mind the difficulty that the people of the island had previously experienced, to which I shall refer later on, and they gave ample warning to the rest of Canada as to the obligation that the Dominion was assuming. And, in order that there might be no possible doubt as to the meaning of the language used, they added still further words to make it clear that this communication was to be such that 'thus'—or thereby—'the island' was to be placed in 'continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of Canada.' You will observe how very carefully the words have been selected. It is interesting to follow the thoughts that must have been in the minds of the fathers of confederation when this condition of the union was framed. These words show the solemn agreement then and there entered into—that there should be, as far as possible, the same facility for communication between the island and the rest of Canada that there was between the various provinces of the mainland. In the case of the maritime provinces it was necessary to place them in close communication with the upper provinces, and this was affected by the Intercolonial Railway. The fathers of confederation insisted that steam communication, winter and summer, was to be of such a continuous character that the people of the island would have the same freedom of communication with the mainland as the people of the other provinces had with one another.

Now, that being the case, what is the duty of the parliament of Canada? Evidently it is to live up to the spirit, at all events, if not to the letter of the agreement. For we must remember that if the rights and privileges assured to any province of this Dominion are not carried out in good faith by the rest of Canada, there is no security for Canada. The foundation stones of our confederation are fair play, good faith and good will towards all. And I say that this is not a question of dollars and cents, it is a question of good faith, and if it costs $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 the question of cost should not stand in the way if it becomes absolutely necessary to build this tunnel. The question is: Is it necessary that this tunnel should be constructed? In order to reach a proper conclusion with regard to that, I think we have to look at the conditions that existed previous to the confederation, the facilities that the people of the island then had for the transportation of their products, and the means of communication that existed. We should consider also the terms of union itself and see whether it is necessary, in order to maintain the good faith of Canada, that such an expensive means as the one proposed should be provided.

Now, previous to the union, the only means of communication was ice-boats plying between Cape Traverse on the island side and Cape Tormentine on the New Brunswick or mainland side. The inconveniences and hardship the people endured, the great danger to life and property and the losses that were suffered I need not go into; they will be apparent to any man who considers the primitive methods then used for transporting passengers and property to and from the island. Bearing in mind these conditions which prevailed before the admission of the island into confederation, it seems to me that if a tunnel were required to maintain the communication, something would have been said about it at the time confederation was entered into. But there is no reference to a tunnel or anything of that nature in the discussion that took place. Considering the very great care that the fathers of confederation used, the great precautions they took in making clear what they intended to convey, I say it is reasonable to suppose that if the need of a tunnel had been anticipated by the people of Prince Edward Island at that time there would have been some reference to it. The words

of the Act call for efficient steam communication. They did not say 'steam' (meaning steamboat) or 'other service.' The very fact that the Act of union is silent on this question is, to my mind, abundant evidence that the only service contemplated at that time was a steamboat service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) say that? I do not observe the word 'steamboat service' in the Act. It is 'steam service.'

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. Yes. To replace the ice-boats it would be reasonable to suppose that if they had thought a steamboat service insufficient they would have made some mention in their discussion of a tunnel or something of that kind.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask why the hon. gentleman deems it necessary to introduce the word 'steamboat' when it is not in the Act?

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. I did not say that the word 'steamboat' was in the Act. But evidently they referred to a steamboat communication.

Mr. BRODEUR. To replace the ice-boats.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. Yes—to replace the ice-boats which, as I have said, were then their only means of winter communication. There was great danger to life and property, great hardship and inconvenience under that system. By the terms of confederation it was expected that all that would be removed if a steamboat service were provided and we find that shortly after the union a steamboat service was provided.

Mr. LEFURGEY. At the time we entered confederation no such steamboat as we have on the route to-day, or such as is contemplated, was in the minds of the parties to confederation; their thought was that some means should be provided to keep up steam communication, winter and summer, and it is reasonable to say that if it could not be done by steamboat communication any other means that came into existence and could be reasonably utilized should be utilized; and so a tunnel may very well be read, by implication, into the terms of union.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. If the gentlemen who had to do with the terms of union in 1873 enjoyed such a service as is enjoyed by Prince Edward Island to-day, they would think that the agreement entered into had been fully and literally carried out. But, of course, what suits one age may not suit another; our fathers were content with certain conveniences which we would look on as far from adequate. They had ice-boats previous to 1876. They must have expected that the steamboats to be put on in place of the ice-boats would meet fully all the requirements of the situation. The wording of the Act would seem to indicate that, because it says, 'steam communication winter and summer,' indicating that ice-boats would not be sufficient, but that steamboats should take their place.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). How does the hon. gentleman interpret the Prime Minister's letter of 1891?

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. I did not happen to be in at the time it was read. I presume the Prime Minister had to say, as every hon. gentleman in this House would say, that if you cannot provide reasonable communication between the island and the mainland by other means than a tunnel, you must have a tunnel; but that if you can provide reasonable communication, taking all the circumstances to-day and previous to the date of union into consideration, by sufficient steamboat communication, the terms of union are satisfied thereby. In an extreme view the most that can be said otherwise is the question a fair subject of debate. We must consider the great importance of the island, which is a very important place. We must take into consideration the fact that the present service is admitted to be as good a service as can be found anywhere for ten or eleven months in the year, and we must take into consideration the further fact that if it is possible to make the steamboat service so efficient as to keep up connection the whole year around without interruption, then the terms of confederation are lived up to literally and fully and so there is no complaint, and a tunnel cannot be demanded on that ground.

In 1876 the first steam communication to replace the old system of ice-boats was established, and I might say here—I hope I will not be accused of partisanship, because that is as foreign to my disposition as to that of the hon. member for Queens (Mr. A. Martin) whom I see smiling—that it was a Liberal government, that of Alexander Mackenzie, that established the first steam communication. The 'Northern Light' was then put on the route. She was superseded by a stronger and better boat, the 'Stanley.' From 1876 to 1897 or 1898 there was only one boat doing duty for the island in winter. In 1897-8 another boat, the 'Minto,' very much more powerful and immeasurably superior to the 'Northern Light,' was put into commission in addition to the 'Stanley,' so that from that date forward there have been two steamboats doing the service that previous to confederation was performed by the ice-boats, and from confederation up to 1897-8 by one steamboat. Again, mark you, this was done under the present Liberal administration.

Listening to the remarks of some hon. members opposite from Prince Edward Island, one would suppose that this government had neglected to do anything in the way of providing facilities for transporta-

tion. But let me say to them that in this as in every other respect, the Liberal party have been in the vanguard of progress and improvement. I say that the boats in use today are staunch, superior boats, rendering excellent service. If there has been a failure to maintain efficient continuous communication, it has not been due to the fault of any government, for each succeeding government for that matter has vied with its predecessor in the effort to meet the wishes of the people of Prince Edward Island and in endeavouring to give them the very best means of access and communication. It is true it has been the rule that for weeks and months at a time there has not been continuous communication between the island and the mainland, but that has not been the fault of the boats. I shall point out later where the trouble lies.

I wish to refer briefly to the history of the service that has been rendered in the past. The route between Capes Traverse and Tormentine was tried at one time. This route was strongly and persistently advocated by an engineer, Mr. Shewen, of St. John. He contended that as it is the shortest route, therefore it is the natural route. He says also that as there is a strong current running northeast and another running southeast along this route near the line between the capes, the drift ice is kept loose and prevented from packing, which makes it the most desirable route. The reasons he advances in support of his contention are most specious and plausible, but investigation and examination show that his conclusions are not borne out by the facts, and that some of his assertions are not facts.

For there is a report on file by Colonel Gourdeau, the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to his chief, the minister of that department, dated January 7, 1904. We must assume that as deputy minister Mr. Gourdeau would be in a position to give independent testimony. He has no prejudice in favour of one route or another route. He went down to the island to inquire into the conditions and give the plain, unvarnished facts. He discussed the question with the agents and officers of the Marine and Fisheries Department in Prince Edward Island and Pictou, N.S. He observed, he tells us, the geographical situation of the several harbours on both sides of Northumberland strait, he had the advantage of hearing the representations made with reference to the harbours of Pictou, Charlottetown, Georgetown and Summerside by the boards of trade of these places, he interviewed possibly all the men who were able to give him accurate information in regard to the prevailing winds, tide and ice conditions, and he says :

An hon. MEMBER. When was that?

Mr. W. CHISHOLM. That was on the 7th January, 1904:

It is only possible to keep up communication between Summerside and Cape Tormentine in exceptional winters, but during ordinary winters that route for the 'Stanley' or the 'Minto' is impracticable.

And further he says:

The Summerside route is a political and not a natural one.

I also happened to notice a copy that was brought down of a letter written in reply to a resolution of the Halifax Board of Trade asking that better communication be provided with the island. In that letter it is pointed out that in 1903 the department made an effort to reestablish communication between Summerside and Cape Tormentine and the writer goes on to say:

The result was disastrous. The steamer 'Stanley' was, on the 13th January, 1903, icebound by the usual quantities of ice in that part of the strait and she was not liberated until March 17.

March 17 that year, I think, was St. Patrick's day, but that is only a coincidence. I could cite to you cumulative testimony of the fact that the contention of Mr. Shewen as to the Cape route was not borne out by the facts. The fact of the matter is that that route is now only a route of the past. It is as dead as Julius Caesar and everybody recognizes that.

Mr. LEFURGEY. If the hon. gentleman will look over the reports which have been handed in within several years to the Department of Marine and Fisheries he will find that route was strongly recommended as against the Pictou-Charlottetown route.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM. I have just been referring to the report of Mr. Shewen which, I presume, is one of the reports the hon. gentleman goes upon, but I also referred to the fact that subsequent investigation and examination have shown conclusively that that is a route of the past. Whilst perhaps it is not as old as Julius Caesar for all practical purposes, it is out of the question. What has been the result of the route between Charlottetown and Pictou? I need not ask. The walls of this chamber resound with the wails and lamentations of hon. members from Prince Edward Island for the last number of years—I might truthfully say—ever since that route was tried. It may be said, however, that some of these complaints are not justified, that the species of chronic grumbler is not yet extinct. On that account I propose to show that the complaints that have been made in this House and out of it are not exaggerated, to say nothing of being manufactured, but that they are justified by the facts. In doing so I shall refer to statements that have been made in this House, not only in recent years but in former times. As far back as 1877 we find attention publicly called in

this House to the unsatisfactory service rendered by that route. We find Mr. Sinclair, then representing Kings county, Prince Edward Island, in this House, asking on the 15th day of February, 1877, whether the government had taken any steps to find out and establish the most satisfactory and practicable route for keeping up communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland during the winter and if not, was it their intention to do so before the opening of navigation? On that occasion several of the islanders spoke and all agreed in stating that the means of communication during the winter were not such as they expected and were not satisfactory. This aspect of the case has, however, been gone into fully over and over again, and I need not go into details. I will refer to a joint address to this parliament of the House of Assembly and Legislative Council of Prince Edward Island in 1884, to a resolution of the Maritime Board of Trade in 1905 and 1906, and to a resolution passed by the legislature of Prince Edward Island in 1905. I refer to these for the purpose of showing that this is not a case of trumped up complaints at all but to show that these complaints were honestly made by the people of Prince Edward Island, and that they must have had some foundation for them. They are not entirely the talk of politicians, if I may say so, who are anxious to say something here for the benefit of their constituents. They are the statements of deliberative bodies and they are statements that we must regard as being founded upon conservative facts. In the resolution of 1905 that I referred to of the legislature of the province of Prince Edward Island the grievances of the island are fully set forth and the attempts that have been made to remedy the situation are there detailed. In studying this question, as I said before, what is impressed upon our minds, next to the grievances themselves, is the earnest effort that has been made by each government, and particularly by this government, to try to meet the wishes of the people, and to try to provide the island with a reasonable means of transportation and a reasonable means of communication between it and the mainland. I commend the present administration for the very generous and magnanimous spirit they have shown in this matter, and I believe that the people of Prince Edward Island do not fully appreciate the efforts that have been made in the past for the purpose of bringing about the desired end. But, the desired end has not yet been reached. Why? As I said before, it is not due to the fault of the boats. The boats are all right, the equipment is all right, the men and officers are efficient and there can be no question on that score. The whole question to my mind is that the mainland terminus is not satisfactory. The proper solution of this question has not yet been adopted by the country. The whole trouble, I submit, is in Pictou harbour.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM. This is a fact that no one can get away from—strive as he will. The trouble with the island communication is found in Pictou harbour. You cannot but see it. God and nature never intended Pictou as a winter port and unfortunately the genius of man cannot in this case supply what nature denied. I shall point out why. If you look at a may of the maritime provinces you will see that between the island and the mainland opposite Pictou, Northumberland strait is narrow. The prevailing winds of winter in that part of the country are from the north and northeast and when the winds blow the ice is driven up the Northumberland strait into that narrow defile between Pictou harbour and the mainland and it gets jammed there. Besides that, northward of Pictou is Pictou island and when the wind blows from the east and northeast the ice is driven in between the island and the mainland shore and the result is that there is formed or collected a mass of ice that it is impossible for any steamer to force its way through. Given sufficient depth of water, a sufficiently powerful steamer, and plenty of sea room, no matter how heavy the ice, that steamer could work her way through. We have heavy ice in the Straits of Canso not very far from Pictou harbour and there is no trouble experienced there in maintaining connection between the island of Cape Breton and the mainland of Nova Scotia, because we have deep water and plenty of sea room. The trouble at Pictou harbour is that it is impossible for a steamer to work her way through when the ice is packed in between the island and the mainland. I do not want to say anything against Pictou harbour, I would be sorry to say anything against Pictou because of the hon. gentleman who represents the constituency, but knowing the geographical position of the harbour it is just as well I should state the facts. I will refer the House to the records and we will see what these records tell. In the report of Mr. Charles Duguid, the British naval designer who was consulted by the government in reference to this question and who has no prejudice against Pictou harbour or predeliction in favour of it, he says under date Nov. 6, 1905:

> The position and formation of Pictou harbour in relation to the northeast gales referred to is well known and wholly accounts for the great barrier which forms here in very severe weather. It will thus be seen that the question of investigating some new route, and one presenting less difficulties to navigation will require to be undertaken by a naval commission at an early date.

In describing the inadequacy of the present route between Charlottetown and Pictou Mr. Duguid says, not that it is due to any occasional or any incidental circumstances but that it is due to the physical position of Pictou harbour itself, and he states that to his mind there is only one thing to be done and that is to investigate as soon as possible some other routes and to do so by an independent commission. Mr. Duguid has no interest to serve except to assist the government in providing the best means of comunication for the people of Prince Edward Island and thus discharge the duty assigned to him, and he says that Pictou harbour because of its geographical position and physical formation is such that you cannot make a good harbour out of it for winter purposes. I am not denying the fact that in the summer time Pictou harbour is all right but there is no doubt that in the winter time it is inaccessible under certain conditions. It was said in the House last year or the year before that dredging would help out the situation. Well, I believe considerable dredging has been done there, and still I venture to prophesy that if this season you have a heavy easterly or northeasterly blow and if heavy ice forms in the gulf you will see Pictou harbour packed solid with ice and inaccessible just as in previous years. The whole trouble is that the natural formation is against Pictou harbour and no amount of dredging will help you; you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. Mr. Duguid in his report further says:

As the bottom is of a sandy nature the possibility arises of the channel refilling owing to the set of the tides and the strong northeasterly winds.

But that is not all; I would also refer to the report of Captain McElhinney, the competent, experienced, and skilful expert who is the nautical adviser of this government, and who says:

The cause of the interruption in 1904-1905 was the jamming of the ice during the east winds between Pictou island and the mainland so as to block the harbour, showing that only during moderate weather can any regular service on the route be maintained. It would appear that the time has come when it is necessary to take action in the direction of providing a more stable and permanent connection between the two shores. The proposed new and more powerful steamers will not solve the problem when the heavy ice is rafting in with an easterly gale, and the entrance to Pictou harbour is sure to fill up and block the steamers in and out.

These gentlemen not only state the faith that is in them but they give their reasons for it. They are not making any conjectural statements or basing their conclusions upon supposititious grounds, but they are telling the actual facts and giving reasons for them. I could quote other opinions to the same effect but it would be supererogation because it cannot be successfully denied that Pictou harbour is in the position these gentlemen represent. Let me quote the report of Mr. Owen and the reasons he gives:

Outside of Pictou the channel is narrow and shallow and in consequence the ice grounded there last winter. I do not believe that any steamer that could be built could force a passage through. The ice grounding was the cause of the 'Minto' being detained in Pictou harbour for several weeks.

My hon. friend from Prince, Prince Edward Island, and every person who is familiar with the situation know such is the case. Now, I have quoted you the opinion of experts; but lawyers differ, doctors disagree, and sometimes the judges do not come to the same conclusion regarding points of law. Perhaps then the opinion of experts and professional men such as I have quoted may be looked upon somewhat askance and therefore I shall give one more authority, this time not the opinion of an expert but of an independent, intelligent, practical man who is in a position to know what he is talking about. I refer to a letter I saw in the 'Daily Patriot' in March last year signed by A. B. Warburton, of Charlottetown, lately Judge Warburton, in which he points out:

Having on several occasions been detained for lengthy periods in Pictou, I have some experience in these matters when there is a continued northeast wind, which is the prevailing winter wind, the ice practically dams the entrance to Pictou harbour and no vessel could make her way through it as when she breaks up the ice it simply collects in front of her and there is no way of getting rid of it. It blocks the ship's progress. If we can judge from recent experiences, it is very doubtful if any vessel could be built that would ensure uninterrupted communication via Pictou throughout the winter.

I could quote a number of other authorities to show that nature never intended Pictou harbour to be a winter harbour, and it is impossible to hope for continuous communication during the winter months by that route.

Is there any other route? There is another, and a very simple and satisfactory route, that is, the route between Georgetown and Cape George in the county of Antigonish. Much as I respect and love the people of Prince Edward Island, I shall be perfectly candid and admit that neither I nor the people of the country I have the honour to represent are so altruistic as to be uninfluenced in this matter by personal motives and considerations. I grant that I am influenced to some extent in the remarks I make by consideration for my constituency. I appreciate the fact that the adoption of the route I suggest would make very much for the material development, progress and prosperity of the thriving dis-

trict of Cape George as well as for the town of Antigonish and the county generally. This is personal and self interest speaking for the county I represent. At the same time, I recognize that the route I propose between Georgetown and Cape George is the only route that will carry out the terms of union and afford the people of the island the regular communication which they are very properly clamouring for. Why is it that this route is superior to the Georgetown-Pictou route? You have only to look at the map to see. Between Georgetown and Cape George, the distance is about 25 miles. As you go up to Northumberland strait the distance between the island and the mainland grows less. It converges as you go up the strait. North of Cape George between Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton Island you have a broad expanse of water. In navigating between Georgetown and Cape George you have ample sea room. This is wanting in the narrower defile between Pictou and Prince Edward Island. There is a current running north and south through the Strait of Canso into the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Another current runs through the Northumberland strait in a southwestwardly direction. The result is that in the vicinity of the proposed route between Georgetown and Cape George the action of the currents is such that the drift ice does not pack as it does in Pictou harbour, but on the contrary is kept loose and mobile. I am informed by sea captains and by residents of Cape George whose testimony is unimpeachable, whose veracity is beyond question, that there is practically open water the whole year round between Cape George and the eastern portion of the island. Why, Sir, last year when the island boats were stuck hard and fast near Pictou, a schooner laden with coal sailed from Port Hastings on the Strait of Canso in the county of Inverness to Georgetown, where the cargo was landed. This was in April last. While the 'Stanley' and the 'Minto' were stuck in the ice for several days on the Pictou route a coal-laden schooner sailed from Hastings to Georgetown. My hon. friend from Pictou must know this. The despatches had it at the time. You will find it in the Halifax papers if you take the trouble of looking up the files for that time. It is true there is drift ice at times between Georgetown and Cape George. But the 'Stanley' or the 'Minto' could easily steam through it, as it is comparatively loose. With the advantage of plenty of sea room the steamers could readily make their way through the ice floes. Frequently has it happened even within my own recollection that mails and passengers were landed at Cape George and in the vicinity thereof, when the steamers were debarred from reaching Pictou. My hon. friend from Pictou in his remarks last year would make it appear that this route I propose is



largely a figment of my own imagination. But let me say to you, Sir, that it is a route that has been recognized since the early days of the union. As far back as 1874 one of the then members of Kings, Prince Edward Island (Mr. McIntyre) recommended the adoption of this route. In the same year, and on the same occasion, Mr. Angus McIsaac, the representative of Antigonish county, remarked that three or four years before then Prince Edward Island mails were landed at Cape George when Pictou could not be approached. My predecessor in the representation of Antigonish county called attention in this House on more than one occasion to this route. It was known to the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries who promised to have it investigated; it is also known to the present minister. What I would call the attention of the government to is the necessity of having this route properly and thoroughly tested. The late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in a letter which I have here, which I received in answer to one I had written to him, calling his attention to this route, stated that when the opportunity was afforded, the Cape George route would receive consideration, and I am assured by the officers of the department and by the present minister himself that it will be tested. An effort was made last year to have it tested, but owing to the 'Minto' having sustained an injury to her propeller and other injuries, it was impossible for the test to be made at that date. The time to test the Georgetown-Cape George route is when Pictou is unapproachable. It would prove nothing that Ballantyne's Cove had then been made, and that no ice obstruction was encountered. In order that a proper and satisfactory test be made it would be necessary to have a spare boat to make the run by the Cape George route not only when Pictou harbour is blocked but also at such times as it would appear there was heavy ice on the Cape George route itself. My contention is that even when there is heavy drift ice there it will not impede, or rather prevent the progress of the boats to Ballantyne's Cove because of the loose, mobile character of the drift ice there. It may happen there is clear open water between Georgetown and Cape George when Pictou Harbour is blocked with ice, and on the other hand that when Pictou harbour is approachable there appears to be heavy ice on the Cape George route, but with ice which I claim will not obstruct the steamers for the reasons stated. Hence in order to have a proper test a boat should be commissioned for a couple of months, say from the middle of February to the middle of April, to make test trips between Georgetown and Cape George of Ballantyne's Cove until the new boat now proposed to be provided is available this test cannot be reasonably made. It requires the two boats now in the service to

handle the island business, and it would be unreasonable to expect the people of the island to be satisfied to have their freight and traffic delayed in transhipment just to enable a series of tests or experiments to be made by the department of a route that cannot be used immediately for lack of terminal facilities at Cape George. From the assurances I have received the details of which I shall not weary this House with at this late hour. I am satisfied when the opportune time comes, satisfactory tests will be made and then it will be demonstrated beyond question of peradventure that the Georgetown-Cape George route is the proper route for a winter service at all events. And by the way, in this connection, let me call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works, to the necessity of an extension of the wharf at Ballantyne's cove to meet present requirements as well as future expectations. When this is shown it will be necessary to build a short spur of railway to connect with the Intercolonial Railway at Antigonish. That is not an expensive matter. It will be a comparatively inexpensive line, as there are no engineering difficulties to be met with, and it will instead of being a burden to the government railway be a source of profit to it. It will be a valuable feeder to the Intercolonial Railway, as it will run through a settled, prosperous section of country. The recent discovery of most promising coal seams at Big Marsh, almost midway between Cape George and Antigonish will necessitate the construction of such railway for the development of those immense coal areas. Further, I venture the prediction that with the development of these coal areas and the iron properties at Doctor's Brook and Arisaig in Antigonish County, a line of railway will extend from Antigonish to Country Harbour in Guysborough county, one of the finest ports in America. This road will run through one of the best sections of Nova Scotia. It will run along the South River valley, than which there is no finer agricultural section in any part of Nova Scotia, through the prosperous and beautiful section of Goshen down to the deep water of Country Harbour. The fisheries and the gold mines of Country Harbour and adjoining districts, the copper deposits of rear Springfield and Copper Lake, and the agricultural products of the excellent farming community through which the road will run will ensure traffic and business for the road that will make it a good paying proposition from the very beginning. Surveys of this proposed road were made in recent years by such engineers as P. S. Archibald, Hiram Donkin, and I think, James J. Taylor, all of whom as I am advised concur in asserting that the road can be built for the ordinary provincial and federal subsidies usually given. If the policy proposed in this House a couple of weeks ago of acquiring branch lines of the Intercolonial Railway as feeders for the road be adopted, then I submit it would be the part of wisdom and sound business sense to extend it and build a road all the way from Country Harbour to Antigonish, a distance of 40 miles, opening up a country of remarkable fertility of soil as well as of rich mineral wealth and on to Cape George affording means of transportation of the valuable coal and iron deposits to which I referred and also providing the means of communication guaranteed by the union to the province of Prince Edward Island. In that country there is an infectious malady prevalent. They have tunnel on the brain, and until they get over that the people will not take hold of the Georgetown and Cape Breton route. If they would take hold of that route and insist upon having it, they would find in it a solution of the difficulties they are now labouring under. When they cease to see visions of great things through subterranean and subaqueous passages the character and cast of which the keenest seer cannot foresee, when they recover from their attack of tumelitis and agitate for and insist upon the route of communication that nature has already provided for them, they will then have solved their transportation problem and the honour of Canada will have been vindicated so far as the terms of the Island union go. I say the honour of Canada, for it is discreditable, aye more, disgraceful, to a pretentious country like Canada that its smallest province should have to run to the foot of the throne in England to ask for justice, and that this parliament should have been reminded of its duty and obligation from Downing street as was the case in 1886 when Earl Grenville asked this government to provide the necessary efficient steam service for that province.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (South Renfrew). We have heard for years the voices of those deeply interested in continuous communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland but no one has lifted up his voice on that question who comes from an entirely different section and has told the people of the island what we think of it. I propose to give a disinterested opinion with reference to the communication between the island and the main shore. I remember distinctly when Prince Edward Island came into confederation and the undertaking we entered into to give that province constant communication with the mainland. I think that undertaking was only right, and I feel sorry for those good people down there. Originally all their interests were with the United States, and when they entered confederation they were deprived of that intercourse. Are we giving them a proper recompense for what they surrendered? True we have constructed very powerful steamers which we thought would do the work but they have not done it satisfactorily. I remember distinctly in 1906 when the poor people down

there were wanting hay for their cattle. They had only recently gone into the work of dairying, and for a whole winter they could not get an ounce of hay to feed their cattle although 400 tons were lying on the shore of the mainland waiting a chance to get across. I know we all felt very sorry for them. There is only one way to solve the difficulty and that is to construct a tunnel. I understand that estimates have been made by expert engineers, according to which a tunnel 16 feet in diameter can be constructed for $10,000,000. If it can, I for one from the province of Ontario, am satisfied to pay my share. We ought to keep our faith with provinces as we keep our faith, as individuals, with one another. What is the good of a man if his word is not good? What is the good of a government if its words is not good? I for one will be perfectly satisfied to have the government undertake a thorough investigation, and if a tunnel can be constructed for $10,000,000 I will vote for it, and I believe every one in Ontario would do the same. I would like to give some figures but it is now half past ten when I think we should close, and shall therefore not take up the time of the House any longer.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Lest some remarks that fell from my hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) might cause some misapprehension, I venture to trespass on your time, Mr. Speaker, a moment or two. Let me congratulate my hon. friend on the able way in which he presented what may be said to be a very poor case. He labours under the disadvantage of coming from an inland county, and his information is naturally imperfect, because those so situated, know little about conditions which apply to the seashore. When we come to consider the fact that the harbour of Pictou, to which my hon. friend referred in a rather unfortunate manner, is the only one with any facilities to be found on the northern shores of Nova Scotia from the Strait of Canso to Point du Chene —and I make that statement with full knowledge—you will realize that my hon. friend was engaged in a task which was almost too stupendous even for him to undertake. When you realize that for the past thirty-two years, as long as winter communication between the island and the mainland has been maintained, seafaring men, whose business it is to navigate back and forth between those two provinces, always went to and from Pictou, you will have some appreciation of what the situation really is. But because in the winter of 1904-5, there was a barrier of ice formed outside the mouth of the Pictou harbour, we are told it is of no importance as a winter port. Well, having lived in the town adjacent to that harbour all my life, I know that that was the only occasion during the past forty years when such a barrier was to be found.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT.

During all the previous years when winter steamers were going to that harbour, at no time was the entrance to it ever prevented by reason of the existence of an ice barrier. But in that particular year, owing to the various currents to be found in the gulf and the straits—in one year you will find large quantities of ice in one place piled up and in another year large quantities piled up in another place—in that particular year, mainly by reason of the fact that a sandbar had been allowed to reach that point, when the water became over it very low an ice block was formed. Since then, however, the bar has been dredged away and we have a complete channel which will take the largest steamer that is available for the service in the Straits of Northumberland; and a result of the new conditions will be found in the fact that during the winter now drawing to a close there has not been a day in which communication has not been maintained between Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, starting from Pictou harbour. I do not think my hon. friend should have found it necessary, in order to make an argument on behalf of a place in his own county, to attack this portion of my constituency in the way he did. Nor do I think that anybody in Nova Scotia pay the slightest attention to the opinion of Mr. Owen of the Marine Department. What does he know about proper harbour or proper winter communication? When we get the opinions of gentlemen who are accountants merely, and have had no experience with conditions put forward seriously here as having some weight with regard to the maintenance of winter communication, you can see that my hon. friend has gone very far afield in trying to make out a case. As regards the Cape George and Georgetown route, which my hon. friend advocates, there is no harbour at Cape George at all. It is, as its name indicates, a cape or a point which runs out into the straits and there is no harbour there at all.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM. There is Ballantyne's Cove.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is not at Cape George at all, and Antigonish harbour is a long way from Cape George, and it is so shallow that a schooner cannot get into it.

Mr. Wm. CHISHOLM. Ballantyne's Cove is a harbour on the northeast side of Cape George, around the point of the cape, and is admitted to be the best harbour on the Northumberland straits. All my hon. friend has to do is to read what Mr. Mackenzie of Prince Edward Island says about it. There is an excellent breakwater there. And in the summer season you will find more coasting and fishing vessels there than at Pictou except when Pictou has the island trade.

Mr. MACDONALD. I hope this discussion will not degenerate from the lofty plane of the question of maintaining continuous communication between the two provinces into the local one of whether there is any harbour at Cape George or not. At Cape George there is nothing else but a cape; there never has been anything else there. But there is this to be said in favour of my hon. friend's argument, that Cape George is one of the nearest points in Nova Scotia to Prince Edward Island and I have no doubt that there may be occasions when boats will have access from Cape George to points on the island when they cannot cross at other points, and that on occasions they can cross from other points when they cannot cross at Cape George. The point I desired to make was that it was not necessary for my hon. friend, in order to justify himself with his constituents, to attack the facilities which are to be found at the one point which the people of both provinces, by mutual consent, for the last 32 years have utilized as their principal means of communication and which is in a better position as far as facilities are concerned than ever before in its history. Unfortunately for my hon. friend the good people of Prince Edward Island do not seem to regard the position he takes as serious at all.

I have seen some arguments from the island advanced in favour of communication between Charlottetown and Brule, on the Nova Scotia shore. I will not discuss that but will simply say that in my constituency we have facilities for communication with the Intercolonial; we have facilities in connection with the winter boats and we have the best available harbour for shelter and all other advantages that is to be found. Thirty-two years trial of that harbour has shown it to be the best place and the difficulties that have been found in the navigation, except in one year, are not difficulties which are due to anything in connection with that particular harbour. I believe that practical people who know the conditions will agree that Pictou harbour is the best that can be found on the mainland in connection with the Prince Edward Island service. I am not saying anything against Cape George, because I think steam communication might be maintained from various points, and I would not have taken part in this discussion except that I want to point out that the conditions existing in my constituency are such that any complaints the people of the island may have had in the past were not due to any defects that are to be found in connection with the terminal being at Pictou. I think that the new icebreaker which the department is arranging to build can obtain easy access to Pictou harbour at all times of the year and with that additional service the good people of Prince Edward Island, who have nothing to complain of this year, will find that a great many of the grievances of which they have complained will have disappeared.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, as has been stated by the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) this subject is not altogether a new one; we have heard of it before. I have no fault to find with the fact that my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island have thought it advisable to bring it again to our attention; on the contrary I may say with perfect candour to the hon. member for Queens (Mr. A. Martin) that I have listened to him with great pleasure, pleasure not altogether unalloyed, however, because I would tell him that in my humble judgment he has not been exactly fair to this government or indeed to any previous government since the island entered confederation. My hon. friend has rather taken the view, and he has maintained it at some length, that there was on the part of the government of Canada a determined hostility to Prince Edward Island. I am sure my hon. friend has no warrant for saying that, and the evidence he sought to adduce did not confirm the view he has advanced. My hon. friend has found fault, for instance, with the fact that the articles under which Prince Edward Island entered confederation did not provide for a fixed minimum representation of Prince Edward Island in this House equal to the representation of the island when it entered the Dominion. On the other hand, he found fault with the fact that the principle of representation by population, which is the cardinal principle under which this confederation was formed, was applied to Prince Edward Island. To-day the representation of Prince Edward Island in this House varies according to population, just as is the case for Ontario and all the other provinces of the Dominion. No exception was made in the case of Prince Edward Island, though subsequently an exception was made in the case of British Columbia because in the articles under which British Columbia entered confederation it is provided that the representation is not to go below the figure it was at in 1872. No such arrangement was made in the case of Prince Edward Island, but it does not lie in the mouth of my hon. friend to reproach us with that and say that there has been hostility to Prince Edward Island. If any one is guilty——

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). Will my hon. friend allow me? I do not think my hon. friend will find in anything I said such a word as hostility. What I did say was that I could not see that the province of Prince Edward Island had been treated as Sir George E. Cartier had said as the junior member of a family. I did not mention the word hostility.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would not say that my hon. friend used the word

'hostility,' but I appeal to him if the whole tenor of his remarks was not intended to convey the impression that Prince Edward Island had not been treated with justice by the Dominion government. I do not mean by this administration alone, but by all the administrations since Prince Edward Island entered confederation. I ask him if it lies in his mouth to say that in this matter, if he will not say 'hostility,' any feeling at all on the part of this government towards Prince Edward Island and if an injustice has been done in this respect to the island, he will agree with me that this injustice was not imposed by the Canadian government upon the government of Prince Edward Island. The entrance of Prince Edward Island into confederation was a matter of agreement. The terms were not imposed on the island. The men who then represented Prince Edward Island accepted the terms such as they were, and if there has been a fault by any one, it is a fault shared in by not only the government of Canada but by Prince Edward Island also.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). What I said was that when the terms of confederation were against Prince Edward Island, binding the island down to a certain point, that you observed the terms to the letter, but when you come to another point as in the adjustment of the new subsidies, the terms of confederation were relaxed in order to give your own province and Ontario large sums of money while my province does not get any.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has departed altogether from the point we were discussing at the time. I said there was no intention on the part of the Canadian government to inflict any injustice on Prince Edward Island. If the provisions made in the case of British Columbia were not made in the case of Prince Edward Island, it was a mistake, if it was an error, call it by any name he may, it was an error common to all the parties to this agreement and Prince Edward Island has no grievance at all on this point.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The point with regard to representation is, as the right hon. gentleman knows, there was a reasonable doubt as to the interpretation, whether the language was not quite as strong as in the case of British Columbia, and we carried our case to the Privy Council. They decided that we could not go outside the four corners of that bond, and the case was given against us. Nevertheless, it will not be disputed that while the wording of the Act did not give us six members in perpetuity, all the evidence outside the four corners of the Act shows that we expected and that we were intended to have six members in perpetuity. What we complain of is that the right hon. Prime Minister could advocate a change with regard to subsidies and other matters and send the Bill over to the imperial parliament to be ratified, but he did not see justice done to the smallest province in giving it fixed representation as had been intended, but placed it in such a position that it is likely to go down in a few years to one representative—I suppose it cannot have less.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Again the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefurgey) is departing from the point at issue. When we went to the imperial parliament to have the subsidies readjusted, we simply carried out the will of the provinces, as declared by their representatives in convention. All the provinces had come here to Ottawa to have this matter readjusted. And we did not feel at liberty to go outside the record and to attempt reform—if reform there ought to be—in a matter which the convention had not dealt with. If the question of representation is to be readjusted in favour of Prince Edward Island, the principle should be submitted to all the provinces. My hon. friend will agree with me that nothing could be more dangerous than to attempt to change the terms of confederation in the representation given to each province without concurrent action of all the provinces or, at the very least, until all the provinces having had an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it. But the point I wanted to make was to protest against my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. A. Martin) attempting to show that there had been some feeling on the part of the Canadian government against Prince Edward Island. On the contrary, I think I can say fairly that all parties in this country have no other feeling than that of affection, regard, consideration for Prince Edward Island. Again, I think my hon. friend was very unfair in the manner in which he contended that Prince Edward Island had not received the full consideration to which it was entitled in the readjustment of the subsidy. If he will look at the new subsidies, he will find that the attempt in the convention was to give to the smaller provinces a larger proportion of subsidy than to the larger provinces. Again, I think he was very unfair, against this government in particular, in the point he attempted to make that Prince Edward Island had not received the full consideration to which it was entitled in the matter of allowance for exhibitions, in that we gave only $10,000 to Prince Edward Island, where as to the other provinces we gave $40,000 and $50,000. This was not because we wished to be unfair to Prince Edward Island or that we wished to make her feel that there was any desire to treat her with any lack of consideration—such a thing is not arguable. The reason for the difference was that in the case of the other provinces they were holding Dominion exhibitions, and going deep into their own pockets for that purpose, and came to us for assistance. But Prince Edward Island would not do that; it would not hold a Dominion exhibition; it

would not place itself in the position assumed by the other provinces. Therefore, it is not fair for the hon. gentleman to cite this as an instance of feeling against Prince Edward Island. In fact, would the hon. gentleman like me to tell him how his speech impressed me? If I may do so without offence, I would say that it seemed to me that the hon. gentleman wanted to keep his grievance —that if he were compelled to choose between the grievance and the tunnel, he would sacrifice the tunnel and keep the grievance. He buttered his own argument with grievances picked up here and there. But when those grievances are examined, as I have examined some of them, they are seen to have very little substance. Now, I come to the tunnel. My hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) has made a demand for a tunnel, followed by my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. A. A. Lefurgey), also by the other member for Queens (Mr. A. A. McLean), on the ground that this is part of the terms of agreement between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion of Canada. Now, of all the reasons these hon. gentlemen could find for this request, the one they have chosen is, in my humble judgment, the weakest of all. If Prince Edward Island is to have a tunnel, she should not, it seems to me, place her demand upon an article of the agreement. It is very questionable—yes it is more than questionable—that, when the articles were signed and it was provided that Canada should furnish Prince Edward Island with efficient steam communication at all times, a tunnel was thought of as that means of communication. All those who took part in the negotiations and framed this instrument had in their minds, so far as my reading on this subject enables me to judge, steam navigation as distinguished from the kind of navigation they had up to that time. But it does not matter what the signers of that agreement had in mind up to that time. I say to my hon. friend that, apart from all other considerations, and simply because Prince Edward Island is in confederation and is entitled to the best that we can give her, we should provide tunnel communication with Prince Edward Island if it can be done with anything like a reasonable expenditure. There is no necessity to go to an article of the agreement or contract; it is sufficient to say that the government and people of Canada, in the spirit shown by my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright), desire to do the best that can reasonably be done for Prince Edward Island. That is the only ground upon which I would place the argument. I do not want to act only as we are bound by contract to act. I prefer to put it on the broader ground, and on the ground that will appeal to my hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin). Now, is this reasonably possible? That is another consideration. Of course, we could spend $10,000,000 or $20,000,000 in this work, but the hon. member knows that we have numerous obligations; we have demands for works in all parts of the country pressing upon us. For many years we have been trying to give Prince Edward Island a reasonable communication by navigation. I think we have succeeded fairly well. In 1876 the government of Mr. Mackenzie first put on the route the 'Northern Light.' Every member from Prince Edward Island at that time agreed that the 'Northern Light' was not a complete success, but that it had done a good deal to improve communication between the island and the mainland. But it was not sufficient, the 'Northern Light' was replaced by a better boat and this by a still better one, and this is to be replaced by another, which, of course, must be to a certain extent an experiment, but which we hope will fill the bill. But, of course, all will agree that no boat will fill the bill as well as a tunnel, which can be used at all times regardless of weather conditions, and through which trains can run on schedule time.

Well, Sir, that is a matter which we have under consideration and to-day I may say to my hon. friend frankly that we are disposed to do the best that it is possible to do under the existing circumstances. We have not yet full information, but information we are always getting and always getting it with the hope of finding it possible, with the resources of Canada, to give to the island what the island wants and what we want to give her also—the full measure of prosperity that it is possible to have with the best possible condition of transportation. All that is needed now, I believe in Prince Edward Island to make it as prosperous as its people think it ought to be is a proper system of transportation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two before the discussion closes. The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) suggests that the members from Prince Edward Island on this side of the House who have spoken on this subject are more anxious for a grievance than for a tunnel. I do not think my right hon. friend was perhaps quite fair in that regard because, having some knowledge of their feelings on this subject and of what they are aiming at, I believe that every one of them is sincerely desirous of completing the communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland in that way and that they place that consideration above every other consideration which would influence their conduct as members of this House. It remains also to say that if they desire a grievance instead of a tunnel my right hon. friend seems very much disposed to satisfy them in that regard, and I did not gather from his words to-night anything more than what he said as far back as 1891, when he was leading the opposition.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Not as much.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not as much, my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) reminds me, because at that time the right hon. gentleman went much beyond what he said here to-night. In a letter of 19th December, 1891, addressed to Mr. D. B. Hogg of Charlottetown, P.E.I., he used these words:

Dear Sir,—I have your favour of 2nd February instant. I hardly thought that an expression of opinion as to the construction of a tunnel to connect the island of Prince Edward Island with the mainland should be required. Every man who has given attention to the condition of things and the interests involved by the entering of the island into confederation must admit that such a tunnel must be constructed if the thing is reasonably practicable.

The first requisite is to have an accurate survey and reliable estimates. I am only sorry that these were not obtained long ago.

Well, Sir, the right hon. gentleman has been in power, with every possible facility, with all the resources of the country at his command, for nearly twelve years, and he seems to know absolutely no more at the present time in regard to the practicability or cost than he did when as leader of the opposition he addressed the words which I have just now quoted to Mr. D. B. Hogg, of Charlottetown. One would think that if the government were serious in regard to an important matter of this kind the information necessary to guide the House and the country on the subject would be in the possession of the government at the present time.

The right hon. gentleman referred to the terms of confederation. I will speak of that later on, but let me say one or two words in regard to his remarks on the question of redistribution. My right hon. friend points out that nothing could be done about a more equitable representation of the province of Prince Edward Island because all the provinces of Canada were not consulted on the subject. Who could consult them if my right hon. friend could not? I do not know how they could be consulted except by some action on the part of the government of the day. When the right hon. gentleman points out that the subsidies to which allusion has also been made were fixed with the consent of all the provinces he surely forgets that one province—the province of British Columbia—did not consent.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Pardon me; it consented but asked for special terms.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a very curious way of putting it, it seems to me. It consented that all the provinces should be entitled to a certain measure of increase in their subsidies, but it stoutly claimed that the province of British Columbia deserved special treatment, and it did not consent to the other subsidies being increased unless British Columbia should receive that special treatment. The premier of that province went to interview the British government for the purpose of enforcing the demand of his province in that regard and, as I can establish by a reference to the debates of the imperial parliament that I have under my hand, he procured an amendment to the Bill, as proposed by this government, in order to safeguard the rights of the province of British Columbia in future in that respect. If you can make a redistribution of subsidies with one province dissenting, and if you can, for that purpose cause an Act to be passed by the imperial parliament in amendment to the British North America Act, the argument of my right hon. friend as to the consent of all the provinces does not seem to carry with it very great weight. However, I am not so much concerned with that particular part of my right hon. friend's argument for the moment.

He has told us that the claim of Prince Edward Island for the construction of a tunnel should not be based upon the terms of confederation between that province and the other provinces of Canada. I am not so sure that I would agree with my right hon. friend in that respect; in fact, my right hon. friend himself made a very strong statement in this House in 1901 in that regard. Speaking of the article of confederation which I am about to read, he said:

It is a direct, binding and solemn understanding that the government of Canada will maintain continuous communication between Prince Edward Island and the Intercolonial. There is no provision there that the Dominion of Canada would try to do it, there is no suggestion that there might be too much ice in certain seasons. True, there might be the case of force majeure. No one would complain if the service were interrupted for a day or two by an act of Providence, because that is a case of force majeure.

The article to which my hon. friend had allusion in making that statement is this:

Efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers to be established and maintained between the island and the mainland of the Dominion, winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion.

The hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. W. Chisholm) who addressed this House at some length seemed to read that article as if it read efficient steamboat service for the conveyance of mails and passengers. It is not efficient steamboat service, it is efficient steam service and I would think that the words would be capable of wider construction than that which was placed upon them by the hon. member for Antigonish. What is the reason that we are to-day no wiser than we were in 1891, no wiser than we were in 1896, as to the attitude of the Liberal party in regard to this tunnel?

There has been ample time in the twelve years that these gentlemen have been in power to procure all the necessary information. The subject is of enormous importance to the province of Prince Edward Island. One cannot blame the people of the province if they become impatient year after year by reason, not during the present winter, but in previous years at the inconveniences of a very serious nature to which they are subjected in consequence of the unsatisfactory condition of this service. My right hon. friend himself has given a construction to the provision to which I have alluded to-night. He has said that it does not mean that the government of Canada is to try to give efficient continuous steam service, but that it is bound to do it. I entirely agree with him in that and it seems to me, as my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Wright) has put it, that it is a subject to which the earnest attention of the people of Canada should be given at once with a view of determining immediately whether or not the project is reasonably practicable having regard to the resources of Canada. That is the whole question. That is a question which seems no nearer solution now than it was when the right hon. gentleman came into power in July 1896. At all events if there is any more information on the subject it has not been brought to the attention of parliament.

I was a little surprised at another argument of the right hon. gentleman which was to the effect that we have to take into consideration the numerous obligations of the country for public works throughout Canada. That is true, but surely the right hon. gentlemen recognizes the distinction between those which naturally attract the attention of the government but which are not matters of interprovincial obligation, and a contract such as that which was made between the province of Prince Edward Island and the rest of Canada when that province entered the Dominion. The two things are not to be placed on the same plane. In the one case the government of the country exercises its discretion as to whether or not the resources of the country will permit certain public works to be constructed in any part of Canada. In the other case the government of Canada has before it a direct contract and obligation between the rest of Canada and Prince Edward Island and it has to see that that contract is carried out in a reasonable and effective way in order that the public credit and honour of this Dominion may be observed. That is the distinction between the two demands on the public treasury. I spoke fully on this question last year and I adhere entirely to what I said then and I would again speak more fully to-night were the hour not so late. It seems to me that the honour of the country is so much involved in the question as to what shall be done, that we cannot afford to have the province of Prince Edward Island resting under the impression or the belief that the articles of confederation have not been fairly and fully carried out, and the very first step that we ought to take, and that ought to have been taken long ago, is to ascertain whether or not this tunnel is reasonably practicable; whether having regard to the resources of the country we can reasonably undertake it. Very strong arguments have been put forward by gentlemen on this side of the House in support of the position that it would be no greater burden on the resources of the country to construct and operate this tunnel than to attempt to keep up communication by means of steamboats. We ought to have had long ago all necessary information upon that subject. I sincerely trust that the government will give to this important subject the attention which it deserves and that within a few months at the outside we shall have in the possession of parliament the necessary information to enable us to say what should be done for the purpose of fulfilling that contract with the province of Prince Edward Island to which the credit and the honour of this country are pledged.

Motion (Mr. Martin, Queens) agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Irrigation Bill of the Minister of the Interior, the two resolutions of the Minister of Finance, and then in Supply the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m., Tuesday.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 10, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 118) to amend the Railway Act with respect to telegraphs and telephones and the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners. He said: For some time the question of placing telegraphs under the Board of Railway Commissioners has been discussed. This Act provides that telegraph companies, with their poles, connections, &c., shall be placed under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners. I need not go into the details of what that may mean. It means with

telegraph companies just what it means with railway companies. Wireless telegraph companies are also included. In addition, the clauses relating to telephone companies are somewhat readjusted, but there is no material change. One very important clause provides for what is known as specific performance. It will meet, I think, the views of several hon. gentlemen who have discussed this particular question in connection with other Bills. It provides for the enforcement of contracts entered into by companies and municipalities or companies and private individuals and corporations. We are giving the Board of Railway Commissioners power to enforce any agreements that may be made by a railway company with any other person or corporation. The provisions are quite wide for the enforcement of these contracts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the Bill provide for machinery in connection with the Railway Commission, or is the machinery in the courts to be used?

Mr. GRAHAM. It provides that the board itself shall be the court and have the power of enforcing these agreements. We have placed under the jurisdiction of the board by this Bill the regulation of sleeping cars, cartage in connection with the transfer of freight and what is known as demurrage. Heretofore the board has had power to make regulations and enforce the payment of certain charges and penalties on shippers who have not loaded or unloaded promptly. We now propose to give the board power to make regulations under which railway companies may be liable to penalty if they do not provide cars promptly or carry freight as promptly as they should.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Will this Bill apply to telegraph companies which have been in possession of streets for a number of years, and have poles on streets that are now a nuisance? We have in Brantford a case of this kind. The wires are very much in the way of the fire department, as they prevent ladders being raised against high buildings. We gave this company this power some years ago and they planted their poles. Can the board, under this Bill, compel the removal of such poles?

Mr. GRAHAM. That opens up quite a broad question. In some instances, I think the commissioners might do so. But other questions may arise. There may have been contracts or agreements between the companies and the municipalities, and these would have to be considered.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). May I ask the minister if this Bill would cover such a case as that brought before the House some days ago relating to the Belleville and North Hastings Railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. That may possibly be a legal question. I am not able to say now that it will apply to a case as old as that or to one in that position. It certainly gives the board power to deal with cases that may arise hereafter.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). The case I wish to bring to the attention of the minister is one in which a telegraph company, acting under a charter granted by this parliament, placed their poles and strung their wires in one of the main streets of Brantford. They have occupied that street for many years under the authority of that charter, and they refuse now to remove the poles though the municipal authorities think it absolutely necessary in the interests of the city that the poles should be removed. I would like to know if the Bill be retroactive and will cover cases where rights have been given by parliament, but, as we think, wrongly, to take possession of the streets of a city without compensation. I do not think that, in this case, there was any agreement between the municipality and the company, but that the company went there under the authority of their Dominion charter.

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine that such a case as that can be found in many municipalities throughout the country, telephone or telegraph companies having erected their poles and strung their wires according to their charter, much as a railway company would run its line according to its charter. The question raised is a pretty large one, and I would not care to answer it offhand.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read first time.

## PRIVILEGE—RETENTION OF RETURNS BY MEMBERS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). I wish to refer, as a matter of privilege, to an editorial article in the Toronto 'Globe', dealing with the returns brought down to this House. I will not read the whole article, but only that portion which specially concerns me:

> It was known that the officers of some of the departments were crusty because original documents which had been brought down either disappeared entirely or were returned in a mutilated state. Mr. Ames, who is the chief deviser of the policy of insinuating suspicion, is himself responsible for the disappearance of five documents entrusted to him. Among those similarly delinquent are Dr. Reid and Messrs. Borden, Foster, Clements, Armstrong, Lake and Kemp.
>
> When, as a protest against these mutilations of the files of departments, the originals were refused there was a great outcry that the refusal had its source in the fear of unpleasant revelations.

So far as that statement affects myself, it is an absolute falsehood. I am pretty careful about documents, and am very particular indeed to return any of the files of

this House which I receive from the officers. I have taken the trouble to examine the returns which have been brought down showing the position in relation to the returns in possession of the House, and I find that this writer has taken particular pains not to call attention to the fact that there are two documents charged to the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To what does the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) refer ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To the return on which this statement is based. In respect of one of these returns, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is in exactly the same position as myself—the document charged to him is in possession of an officer of this House. Every one knows that there are two departments of this House which have charge of these documents. One is called the Journal Office, which, as I understand, takes charge of such returns brought down during any particular session for the purposes of that session. Afterwards, they are transferred to what is known as the Records Office. In the return brought down, I am charged at page 7, with return No. 106, taken out by me on October 16th, and said to be not yet returned. But in this editorial not the slightest reference is made to a return taken out by my right hon. friend and mentioned at page 10 of this return as having been taken out on November 16, 1906.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is it ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have forgotten. As a matter of fact, these returns, though not in the Journal Office, are in their proper place in the Records Office. And there is not a single document that I have received from any officer of this House which has not been returned, except a couple that I have received during the past three or or four days. Therefore, so far as this article charges me with receiving documents from officers of the House and either mislaying them or not returning them I repeat that the statement is an absolute falsehood. And the slightest investigation would have disclosed to the person who wrote it that the facts are not as he claims. There is a further insinuation in this editorial that these were original documents and that they had been mutilated in some way. They were not original documents in any case, but copies of documents brought down in response to orders of this House,—copies made in the proper departments. And when the suggestion is made of mutilation of either the originals or copies brought down to this House once more as a matter of privilege and speaking for myself—and I have no right to speak for any one else on this particular occasion—I say that the statement contained in the 'Globe' is an absolute, utter, complete falsehood.

Every one knows that returns brought down in response to orders of this House are handed on request to members, who are responsible that they shall be returned. They are sometimes retained by members for a considerable time. The same spirit which prevented the person who wrote this editorial from alluding to the fact that one of these returns was charged to the right hon. Prime Minister himself, led him to overlook the fact that the right hon. gentlemen is shown on page 14 of this return to be now in possession of a document which he received on November 20, last. I am not saying that by way of criticism of the right hon. gentleman ; it is a common practice for hon. members of this House—and, in this respect, the right hon. gentleman has the same privilege as any other hon. member and no more—to retain these documents for some weeks being always ready to hand them back when required. I have kept returns for as much as thirty days in some instances, having them in my room, but ready to hand them back to the officer of the House if any hon. gentleman requires them. During the present session, on one occasion, I went to the clerk and found that an hon. member on the other side of the House had had for a long time a return which I desired to see. I made a request that it should be returned, as I wished to examine it, and after a short delay it was returned. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in the same way has had one of these returns since November last, and it would be as fair to charge him with concealing and withholding and mutilating that return as to charge any hon. gentlemen on this side of the House with such things. I do not often complain of statements in the press with regard to myself, but when there is a deliberate charge in a journal of mutilation, concealment or withholding of public documents, I think it only right that I should take a few minutes of the time of the House to explain the situation. I repeat again that the document charged to me as having been received from the journal office on the date I have mentioned, is now and for months has been in the possession of the keeper of the records of this House and available for the editor of the 'Globe' or any representative of that paper or any hon. member of this House.

Mr. H. B. AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine). I also wish to rise to a similar question of privilege. In this same editorial, which appears in the 'Globe' of March 9, and is headed 'There is nothing to conceal,' are these words :

A very ingenious collateral device was when the copy had been brought down to ask for the production of the original documents. It was known that the officers of some of the departments were crusty because original documents which had been brought down either

disappeared entirely or were returned in a mutilated state. Mr. Ames, who is the chief deviser of the policy of insinuating suspicion, is himself responsible for the disappearance of five documents entrusted to him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, any impartial and uninformed person, reading those remarks, would draw the conclusion that I had purloined, mutilated or caused to disappear certain original documents which belong to this House. That statement is absolutely false, it is a malicious lie and slander. It is perfectly true that I had charged up against me, on the 31st of December, 1907, five returns which at that time were out. Those returns were all copies. Of those five returns, three of them were passed back to the Records Office on the 31st of January last, or six weeks ago. For six weeks they have been in the possession of the Records Department, where they have been open to inspection and study by any member of this House. Had the writer of that article taken the trouble to inquire in the Records Office he would have discovered that these files had been there at least six weeks. The other two returns with which I am debited, Nos. 150 and 167, were drawn out by me at the request of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy), in whose possession they have been since the time they were drawn, and in whose possession they are to-day, as he is prepared to vouch. I have here the certificate of Mr. Colwell, clerk of Routine and Records, in which he says :

Referring to your inquiry regarding sessional papers Nos. 94, 167a and 167b, of 1906-7, I find by my office register that you returned them to me on January 31, 1908.

The 'Montreal Herald' in commenting upon that return, stated the case as follows :

Mr. Ames himself has taken out at least five returns which he has never returned at all.

To that statement I make no objection, it might have been made more accurate by saying, 'which had not returned on the 31st of December, 1907.' But there is no animus in that statement, and I make no objection to it. But I say that this other statement, which endeavours to give the impression throughout the country that I deliberately took public documents that were originals and mutilated them, and caused them to disappear, is a false and malicious lie and slander, and I shall expect to have that withdrawn within twenty-four hours.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I must rise to a question of privilege with reference to myself. I have been charged by this particularly veracious journal, edited I believe by a particularly veracious and reverend gentleman, with taking out at least five documents, because I am similarly delinquent with Mr. Ames, who I believe is responsible, according to this paper, for the disappearance of five documents entrusted to him. Well, all I can say is that I am not delinquent in that respect. I have never knowingly or wittingly mutilated a journal or any other document. I have had one original document out, and the Minister of the Interior stated some time ago in the early part of this session, that it disappeared under my name, and he should hold me responsible for it. I told him at the time that I would try and look it up for him, as he did not seem to have spirit enough to hunt it up for himself, and I found it was exactly where it should be. The document was ordered by the House, received by the clerk, sent up to the Journals Office, was taken out by myself, used by myself, sent back to the Journals Office, and at the end of the year sent to the Records Office, where I found it when I made inquiry a few days ago. I also beg leave to protest against another statement in the paper that there was no purpose in getting these documents, or in trying to get original documents, except a purpose insincere, and which partook of the nature of simply playing a sort of trick to the gallery in order to influence public opinion against the government. Now that is an insinuation that no man and no journal should make with reference to a member of parliament when he is carrying out his duties as best he can in this House, and I beg leave to make my protest against such an insinuation as that. I do not know that I can make it any stronger than to say that the statement as regards myself is utterly mendacious.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Hon. gentlemen on the government benches do not seem to care for this procedure. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to rise to a question of privilege in regard to this matter. I wish to say, as my name is mentioned as one who is delinquent in sending back returns of the House, that the statement is absolutely false. I went to the Journals Office and inquired of the clerks the number of the return that I was blamed for not sending back to the office, and they gave me the number as 128. I then went over to the Clerk of the Routine Office, and Mr. Colwell, after some investigation, found the return in his office. I think that should be a sufficient explanation. Mr. Colwell gave me to understand, with regard to a number of members who were being blamed for not making the returns to the Journals Office, that if they would go to the clerk of the Routine Office they would find these very returns all in his possession. I hope that the 'Globe' will take back these false statements it has made with regard to a number of our members.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). This is the first time my attention has been called

to the article in question. I wish to state that so far as the charge against me is concerned, of mutilating and abstracting documents, it is absolutely false, not a word of truth in the whole statement. I have never seen original documents except in the room of the Public Accounts Committee, where I have seen them occasionally in the presence of the clerk in charge of that room, or the original documents which we fought for so strongly for several weeks, and which I have seen in the office of the clerk of this House, therefore it would be impossible to charge me in any way with such a crime as this paper has brought against my name. With regard to returns which have been brought down to this House, some time ago I took the trouble to go up to the office above, to the officials who have charge of these returns, and ask them what returns were standing against my name and I could not find one single return standing against my name. At the present moment I do not believe there is any such return. I beg to repudiate in the strongest manner any insinuation made against me in this respect, and which seems to create so much amusement on the other side of the House.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). I think I am the only gentleman whose name has been mentioned in the 'Globe' who has not repudiated the insinuations made by that paper. I wish to say that I am not guilty of mutilating or abstracting any of the records of this House. Last year in the month of April I find that a return standing opposite my name was brought down and as it was desirable for the right hon. Prime Minister to go to the colonial conference, and as I understand, the session was cut short on that account I thought I would hold that return over until this session. It is not an original document, it is a copy and it is a return showing the statistical matter which has been omitted from the Canadian Year-book of 1906 which it was customary to include in the Year-book of former years. As it was not a very important matter I took good care of the document until this session and I thought that I might be able to draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to it. The document is in a perfectly good state and I repudiate the charges of the 'Globe.'

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). As my name happens to be mentioned in the 'Globe' report I want also to deny the allegation in so far as original documents are concerned. In so far as one return is concerned it is only a copy relating to the imports and exports and not an original document. Some time last session, as I fully explained to the office upstairs, I could not find the return because it had been taken out of my desk in this House. It was not my return. I want to repudiate the insinuations cast upon me in regard to myself in that article. They are entirely false and untrue.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I find that my name is also mentioned in the Toronto 'Globe.' All I have to say is that the return referred to is in connection with the Ross rifle. I took that return from the office of the records over to the Public Accounts Committee last session and I asked two or three times to be allowed to take it back again, but as the investigation was not completed and as a motion had been moved that all papers be left in the Public Accounts Committee until the case was was closed I certainly was not able to get the return and take it back to the office from which I had procured it. It never was in my possession any longer than while carrying it from one office to the other, and it has never, in so far as I know, been out of the room of the Public Accounts Committee and has been in charge of the clerk of that committee. There is another return charged up to me which I got about four or five weeks ago and which I handed to another member of this House in order that the matter might be brought up in the Public Accounts Committee. He still has it and when we are through it will be returned to the proper officer. In each case, in so far as I am aware, they were only copies and not originals. I therefore feel that the 'Globe' was not justified in charging me with taking any returns from the office or mutilating any of them and I hope that the 'Globe' will retract the article that it published.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY (Calgary). Mr. Speaker, my name has not been mentioned by the 'Globe' but I understand that some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have been charged with obtaining returns two of which have been handed over to me. They were returns Nos. 150 and 167. In regard to No. 150 they are not original documents at all but simply printed copies of orders in council. I moved for a return last session and I received a communication from the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) saying that my motion would involve months and months of work. At his suggestion I amended the motion and there was simply handed over or brought down printed copies of orders in council in regard to certain land grants to railways in the Northwest. This return came down last session at a time when it was utterly impossible to take the subject up and have a discussion upon it if it were so desired. The other return, which, I understand my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, (Mr. Ames) has been blamed for retaining in his possession is return No. 167 in regard to certain timber limits in the railway belt of British Columbia. That return did not

come down until the 4th day of March, 1907, when it was too late to investigate the matters referred to and too late to have any discussion. I therefore, last fall, wired to my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, asking him if, when he was in Ottawa, he would kindly get copies of these returns for me and he did so. They are not originals at all, it is a matter which requires investigation and if they have been retained so long it is due to the lack of promptness with which the motion has been complied with by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I have nothing to say in reference to the question referred to but I want to bring to the attention of the House a personal matter of my own in reference to the 'Globe' newspaper.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is also a question of privilege ?

Mr. BENNETT. A question of privilege. In the Toronto 'Globe' of Wednesday, March 4 appears a leading editorial under the heading of :

A faction not an opposition.

Among other things in the long editorial is the following :

The Bennett-Sproule-Taylor crowd, however, howled Mr. Bergeron down, and declared he had no authority to speak for them. It will be seen, therefore, that all is not harmonious within the opposition fold.

I assume that the first duty of a public journal is to try and report occurrences and happenings particularly from the parliamentary point of view in a way to command not only the respect of its own political supporters but of the public generally and to comment editorially with fairness to those who may be politically opposed to it. As far as the 'Globe' newspaper is concerned, I think it has passed altogether out of that stage of even being respected for common decency.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, that is not a question of privilege. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) intends to speak on a question of privilege he may do so.

Mr. BENNETT. I am pointing out the utter untruthfulness of the statements contained in this paper and I wish to illustrate by other occurrences how deliberately untrue the statements are that the 'Globe' newspaper has published. I wish to place the blame upon the proper shoulders. If I am not out of order——

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman is in order in conducting a discussion on a question of privilege along the line that he is now taking.

Mr. BENNETT. There are two lines of communication as to what happens as to matters political in this country.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has not yet stated his question of privilege and I do not think it is proper for him to make an apparently irrelevant speech and then bring up a question of privilege.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you missed my reading of it. I shall read again what it is :

The Bennett-Sproule-Taylor crowd, however, howled Mr. Bergeron down, and declared he had no authority to speak for them. It will be seen, therefore, that all is not harmonious within the opposition fold.

That article is deliberately false and untrue. When my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) spoke on that question he was not treated with derision by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, including myself. The public must expect and they do expect a certain amount of decency in a public journal, especially when that journal is edited as this one is by a reverend gentleman, or at least by one who assumes to be a reverend gentleman. We know that to-day the country are looking for a state of decency in public life. May I quote from a public journal the utterances of a gentleman who, preaching from the pulpit, made this strong declaration as to what the public life of Canada should be.

The compelling power of parliament comes not downward from the Crown, but up from the crown. This is the land and the day of the man in the street. That significant political fact means much for the church. It offers the most splendid opportunity and involves the heaviest obligations. It may be that under monarchy the government of a city or of a country might grow corrupt and sink into decay and yet the church be free from blame, but if in any city or nation where the people rule there flourish crime and unabashed public evil, the church cannot be held guiltless, for under the reign of the people the church has its chance.

Now, these are splendid sentiments and I am bound to say there is not a man inside of the House or outside of the House who will disagree with them. But let me quote some further utterances from the same gentleman who occupied the pulpit on this occasion. Here is the editorial page of the 'Globe' newspaper and there is no question but that this editorial page is controlled by two men, namely, J. A. Macdonald and——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will understand that the rule is, there shall not be a discussion on a question of privilege. If the hon. member thinks a newspaper has improperly, or falsely, or maliciously represented him to have said or done something, he has a right to rise in the House and deny it and to state that it is inaccurate, or false, or malicious. I think it must end there. A discussion of the matter is not customary nor according to the rules of the House.

Mr. BENNETT. I have dealt with the untruthfulness of the article, and I was proceeding to point out its maliciousness, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the maliciousness of the article.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member must confine himself to a statement that it is malicious. He is quite within his right when he does that, but if he proposes to enter on a general discussion he is quite without his right.

Mr. BENNETT. All I wish to say then under your ruling, which, of course, I bow to, is that the statement contained there and which I believe is written by either J. A. Macdonald or one John Ewan is deliberately untrue, and in saying that I do not reflect on any of the gentlemen who are in the press gallery representing the 'Globe' newspaper as reporters. I also say that what I quoted from the newspaper was the celebrated sermon preached by the same lying, smug-faced John A. Macdonald, and—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I rise to a question of privilege. In the report of the proceedings of the House on Thursday last 'Le Canada' of Montreal made me say, in speaking of the Quebec tercentenary, that I suggested that all the commissioners should be French Canadians. I never said anything of the kind and I beg to deny the statement in 'Le Canada.'

## BEHRING SEA COMMISSION—EXPENSES OF SIR C. H. TUPPER.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Before the orders of the day are called I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a question which I put in his absence on the 11th of February. I understood the hon. minister to state to this House that certain expenses of Sir C. H. Tupper in connection with the Behring Sea Commission in Paris had been paid by the British government. Sir Charles has written a letter to me denying that statement and requesting that authority of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for making the statement.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Some time ago a question was put with regard to the expenses of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, and this question, like all other questions so put to a minister, was referred to the officers of the department, and the accountant, Mr. Owen, prepared the answer. I now see that the answer he handed to me was not correct. I may say that Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper wrote me also on the matter, and the accountant has given me the following letter of explanation which I shall read to the House:

Ottawa, February 13, 1908.

Dear Mr. Brodeur,—I have read Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper's letter in which he takes exception to the statement made in 'Hansard' in connection with his expenses while acting as British agent in the Behring Sea arbitration in 1892-3, and in which he asks on whose authority the statement in the foot note, applicable to his name in the schedule of expenses, was used.

The objectionable statement is that he was also agent of the British government and that his expenses as such were paid by the British government, in addition to those paid by Canada.

The first question asked was 'Who were the Canadian ministers who represented Canada at the Behring Sea Commission in 1891-92?'

In preparing the answer I naturally included his name, he being a Canadian minister at the time, and when copying expenses, I erroneously made the note on insufficient information, but I have since ascertained what I did not at the time know, that an order in council passed at the time of the settlement of the expenses, by which Canada agreed to pay the expenses of the British agent.

I have written a personal note to Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper explaining the error.

I exceedingly regret the misleading statement.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) A. W. OWEN,
Accountant.

## MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT PAPERS.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called I would ask the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the Bastedo papers or order in council or whatever there is, and also to certain papers and correspondence in connection with the travelling expenses of Commander Spain unpublished by the Auditor General, but which the minister said he would lay on the table of the House. Would the minister kindly take a note of this?

Mr. BRODEUR. I had before me yesterday the order in council concerning the appointment of Mr. Bastedo and I intended to make a motion to bring it formally before the House. Unfortunately I have not it with me to-day. As to the other papers they are ready and I will bring them down.

## THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Minister of Finance tell us when we may expect the budget speech?

Mr. FIELDING. I had contemplated arranging for the budget speech on Thursday of this week, but as my hon. friend intimated that he would be absent on that date I will now say that on Tuesday of next week the budget speech will be presented.

## IRRIGATION ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 99) to amend the Irrigation Act —Mr. Oliver—read a second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

On section 7—Memorial and plans to be examined and approved—

Mr. FOSTER. What is the meaning of the term commissioner?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of Interior). The Irrigation Commissioner.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is his head office?

Mr. OLIVER. At Calgary.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the name of the commissioner at present?

Mr. OLIVER. John Stewart. Under the old Act the commissioner held a dual position, as Commissioner of Public Works for the Northwest Territories and Commissioner of Irrigation for this government. But by the organization of the provinces the dual position was automatically destroyed, and it became necessary to make an amendment to meet the conditions as they exist.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The intention is to require the filing of permission by the municipal or other proper authorities?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. When the Commissioner of Irrigation was the Commissioner of Public Works for the Territories he accepted in that capacity the application for the territorial government; but now the Commissioner acting for this government is to have the permission of the provincial government filed with him.

On section 8,

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I find some difficulty in following the Bill. A Bill regarding this matter was introduced the 5th of December, 1907, intituled Bill (No. 10) to amend the Irrigation Act. Then some days later we found on our desks a Bill not numbered, intituled an Act to amend the Irrigation Act, containing certain explanations. On the 18th of February a third Bill was introduced, but upon going to the distribution office this morning I found there are certain explanations regarding the Bill. Before proceeding to pass the different sections, I would like to get from the Minister of the Interior just what changes have been made from the Bill originally introduced on the 5th of December. The reason I ask is that when the Bill was first introduced, I called the attention of the minister to certain recommendations made by the union of municipalities of the province of Alberta, and I would like to know what changes are made in the Bill before us.

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill originally introduced was intended to meet certain conditions in connection with irrigation, with regard to one or two matters which seemed to be of pressing importance. One was the protection of the rights of municipalities, which might be threatened by irrigation companies under the law as it stood. The other was the protection of the interests of people who desire to get water from an irrigation ditch but who had no rights which would enable them to do so. When brought up for discussion, it became evident that, since we were dealing with the question of irrigation, we might as well go somewhat further and not only provide for these immediately pressing conditions but for other conditions. With that end in view, further amendments were drafted and placed before the House informally, and in deference to my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) further consideration of those amendments was postponed. Later on, after more fully considering the matter, the Bill originally introduced was withdrawn and a new Bill submitted, which is the Bill now before the House. This Bill covers the points met by the original Bill and a number of other points. The principal change is in the introduction of the authority of the Railway Commission in dealing with certain questions necessarily at issue from time to time between irrigation companies and private owners and municipalities. These seem to be a proper matter to place under the jurisdiction of the commission.

We have, therefore, adopted almost exactly the provisions which are contained in the Railway Act, and which apply to somewhat similar cases where the rights of municipalities are affected by railway companies. We have adopted these provisions of the Railway Act to the establishment of irrigation enterprises in the belief that we have thereby done the best that could be done to meet a very difficult situation. When the matter was up for consideration before; it was pointed out that the provisions we had in the Bill would effectually protect the rights of existing municipalities. It was criticised by my hon. friend from Calgary on the ground that it would not effectively protect the rights of extensions of municipalities or of municipalities to be established thereafter on irrigation enterprises. At the time, it seemed to me that it was well to meet the requirement of the moment and to meet it thoroughly, and to let the future, perhaps, take care of itself. However, in deference to the suggestion of my hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Galliher), who advised strongly that we should provide now for future conditions, and having the advantage of consultations with gentlemen who are very deeply interested in irrigation enterprises, and whose legal ability is unquestioned, I thought it well to introduce such provisions in the Bill as would meet not only the present situation but future questions and would be satisfactory to both parties, so far as it may be possible to satisfy two opposing, not to say conflicting, interests.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Instead of reserving the absolute right of municipalities to give or withhold consent, you leave that to the commission?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In both cases? That is, if the municipality wishes to cross the irrigation ditch, or if the irrigation company wishes to cross a highway, in case of dispute the matter must be referred to the railway commissioners?

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely.

Mr. AMES. I understand that the Board of Railway Commissioners intervene only in case the contracting parties cannot agree?

Mr. OLIVER. Quite so.

Mr. PORTER. I notice that, in connection with these two sections, either party may apply to the board, but I do not notice any provision for notice to the other party. For instance: A municipality applies to cross an irrigation ditch; an order should not be granted without notice to the other party and the right of the other party to show cause. This may be covered by the provisions of the Railway Act which are made applicable. I have not had opportunity to examine these, but I call the attention of the minister to the point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the Railway Act provides that in the case of any application such notice as may be deemed proper by the board should be given to any person whose interest is likely to be affected by the proposed order.

On section 9,

Section 20e shall not apply to any company as respects any works for the construction of which it has obtained authorization before this Act comes into force.

Mr. AMES. Is the authorization referred to in this section local or federal; that is, does this section mean that if an irrigation company has already obtained from the federal government permission to construct works, it is exempt from the provisions of section 20e ? Or does it mean only exemption to the extent of the works that have already been locally, so to speak, authorized? Does it exempt a company which has already been granted a charter from the government to construct certain works entirely from the provisions of 20e, or only to the extent of such works as it has already made local arrangements for?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) hardly has in mind the method by which that authorization is given. The provincial authorities do not authorize—they merely consent; all authorization is from the Dominion. But this section 20e purports to apply not to all works that may hereafter be constructed by a company now chartered, but only to those works for which authorization has been given by the Dominion authority. That is to say, an irrigation scheme may cover a very large tract of country, but the works are authorized to be constructed from time to time, and those works the construction of which is already authorized are, by the terms of this section 9 exempted from the operation of section 20e ?

Mr. AMES. Take a concrete case as an example. Suppose that the Robbins Irrigation Company have secured a contract from this government authorizing them to construct certain irrigation works; and supposing that a very small portion of the works have been definitely authorized on plans submited. Am I to understand that the small portion is exempted from the provisions of 20e but that the subsequent works which the Robbins Irrigation Company may construct under contract with this government will come under the provisions of section 20e ?

Mr. OLIVER. That, as I understand it, is the reading, and it certainly is the intent of the section.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Before reporting the Bill, I would like to hear from the minister if the Union of Alberta Municipalities have been in communication with him, and if they are satisfied with the substitution of the Railway Commission. This Bill substitutes the Railway Commission for the consent of the municipalities. Have any further representations been received by the minister from the secretary of the Union of Alberta Municipalities?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not received any such approval from the secretary of the Alberta Union of Municipalities. But I may say that copies of the Bill have been sent to various parties in the west, and while we have not received replies from all to whom we have sent copies, the replies we have received have indicated their satisfaction with these provisions.

Mr. HERRON. Is there anything in this Bill that would allow irrigating corporations to divert water from a stream and leave it dry, that is a stream where there was not otherwise sufficient water for domestic purposes?

Mr. OLIVER. It is provided in the original Bill, and in the Act as it stands, that all usage of water for domestic purposes stands as a first right; the right to the water of the original stream for domestic purposes is not granted away. Section 11 of the original Act makes this clear, assuring to the party 'whatever water he requires for domestic purposes.' The word 'industrial' has been added in the new Bill, so that it will read 'domestic or industrial purposes.' The intention is to preserve existing rights.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

## CONSTRUCTION OF DRY DOCKS.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolutions:

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the repeal of chapter 116 of the Revised Statutes, 'An Act to encourage the construction of dry docks,' and that in substitution therefor it be provided that as an aid to the construction of any dry dock, approved as to location and capacity by the Governor in Council, a subsidy of three per centum per annum of the cost of such dry dock be paid out of Consolidated Revenue Fund, for twenty years after the completion of the work, to any incorporated company, approved by the Governor in Council, which shall enter into an agreement with His Majesty to construct the same with all necessary equipments, machinery and plants, the cost on which subsidy is to be calculated to be determined by the Governor in Council, from the plans and specifications and reports thereon before the agreement for construction is entered into, the Governor in Council being satisfied that such dry dock is needed in the public interest; and the total subsidy payable per annum not to exceed forty-five thousand dollars.

2. Resolved, that for the enlargement and extension of any dry dock subsidized under chapter 17 of the Acts of 1882, 'An Act to encourage the construction of dry docks by granting assistance on certain conditions to companies constructing them and any amendmet thereof, a subsidy of three per centum per annum of the cost of such enlargement and extension be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, for twenty years after the completion of such enlargement and extension, to any incorporated company approved by the Governor in Council, which shall enter into an agreement with His Majesty to enlarge and extend any such existing dry dock, and to furnish the same with all necessary equipments, machinery and plants the cost on which subsidy is to be calculated to be determined by the Governor in Council from the plans and specifications and reports thereon before an agreement for enlargement is entered into, the Governor in Council being satisfied that such enlargement and extension is needed in the public interest; and the total subsidy payable per annum in respect thereof not to exceed fifteen thousand dollars.

3. Resolved, that the work of construction or enlargement be done under the supervision of the Department of Public Works.

4. Resolved, that the Governor in Council be empowered, after a subsidy becomes payable, if such dry dock is not in a state of efficiency and repair, to take possession of the same, and expend out of Consolidated Revenue Fund, a sufficient sum to repair the same, and thereafter operate such dock until the cost of such repairs, after payment of operating expenses and maintenance, is received by the Crown.

5. Resolved, that the tariff of tolls and rates for the use of the dock prescribed by the company, shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and that the company shall make an annual statement to the Governor in Council of the operations of the company with a statement of receipts and expenditures in detail.—Mr. Fielding.

Mr. OLIVER.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The object of these resolutions is to make one or two amendments of some importance to the existing legislation for the encouragement of the construction of dry docks. As a matter of convenience, we have thought it best to propose the repeal of the old Act and enact it in an amended form entirely. We have had on the statute-book for some years legislation designed to encourage the construction of dry docks. Two docks have been constructed under the encouragement so given, one many years ago in the city of Halifax and one more recently in the town of Collingwood. The legislation as it now stands for the encouragement of the construction of other docks provides that a subsidy of 3 per cent may be paid on an estimate of a million dollars for a period of twenty years. It is proposed to enlarge the amount, so that instead of paying 3 per cent on a million dollars, or $30,000 per annum, the government shall be authorized to pay a subsidy of 3 per cent, or a sum not exceeding $45,000 per annum, on a million and a half dollars. The enlargement of the subsidy is due to the fact that, with the enlargement of ocean ships, a dock that would have been quite satisfactory a few years ago might now prove insufficient, and it is thought well that we should look ahead and anticipate the need of larger docks in view of the construction of larger ships. $45,000 per annum is the maximum for any one dock. Then provision is made in the existing legislation for similar assistance in the case of the enlargement of any existing dock. It is proposed that that feature shall be continued. The rate of the subsidy in former years was 2 per cent, it was later enlarged to 3 per cent, and it is proposed that this rate of 3 per cent shall apply, either to the construction of a new dock to the extent of $45,000 per annum, or to the enlargement of an existing dock to the extent of $15,000 per annum, being 3 per cent on half a million dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. As a matter of fact, what has been the cost of the Halifax dock?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not sure of the figures, but from memory it is something over a million dollars. It was subsidized by special Act, giving them $10,000 a year for twenty years. That provision has been in operation for some years and will shortly run out. This is one of the chief changes, the enlargement of the subsidy to correspond with the expected need of larger docks in view of the known construction of larger ships. The Halifax dock is the largest one we now have. I believe it is large enough to accommodate any vessel which is now engaged in the Canadian trade; but in view of the constant increase in the size of ships, we have assumed that the promoters or owners of that dock might wish to enlarge it to accommodate larger ships, and under

this legislation we would have power to assist in the enlargement.

There is another feature, however, of considerable importance. In the existing legislation the payment of the subsidy is dependent upon the constant operation of the dock. It has been found in the case of parties who have been endeavouring to finance dock schemes that there is an element of uncertainty in that respect, to which financial people object. People who advance money in these cases are very often people not connected with practical dock operations and who look at the matter entirely from a financial standpoint. They ask that they receive a definite and fixed engagement to pay a specified subsidy; and that as to the question of the operation of the dock, that is a matter which the government should protect in some other way. What is proposed then in this case is that instead of giving the assurance to promoters that they will receive this subsidy as long as the dock is in operation, we shall give an absolute assurance that the subsidy shall be paid for a period of twenty years. The cost of the dock is to be ascertained at the beginning of the movement, upon the proper reports of engineers, after due inquiries, accepted by the Governor in Council; and upon the cost of the dock so to be established the government will undertake to pay a definite subsidy of 3 per cent for a period of twenty years, limiting, of course, the sum to $45,000 per annum.

Mr. BENNETT. Assuming that the dock company became bankrupt, what then?

Mr. FIELDING. It is proposed that the government shall take over the dock if they cease to operate it. The Bill which I will introduce later will contain a clause to the effect that if the company fail to operate the dock, the government shall take possession and may operate it, with the condition that if there is any return over and above the proper charges the dock company may receive it. The hon. gentleman will see that the element of uncertainty which has existed in the legislation hitherto on the statute-book has made the scheme somewhat objectionable to financial people. They asked for a definite and fixed assurance, and in view of the experience of several years and the criticisms which financial people have offered to the scheme in that form, we have concluded that this reasonable provision should be made, and that the government should give them an absolute undertaking to pay this money for a given period after the construction of the dock has been completed to the satisfaction of the government, and then, if any questions should arise as to the operation of the dock, the government should protect themselves by taking possession of the enterprise and operating it for the time being as a government work.

Mr. BENNETT. Will that Bill be retroactive as to docks now in existence?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Or in respect to docks being enlarged?

Mr. FIELDING. Of course docks which are already constructed have been constructed under a contract and we could not vary that. We are not able to deal with conditions already established. But if the promoters or proprietors of these docks should desire to enlarge them and take the benefit of the Act they will be allowed to come under the new conditions and put themselves in the same position as the owners of new docks.

Mr. AMES. To the extent of the enlargement?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not see how we could draw a distinction between the enlargement of a dock and the construction of an original dock. If the proprietors desire to enlarge existing docks and participate in the benefit of this new Act they will have to agree that the government shall take possession. I do not see how we could make any distinction between an enlargement and the construction of an original dock.

Mr. AMES. The enlargement would be under the control of the government?

Mr. FIELDING. I would say that the whole undertaking would be under the control of the government. These are the principal clauses in the Bill; in fact these are the only points in regard to which the measure differs from the legislation which has been on the statute-book for several years.

Mr. LENNOX. Under the last Act I think you could grant a percentage on amounts up to $500,000?

Mr. FIELDING. Up to a million. We are now enlarging it to a million and a half. Under the former Act it was three per cent on $1,000,000 or $30,000. We are now proposing to increase that to $45,000, being three per cent on $1,500,000.

Mr. BENNETT. As soon as a dock is enlarged the parties might call on the government to take it over at a valuation?

Mr. FIELDING. No, the government would not take it at a valuation; the government would have to take it for better or for worse and operate it. The great consideration is to have docks constructed in places where they are necessary in the public interest and to have some one to operate them. The government would have to accept the responsibility of taking over a dock in case of default on the part of the company or failure to keep it in operation.

Mr. BENNETT. What will the shareholders receive if it is taken over?

Mr. FIELDING. Unless the dock earns more than its working expenses the share-

holders will receive nothing. That is a risk that they will have to take. The government, if they undertook to operate a dock, would first have to see that they were protected for any costs and charges and if there were any profits beyond that the government would not desire to take them. I presume that if there were any profits the company would desire to continue to operate the dock.

Mr. FOSTER. Could the minister give us any information at all as to projects which are on foot which have been mooted, or brought to the attention of the government? Of course new legislation of this kind usually proceeds on the idea that there is a call for this aid. Is there a call for docks, would it be difficult to have them built unless aid were given and is there a call provided for by the present legislation? What demands for new docks or for increased dockage have reached the government?

Mr. FIELDING. The only company which has made representations on the subject has been the St. John Dock Company. For some time an effort has been made at the city of St. John to construct a dock, aid has been granted in various forms, but the scheme did not materialize, and we have understood that one of the difficulties in the way was the uncertainty of the Dominion contribution. While some conversations have taken place with respect to possible docks in other places the only case which has been brought to our notice in concrete form is that at the city of St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. Have there been any other applications or negotiations?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think there have been any other applications or negotiations as respects further aid for the building of docks.

Mr. FOSTER. Demands have for many years been made for the construction of a dock in the city of Montreal. Has that been brought to the attention of the minister at all as the foundation for this legislation?

Mr. FIELDING. Well, this would apply of course, to the city of Montreal if they wished to take advantage of it, but it has not been in consequence of any particular representations from Montreal that we have introduced this legislation. I think that in all probability there are several places in the Dominion which would desire to have docks and which might make application. We have no applications yet for this Bill unless it be that of the city of St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the cost of Collingwood dock?

Mr. BENNETT. Half a million.

Mr. FIELDING Yes, they got $10,000 of subsidy.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. BENNETT. No, excuse me they got $15,000 a year for ten years. The estimate made for the cost was $500,000.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, they are receiving $15,000 per annum. They have received four payments of $15,000 each, or $60,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister any information as to how countries similarly situated get their dry docks built? For instance, take the Australian provinces or any other British country.

Mr. FIELDING. No, but I think that in large communities these docks are generally profitable enterprises and are undertaken by private corporations. I have not gone into the case of Australia. I shall be very happy to look into it before the Bill comes up for its second reading if it is desirable.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be desirable because we are blocking out what may be a very large obligation. One great difficulty, as the Finance Minister knows, is that very many projects are brought to our notice not because they are essentially meritorious but because somebody wants a contract to carry out the work. We need not conceal from ourselves that a great many of our pseudo public works have originated in that way. There is a demand for a railway through a section or a public work, not as a commercial undertaking of merit, but because certain interested parties, for the sake of contracts, or for patronage, or for development purposes, conduct an agitation and the work is launched. Therefore the trouble is that you get projects started not because they are necessary or because they are practical commercial undertakings but for the reasons that I have named. This is a piece of legislation which it seems to me would be very prolific in promoting that kind of an operation. These works are let out, bonds are issued, a certain amount is done and may be they are constructed to the point of partial practicability, but that is only a partial operation and then it is found that there is not enough business to keep them up. In that case the government has to come in and take hold of them. I see that the resolution reads:

4. Resolved, that the Governor in Council be empowered, after a subsidy becomes payable, if such dry dock is not in a state of efficiency and repair, to take possession of the same, and expend out of Consolidated Revenue Fund, a sufficient sum to repair the same, and thereafter operate such dock until the cost of such repairs, after payment of operating expenses and maintenance, is received by the Crown.

That, in connection with the idea of having no lapse of payment if it is not in operation, is essential, the minister says, in order to give financial men a sufficient inducement to put their money into it. That

is, in such a case the government would be bound to take hold of such work and to put it into a state of efficiency and repair and carry it on and pay a subsidy to the company at the same time. There is a large possible obligation upon the government in that. Now, when you come to take the other part of it as to the subsidy that is given; if you have a dock that costs one million dollars you are to give $30,000 a year and for twenty years. That is, you contribute considerably more than one half of the cost of the dock whilst participating of course in none of its profits. That is, the government's contribution of a subsidy to the commercial development of a port. In connection with railway subsidies the first idea was to give a railway sufficient to put the steel on its track, and to-day the railway subsidy runs from $2,400 to $5,000 per mile which is not at all so large a per centage of the cost as is now proposed in the case of a dry-dock. The government is here rendering itself liable to more than one half of the cost of the building of a dock. That is a very large subsidy. Then when you extend that to docks that have been already built and which when improved are brought under the Bill, you do the same for that kind of dock as for the other, and in that case I understand you would have to take hold of it and put it in repair and carry it on and at the same time pay a subsidy for the enlargement to the owners. Altogether this is a pretty important piece of legislation, and it opens up pretty large obligations for the government of the country. The main fear I have with reference to it is this: That these matters being under the control of the government and political influence being the main influence that carries them out, you will get these things started not for commercial reasons altogether but for reasons that are not so desirable. If we had some independent body, which, taking a survey of the requirements of the country in dry docks would formulate a plan for gradual improvement and then carry out that plan as the financial conditions of the country would allow, I would have less objection to it. But this will be just simply as it always has been—whichever place has the greatest pull will get the commencement of the dry dock, and it will be undertaken because of considerations, (at least in part and sometimes in very large part), other than its mere commercial necessity. I mean by that, that where a commercial body would not go into the scheme as one which would in the end prove successful in their view, political considerations come in also and the two combined land the government into the erection of dry docks where they are not absolutely necessary and entail on the government very large obligations. The same thing takes place with reference to harbour improvements. That has not been done under any fixed plan by this country; it is the constituency or the politician who has the strongest pull that in nine cases out of ten gets a harbour commenced. This country would have been in an infinitely better position to-day, if 40 years ago or 25 years ago it had had this thing thoroughly studied and put under the supervision of some body which would have carried it out consecutively and from the standpoint of what is necessary for the better development of the country from year to year and from decade to decade. Had that been done we would have had a far greater result from the moneys we have expended and we would have had far fewer failures than we have made in the attempt to establish our public works. This is an important piece of legislation then, and it leads us, I do not quite know where. On the other hand, I would like to give as much encouragement as we can to what are reasonable and necessary dry-docks in the country. Under this proposal we are giving a very large subsidy and I am afraid we may be giving altogether a very indiscriminate subsidy to dry docks at places where there will be no absolute necessity for them, and where there are not the best prospects for their commercial success.

Mr. FIELDING. Whenever we grant a subsidy to a public work it is open to the criticism which my hon. friend has brought to bear upon this resolution. If a subsidy is offered presumably for a public work needed by the public, it is always possible for some person to take it up and to turn it to profitable account. That has occurred in the past and I do not think we can ever prevent it by any system of legislation. Still, with regard to dry docks I am bound to say they have not proved a very attractive speculation to the people heretofore. There is a difference in the present Bill as compared with the Act of previous years, and I am not sure that difference alone is enough to make this a very attractive speculation. We have had legislation of this nature on the statute-books for some years, subject only to that element of uncertainty that if the dry dock had to be operated in order to earn the subsidy, and I think that in that form it offers inducements almost as strong to people who wish to speculate upon the possibilities of enterprises of that character, and yet we know as a matter of fact there has been very little work done under this dry dock legislation. The difficulty has been in reality to find people willing to enter upon the construction of the docks. The main consideration after all is that we shall have at several points in Canada docks of a larger and more satisfactory character. The Halifax dock in its day was one of the best in the world. It is to-day one of the largest docks in the world. Only a few years ago the

United States government discovered they had not a dock in the United States—on the Atlantic coast at any rate and I think on the Pacific as well—that was capable of receiving their large war ships, and one of their great ships had to be sent to Halifax to be docked for repairs. As I have said, we have had this legislation for some years and our chief difficulty has been to induce people to take it up. I frankly admit there is room for possible abuse. My hon friend's criticism is correct, that if you are going to put dry docks everywhere or in too many places that would be an abuse. There are not many places in Canada where the business will be sufficient to make it a reasonably attractive proposition to establish a dry dock. I do not think we need be very much afraid on that account. I quite agree that if the government are going to allow dry docks to be undertaken at a large number of places this will be a very serious measure which we are asking in the House to adopt. The main consideration is, what can we do to encourage the construction of dry docks at the few places in Canada where unquestionably they will be needed for the accommodation of our trade and commerce. The hon. gentleman says it would be better if we could have somebody other than the government to control the public works of Canada. Well, that is a pretty theory, but after all I am afraid there is no other body to control the public works of Canada than the government of the day. Popular government has its misfortunes and evils but it is the government of the people, and I am sure that any measure which would provide that some other body than the government of Canada should determine when and where and how a dock should be constructed, would not be a very wise and satisfactory provision. In offering this measure to the House we simply desire to meet a difficulty which we have encountered and we ask the House to pass it with the belief that the government will administer it wisely so that if there is a large and important community where there is a fair prospect of a dock business being done we shall be able to hold out the helping hand by the instrumentality of this Act. We do not desire to assist in the construction of docks for purely speculative purposes ; but for the administration of the Act the government will be responsible and it must be responsible to public opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the government might find a better method of carrying out popular government. For instance, the government of Great Britain is responsible for all the outlay on the naval and military services and the great departments of government, and yet, as my hon. friend knows, there is a very different method of carrying out popular government in Great Britain than there is in this country. Here it is what one may call all political or all party. There it is made absolutely non-partisan, and is permanent and has the elements of uniformity and thoroughness. They have their permanent boards of experts, recognized experts, and the government would not embark upon a great public work or a great expenditure without the most thorough examination and research and reports on the part of these permanent experts. Here we know the practice is entirely different. Ten or twelve or thirteen men sit around a table; their supporters are behind them, in the House or scattered through the country, and what comes before them is a demand from a constituency or a supporter, backed up by others who are interested, and in nine cases out of ten the whole thing is put through without any evidence or expert examination with reference to it. My hon. friend may say that that is popular government and we have to pay for it, but you could have a much better popular government by having regular permanent experts as buffers between the government and those who desire to promote the speculation or the enterprise. If we had in this country a permanent board of experts, made up out of the departments, if you like, then whenever an application for a public work came before you, instead of the cabinet deciding the matter by counting noses, your board of experts would report upon it, and if that were done by a carefully selected body of men immense expenditures which we have made uselessly in this country would be avoided, and the people's money would have gone for the people's benefit, whereas in many cases it has gone not for the people's benefit, but for the speculators' benefit. I am not speaking thus with reference to this government any more than with reference to any other. I am speaking of what has been the bane of governments in Canada ever since Canada has had a government, under the delusive idea that the method followed was in accordance with popular government.

Mr. PATERSON. Would that be an advisory board, or would their report be adopted ?

Mr. FOSTER. It would be an advisory board in a way, but under the principles of administration that prevail in Great Britain, and with the quality of expert boards they have, it becomes pretty nearly a dead sure thing that if they reported against a project it would not be undertaken. That, I believe, would be the result in nine case out of ten. My hon. friend who administers the customs here knows how the customs is administered in Great Britain. He makes an appointment to office in accordance with this idea of popular government, and he finds out sometimes how popular it is when he makes one man half

happy and twenty others very cross. He knows that in Great Britain the board of customs is a permanent body and that the man in the cabinet at the head of the department has no more to do with making an appointment than I have sitting in this parliament. All that atmosphere of partisanship and favouritism is cut off and popular government is all the better served. I am saying this not with the idea of bringing anything against the present government more than against others. I have been in governments, and I know what has been done, and I say that millions of dollars have been worse than wasted in this country because of political interprises instead of business enterprises being carried on with the people's money. In this case my fear is that the same thing will go on, and this measure opens a very large area of possible obligation and expenditure to the country. If we had some permanent board as I suggest, and if I could be assured that the government would pay reasonable heed to the reports of such a body, I think a great deal of the difficulty I see in this measure would be removed. We can have it in Canada if we wish. It only requires public men on both sides to say so, and Canada is coming to a status where it is very necessary that she should start out on this line. It is time she had her experts whose word would be authoritative. To-day if your man in the department is asked to report on something, and he condemns it, and if the minister has an idea that it should be carried out, what does he do? He sets aside the report of the trusted officer and if necessary appoints another in his place to make a report along the line he wishes to carry out. So long as that is the case no expert feels that he has any standing. There is no incentive to a man to approve himself as a good workman in this field with the idea that the government will pay heed to the report he makes. Have we not wealth and strength enough to have such a board of experts who will stand as a buffer between improvident projects, which are always paid for with the people's money, and provident projects which would be good for the country and be popular government to have carried out, provided the financial conditions were favourable?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I would like to ask the Finance Minister if he has considered the effect this measure will have on the government dry docks. I do not know how many government dry docks there are in Canada, but under the terms of confederation we have a government dry dock at Esquimalt, which is an important enterprise and is to-day I believe self-sustaining. True it is not large enough to meet the constantly increasing size of the vessels which come into that port, but at this juncture it will be well for the government to consider the effect which a dry dock, constructed by private enterprise, would have on their own dock. The government dock is a revenue producing enterprise. It is a part of the federation contract and has to be maintained, and it is a question to consider whether they could not enlarge that dock and meet the demands of the shipping interests in that way.

Mr. FIELDING. There are several government dry docks throughout the country, and when application is made for another dock, where there is one already, that application has to be considered from every point. In the Bill, I propose to introduce and which is founded on the resolutions—but the resolutions of course do not cover the whole matter—we have provided machinery which will enable us to meet the contingency the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has alluded to. It is provided that such aid shall not be granted unless the Governor in Council is satisfied, from the report of the Minister of Public Works based upon a report of the chief engineer of Public Works, and such other evidence as they may deem necessary, that such dry dock is needed in the public interest, and will be of sufficient capacity to meet the public requirements. That is precisely what my hon. friend suggests, except that he would have perhaps some larger machinery than we now have. But this Bill requires the minister to obtain a report from his chief engineer and also such other evidence as may be deemed necessary to establish the need of a dry dock at the particular point and of the character proposed. I do not see how, with our existing machinery, we can do better than we have in this draft Bill to meet the point the hon. gentleman has suggested.

Mr. DANIEL. Reference was made to the Imperial Dry Dock Company at St. John. That company has been endeavouring for some years to finance the building of a dry dock in that city. One of the principal reasons why they have not so far succeeded is because it is necessary under the Act to provide for continuous operation of the dry dock after it is built, and because, unless that be done, the various subsidies would not be payable from this government and probably also from the provincial government. This Bill will change that arrangement so that once the dry dock is built, its continuous operation will be guaranteed by the fact that the government have power to step in and do the operating themselves should the company fail to do it. The subsidies will therefore be continuous, and those who advance the money need have no fear on that score. We all know that dry docks are necessary. No port is well equipped that has not one, or one in its vicinity, where vessels can be laid up in case of accident or for repairs. We all know too that, in this country at all

events, it is impossible for private enterprise to build, equip and carry on anything like a large and properly equipped dry dock. Take the Halifax dry dock which receives assistance from this government and the city of Halifax and I think also from the province of Nova Scotia and in addition has also received a subsidy from the imperial government. This imperial dry dock in St. John receives subsidies from this government and the provincial government and the city of St. John and the city also gives the site. These dry docks are necessary and important, but like canals they are too expensive to be built unaided by private capital, and in my opinion, in so far as this resolution enables the government to step in and take over any such undertaking, in case of necessity, that will enable such an undertaking, as for instance the imperial dry dock in St. John, to be proceeded with and brought to completion. In so far as that is concerned, I think therefore that the measure is a judicious one and should be passed.

Mr. OSLER. Does the Bill provide for the application of the three per cent to the first security issued on the dock or is it to be a direct payment to the company ?

Mr. FIELDING. The Bill provides for a direct payment, but no doubt the company would arrange to apply the subsidy to its securities in some way.

Mr. OSLER. Might not this occur in case the government took over the dock ? Suppose the dock cost a million dollars and suppose that cost was covered by first mortgage bonds and then second mortgage bonds were issued for $500,000, secured by the government subsidy. This guarantee by the government would make the first mortgage bonds quite good, yet the government would be obliged to assume $500,000 more before they could take over the dock and work it themselves.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not contemplated that the government should buy the dock. All it is contemplated is that, if the dock be not operated, the government will take possession and operate it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The government will be obliged to pay the interest on any outstanding mortgages in addition to the repairs and maintenance.

Mr. FIELDING. The government would not aim at making a profit. They would work the dock. If there should be anything earned over working expenses, that would go to the financial interests concerned, first the bondholders and then the shareholders.

Mr. OSLER. Suppose the dock earned $25,000, that would not go to the government but to the first bondholders, and the government would be paying a subsidy without getting any profit at all. They would either have to hand the dock over to the first bondholders to be operated or operate it themselves. I think there is something more required in the Bill. Of course these dry docks are not profitable private enterprises, and I think it is perfectly right that the government should give a guaranty, but there is a chance here for making a transaction which would not be a benefit to the government.

Mr. FIELDING. All persons who have put any money into such an enterprise, whether on first or second mortgage, or by purchasing shares, make their investment subject to the conditions of this Bill. Consequently when the government take possession of a dock, we do not owe anything to any one. We simply take the earnings ; If there be any surplus there is no reason why that surplus should not go to the various private interests concerned, but we are not under any obligation to pay any bonds in any shape or form. If the company can take this subsidy and arrange to apply it to the issue of bonds, that is entirely their own business ; but any body who puts a dollar into the enterprise must put it in subject to the conditions of the Act, which reserves the right of the government to take over the property without incurring any obligation except the expediency of keeping the dock in operation.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister of course, would understand that, in case the government took over the operation of this dock, the subsidy up to the end of twenty years would be still payable ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, the subsidy would have to be payable anyhow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not exactly expressed in the resolution, but perhaps it would be understood. But I think the power of the Governor in Council should be made sufficiently plain. I do not know whether, in the Bill, it is made perfectly plain that the government would have the right to take possession of the property irrespective of the lien of a third person. It may be that the language of the Bill goes that far.

Mr. FIELDING. The Bill should clearly indicate that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it does clearly indicate that, well and good. It would, perhaps, interfere a good deal with the power to raise money by way of a mortgage.

Mr. FIELDING. I think that as to these points my hon. friend would prefer to reserve judgment until he sees the Bill which, I think, to some extent, meets the criticism

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is very fair. Is it intended that the work shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council ?

Mr. FIELDING. Surely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN It is probably so expressed in the Bill, and I will reserve my remarks as to that until we see the measure itself. I observe that the work is to be carried on under the supervision of the Public Works Department, but I do not see any express provision that it should be completed to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council, although, no doubt, that will be supplied by the Bill. I would suggest that at the conclusion of the fifth clause words should be introduced to provide that the statements made by the company to the Governor in Council shall be laid before parliament. Would there be any objection to that ?

Mr. FIELDING. When we come to consider the Bill I shall be happy to take up any suggestions made. I may say that the Bill does deal with one point to which the hon. gentleman refers. Of course, the hon. gentleman has not yet seen it, but I may say that section 6 of the Bill covers a point which is not covered by the resolution—the resolution, of course, cannot cover the whole ground :

The work of constructing or of extending and enlarging any dry dock for which a subsidy is authorized under the provisions of this Act, shall be done under the supervision of the Department of Public Works, and shall be completed with the time limited by, and according to the provisions of the agreement in that behalf, unless the time for construction or enlargement is extended by the Governor in Council ; and the subsidy shall be payable during twenty years from the time the Governor in Council, upon a report from the minister, determines that the work required by the agreement has been completed, and that the reception and repairing of vessels as contemplated by this Act may forthwith be proceeded with at the dock.

I think that most of the points are fairly well covered by the Bill, but, when we come to the second reading, any suggestions that may be offered to make it more effective in carrying out the purpose intended I shall be happy to consider.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 119) to encourage the construction of dry docks.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## GOVERMENT ANNUITIES.

House went into committee on the following resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the sale of government annuities, to the end that habits of thrift be promoted, and that thereby opportunity be given to the people of Canada to provide for old age by means of annuities of not less than fifty dollars, nor more than six hundred dollars per year; annuities to be purchasable either by paying a single sum, or by the payment of a stipulated sum periodically at fixed and definite intervals; the Governor in Council, by regulation, to fix the rate of interest to be allowed in the computation of values in tables which are to be the basis of such purchases; such annuities to be payable after the annuitant has reached the age of fifty-five years, or has become disabled; the moneys paid in by an annuitant to be repayable, should the annuitant die before the annuity is payable, to the heirs of the annuitant, with three per cent interest compound yearly; the property and interest of an annuitant in the contract to be unassignable, and to be exempt from legal process except the contract be entered into and consideration therefor paid with intent to delay, hinder or defraud creditors, and upon establishing such intent in a court of competent jurisdiction, creditors to have the right to receive, if the annuity has not become payable, the amount paid in with three per cent simple interest; or if the annuity has become payable the present worth of the same; the moneys received to go into Consolidated Revenue Fund and the moneys payable to be paid thereout; an account, to be known as the Government Annuities Account, to be kept of all moneys received and paid out in connection with annuity contracts, and the assets and liabilities appertaining to the grant of annuities, including among the liabilities the present value of the prospective annuities contracted for up to the end of each fiscal year.—Mr. Fielding.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The subject of this resolution is one which, as hon. gentlemen may have observed, has engaged the attention of my colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright. At the last session of parliament, that right hon. gentleman discussed the matter in the Senate and presented a draft Bill, not for the purpose of enactment, but by way of illustration of the views which he desired to submit to the public. As the Bill is one which, to be enacted, should properly originate in this House, I have caused this resolution to be placed upon the paper in order to be able to introduce a measure such as that which Sir Richard Cartwright has laid before the public. The Bill itself, founded on this resolution, and to be introduced to the House, is not precisely the same as the Bill which my right hon. colleague presented in the Senate, but it is for the same purpose, and substantially there is very little difference between them. Let me first observe that it is necessary to guard against any confusion of this Bill with the proposals respecting old-age pensions which were discussed in the House several weeks ago, and which have now been referred to the consideration of a committee of this House. Old-age pensions, as commonly understood, imply a contribution wholly or largely from the public treasury. This measure proposes nothing of that sort. It is not contemplated by this Bill that any contribution shall be given by the government, unless it be in

rate of interest to be allowed on the moneys collected. The government, by giving a little higher rate of interest than would otherwise be allowed, may be said, in a sense, to make some contribution to these funds, but, except in that way, it is not contemplated that anything shall be paid by way of contribution out of the public treasury. The ordinary insurance companies usually have power to conduct an annuity business, but that power has not been used to any large extent. If any companies desire to engage in the annuity business on a large scale, we have no desire to interfere with them. The object of this measure is to provide small or moderate annuities at the lowest possible cost and with the greatest possible security. These are the features which it is hoped will commend the Bill to the favourable consideration of the House and the country. It is proposed that no annuity shall be larger than $600 to one person, and not more than $600 to husband and wife jointly. In the proposition submitted by my right hon. colleague in his discussion a year ago, he had fixed upon sixty years of age as the minimum age when an annuity should begin. In the Bill which we intend to submit, the minimum is fixed at fifty-five years. A man may arrange to have his annuity begin at a later age if he wishes to, but we propose that no person shall receive an annuity until he has reached the age of fifty-five years. This is subject to a proviso that, if disability falls upon a man and he needs the annuity at an earlier age, he can receive it, but, of course, a smaller amount than he would have received had he carried the transaction to the full fifty-five years.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. What are the essential changes made by this Bill in the Bill presented in the Senate ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have just referred to one—the resolution of the minimum age of from sixty years to fifty-five years. I do not know that there is any other of any importance.

Mr FOSTER. Who judges of the disability ?

Mr. FIELDING. It would have to be the minister in charge for the time being. The Bill proposes that this system may be administered by any department of government to which it may be assigned, but, in the beginning, it is to attach to the department of my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. SPROULE. In case of disability a pension may be paid at an earlier age than fifty-five years ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. Of course, the annuitant would receive a smaller amount than he would if the claim were not made until he was fifty-five years of age.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. SPROULE. And that is something to be decided by the minister ?

Mr. FIELDING. Under such circumstances, it may be wise to have a little elasticity.

Mr. SPROULE. What board, or body or authority will fix that?

Mr. FIELDING. It will have to be done by general regulation. Many details of this measure will have to be the subjects of regulation rather than of direct legislation. It is proposed that these annuities shall not be transferable, and that they shall not be subject to seizure. A man who puts his money into a fund for the purpose of producing this annuity shall have it secured to him, and it shall not be subject to seizure under any process of law, unless it be established that he has placed his money in the fund with the intention of defrauding his creditors ; otherwise, it is provided that these annuities shall not be subject to seizure. In the case of death before reaching the annuity, it is proposed that all the moneys which have been paid in in a given case shall be returned to the representatives of the annuitant, with interest at 3 per cent compound yearly. The Governor in Council is to make regulations as to the rate of interest to be allowed, as to the preparation of tables for determining the value of annuities, as to the mode of making contracts and the forms of contracts for annuities, as to the selection of agents and the remuneration, if any, as to the mode of proving age and identity, and other matters of detail. The essential elements which it is hoped will commend the system to the public are: First, that the annuity shall be absolutely secure; there shall be no question whatever as to its character, but it shall be secured upon the public credit of Canada. That in itself is a very important consideration, especially to the small investor whose means, though small, are of more importance to him than larger resources are to the rich man. Absolute security then is the first consideration. The second consideration is that there shall be cheapness of administration, and that the charges of administration shall be borne by the Dominion treasury. In that sense it may be said that there is some charge upon the public. It is assumed, however, that this system can be worked out to a considerable extent through the instrumentality of the various public officials, with a very small addition to the cost of the service rendered by the officials in other respects. For example, the postmaster, the collector of customs, or any other official of the government who is a salaried officer engaged as a servant of the government, might, for a small commission, undertake to assist in carrying out this scheme by receiving moneys and by becoming an agent for this purpose. It would be possible also to employ, under proper arrangements, pri-

vate parties, either corporations or individuals, as agents. My own anticipation is that at the beginning this scheme will not be widely taken advantage of. Those of us who know anything about insurance know that in most cases men take insurance policies, not because they are looking around for them, but because some energetic agent comes along and brings a scheme to their attention. So in this case, what is everybody's business is nobody's business, and so we expect that the scheme may make headway slowly. Under the regulations, of course, the minister might pay any reasonable compensation he might think proper to an individual for the purpose of inducing parties to take up the annuity scheme.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister or the government considered the advisability of putting it under some other department than that of Trade and Commerce, which has comparatively few affiliations or ramifications throughout the country? For instance, the Post Office Department, where every postmaster in the country could become an advertising medium. I suppose the desire is really to encourage the buying of annuities because they will be of benefit to the people. If it is placed in the Post Office Department, you have the most widely distributed agency that the government possesses, and every postmaster would become, as it were, a medium for the would-be annuitant.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, that criticism is fairly made. I may say that in the Bill to be presented provision will be made that the system may be assigned to any department which may be deemed proper for dealing with it, and I think the Post Office Department is probably the best department. However, at the beginning we propose to assign it to the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. FOSTER. He is the father of it, I suppose?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, because he has taken a very deep interest in it, and I am quite sure that if it is assigned to his department he will devote himself to it with energy, and I trust successfully. But I realize that as a general principle probably the Post Office Department would be the best adapted for its administration. However, the Bill will provide that it shall be a branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce at the beginning, but may be at any moment assigned to any other department. Now, payments may be made in two forms. The annuitant may make periodical payments at stated times, or he may make independent payments to suit his own convenience. Let us take an illustration of what can be obtained under this system by a rather small contribution. I will assume, for the purpose of illustration, that the rate of interest may be 4 per cent, though no rate has yet been fixed. I am inclined to think that perhaps a good argument can be made that the government might pay that rate as an encouragement to thrift. But if it should be determined that a lower rate of interest shall be given, then the figures would be subject to slight modification.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister have a different basis as an encouragement to thrift in this case and in the case of the savings banks?

Mr. FIELDING. That is worth considering. I rather think so. If there is a distinction between the two things, it is more important to induce men to make provision for their old age than to put money in the savings banks for present purposes. However, that is a point that might fairly be considered, whether we should treat it in the same light as a savings bank. My object for the present is not to determine that question, but I am making calculations on the assumption of a 4 per cent rate.

Mr. SPROULE. You would come into conflict with the insurance companies.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, for this small class of business I don't mind if we come into conflict with the insurance companies, but I think it is a class of business that will be more likely to become successful if it has the security of the government. As I say, in these calculations I am assuming a rate of 4 per cent. I assume that the contributor begins at the age of 20 and continues until the age of 55. I think it is fair to say that the period during which a man is likely to save money, as a rule, is between these two ages—20 and 55. Probably at the age of 55 a man might still be able to earn enough for his daily wants and yet not be able to lay aside anything. Therefore, we contemplate in this calculation—which is only by way of illustration—that the man begins to pay at the age of 20 and ceases to pay at the age of 55. He can then take his annuity at once or, if he sees fit, let the money stay a little longer in the hands of the government and he will receive a larger annuity, though we contemplate that at the age of 55, for the purpose of this illustration, he will cease to pay.

Mr. SPROULE. Commencing at 20 how much will he pay annually?

Mr. FIELDING. I will give several illustrations. Let us take the case of weekly payments, what are called periodical payments at definite times. If a man at the age of 20 begins to pay 25 cents a week and continues it regularly until he has reached the age of 55, he would then have an annuity for life of $87.25. If he ceases payment at the age of 55, and not desiring to take the annuity at once, his circumstances perhaps enabling him to make himself comfortable for a few years longer, if in that

case he will let the money remain without further payment until he has reached the age of 60, he will then be entitled to an annuity of $126. If he lets the money remain until he is 65, he would receive $189.47 as annuity. If his circumstances enabled him to wait still longer, and let the money remain until he had reached the age of 70 years and then claimed his annuity, his 25 cents a week paid from the age of 20 to 55 would then give him $301.71 annuity.

If you take fifty cents per week you simply double that. It is a mere matter of calculation but I take that as an illustration. Let us take the payment of a dollar. Suppose that at the age of 20 he contributes a dollar a week up to the age of 55; he will then have an annuity of $349.02. If he allows the money to remain in the possession of the government without any further payment until he reaches the age of 60 he will receive an annuity of $504. Now let us take a monthly payment. Suppose that he pays $2 a month beginning at the age of 20 and continuing until the age of 55; his annuity at the age of 55 will be $161.47. If he wishes to let the money remain in the possession of the government without any further payment on his part until he reaches the age of 60 his annuity will be $233.22. If he wishes to let the money remain until he is 65 without any further payment on his part his $2 per month will give him an annuity of $350.83. If his circumstances—and this perhaps will be more unusual—permit him to let the money remain until he has reached the age of 70 his $2 per month will give him an annuity of $559.03. Let us take the case of a man who can afford to pay $5 per month. If he begins the payment of $5 per month at the age of 20 and continues that up to 55 years of age he will be entitled to an annuity of $403.67. If he lets the money remain with the government until he reaches the age of 60 his annuity will be $583.05. We do not carry it beyond that because the next stage will take it beyond the maximum of $600. Suppose a man does not want to be troubled with weekly or monthly payments but he wishes to make his payments quarterly, which, no doubt, will suit the convenience of some people; if he undertakes to pay $5 every quarter beginning at the age of 20, at the age of 55 he will be entitled to an annuity of $135.20. If the money is allowed to remain with the government until he reaches the age of 60 he will get an annuity of $195.37. If it remains until he is 65 years of age he will get an annuity of $294.10. If it remains until he reaches the age of 70 he will receive $469.23, these being the products of a quarterly payment of $5 each quarter until the age of 55.

Of course, it is a mere matter of multiplication, hon. members can see what would be realized by making larger payments. These are what we describe as periodic payments, But it may be that there are those who will not wish to obligate themselves to make these periodic payments. It is comtemplated that if a man undertakes to make periodic payments and he is unable to keep them up regularly he does not forfeit his rights, because it becomes a mere matter of actuarial calculation and he will receive the value of his payments in the form of the annuity which he has chosen. If he does not wish to make periodic payments, but independent payments, then he is free to do so and he can make a payment of $10 or more at any time. He will have assigned to him whatever annuity he will be entitled to receive as the product of the payments which he has made. Let us suppose that he makes a payment of $100 at the age of 20 and never pays anything more; at the age of 55 he will be entitled to an annuity of $36.60. But if he makes a payment every five years, if he makes a payment of $100 at the age of 20, another payment of $100 at the age of 25, another payment of $100 at the age of 30, and so on every five years until he reaches the age of 50 years he will then find that he will be entitled, at the age of 55 years, to receive in return for these seven payments of $100 which were distributed over his life between the ages of 20 and 50, an annuity of $149.28. If he wishes to let the money remain until a later period of course the annuity will be still larger.

Mr. BARR. Suppose that he died shortly after reaching the age of 55 or before he was 60 and had only received two or three payments of his annuity, would his heirs get anything back?

Mr. FIELDING. Not after the annuity period begins. He can only receive the value of his annuity. That is one of the risks and his heirs would lose probably, but that is what cheapens the cost to hundreds of those who remain.

Mr. SPROULE. If he died before the annuity period he would get the money back?

Mr. FIELDING. He would get the money back with compound interest.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be his best plan.

Mr. FIELDING. We cannot always arrange these things in the best way. Another form would be that of the immediate annuity. A man would agree to take an immediate annuity. He may have saved money, but he has reached the time of life when he wants to take his capital sum and convert it into an annuity. By payment at the age of 55 immediate annuities may be purchased. For example, a man may purchase, by depositing $1,000, an annuity, payable quarterly, of the following amounts:

At age 60, $96.14; 65, $112.65; 70, $135,39; 75, $166.97.

Of course all these things are mere matters of calculation according to the experi-

ence of experts. There is nothing new in the scheme, nothing novel, nothing unusual. The two elements which we hope will make this scheme successful and appreciated by the public are those which I have mentioned.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose that these calculations are based on the mortuary tables, taking 65 as the duration of the ordinary life?

Mr. FIELDING. The minister is authorized to make regulations dealing with all these matters and, of course, he would have to be governed by the experience of experts and by actuarial statistics.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the calculations made on that basis?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, we have simply taken the rules of the insurance companies in that respect. There are the two points which I think should commend the scheme to the public. First, there is the absolute security which it will have by reason of it being guaranteed by the credit of the Dominion of Canada, and second, the cheapness of administration. The government can, by allowing a rate of interest something better than the ordinary rate, grant a protection and encourage thrift. The cost of administering this scheme is not likely to impose any very extensive burden on the treasury. We think that the more it becomes known the more likely it will commend itself to the public at large, not to the rich man, who will not avail himself of it, but to the man of moderate means whose income is small but who desires at an early stage of life to begin to save his money for the days when he grows old. I have briefly outlined the scheme, but when the Bill is under consideration I will go into it a little more fully. Necessarily there is a good deal that must be left to be worked out by regulation, but I now ask the good will of the House for the purpose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this Bill based on the experience of any other country?

Mr. FIELDING. It is substantially the same as the British system of annuities.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Have there been any representations made by any societies against this Bill?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not aware of any communications against the Bill. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has given it more personal attention than I have, but I think I am correct in saying that no representations have been made against it.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the government considered what effect this proposal will have upon the large number of fraternal societies doing business in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. The fraternal societies do a life business, not an annuity business. There was a company chartered called the Annuity Company of Canada which contemplated doing the same kind of business, and I understand the parties concerned have recently held a meeting and discussed the question as to whether they would go on. I do not know whether that is due to the government taking up the matter or not. If there are any companies engaged in this business the government would be quite free to employ them as canvassing agents, assuming it could be done at a reasonable cost.

Mr. BLAIN. Will not this government system of insurance have a very serious effect on the large number of fraternal organizations now doing the same kind of business in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think the fraternal societies do an annuity business. I frankly admit that there is something to be said in favour of government life insurance for the small policy-holder, but we are not dealing with that for the moment. I do not think this comes in conflict with any organized company in Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. I believe that if this system is adopted it will do away with a large amount of insurance that is now being done by fraternal organizations in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. The man who goes into a fraternal society does so for life insurance and not to draw an annuity. If he could afford it he would still continue the life insurance to protect his family should he die at an early age, and also to avail of the annuity system to provide for himself if he is favoured by reaching the evening of life.

Mr. BLAIN. There are fraternal societies in Canada which make provision for people when they grow old.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not apprehend the danger my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) sees, because to my mind the system outlined by the minister will be too expensive for the people for whom it is designed to take advantage of it.

Mr. SPROULE. When this system was first announced it was to be an old age pension scheme and many imagined that the government were to provide old age pensions for all, the improvident as well as the provident, and the government came in for a share of eulogy on that account. The scheme now announced will be a disappointment to many. A pension system to be valuable ought to apply to all. Most provident people will make provision for their old age and it is the improvident generally who are helpless in the evening of life. I do not know that this scheme is likely to interfere with the fraternal societies for the reason that the contributions provided for in the legislation are higher than the fraternal companies usually charge.

In a certain society which I have in mind the insured member pays his monthly fee until he is 70 years old and after that his contribution ceases and he draws one-tenth of the money coming to him annually until the money is all drawn. Should he live to draw it all then he would have no more annuity coming, but should he die before that the balance goes to the beneficiary mentioned in the policy. It is not exactly an annuity in a sense, but it is a certain kind of annuity providing for a determined amount.

Mr. BLAIN. This is a new departure in Canada and the government should take time to investigate the conditions of our fraternal organizations before this legislation is carried into effect. I believe this legislation will interfere largely with the existing fraternal organizations. A large number of Canadians have been paying into these fraternal societies for years and the government should consider the position these people will be in when they have grown old and are not able to participate in this measure in a way advantageous to them. I will discuss the principle of the legislation further when the proper time comes.

Mr. FIELDING. I will be happy to consider any suggestion the hon. gentleman offers, but I cannot see that the two things are in conflict.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the case of those who die before the age of 55 years this is practically a system of insurance.

Mr. FIELDING. Savings, rather.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Call it what you like, the whole system of insurance is based upon the theory that the amount paid in will be sufficient upon reasonable expectation of life to satisfy the amount payable under the policy at the decease of the insured. I understand that in this case there is to be no medical examination.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no risk which calls for medical examination.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me that to some extent there is. The question whether a man will attain the age of 70 materially affects the amount which will be paid by the government If a man dies at the age of 60 he will have enjoyed his pension for five years and if he dies at 70 he will have enjoyed it for 15 years. Therefore I cannot understand how the question of the life risk is not material to be considered. Another curious phase of it is that the heirs of a man who dies at 54 receive everything back with interest at 3 per cent compound, but if a man dies at the age of 56 he will have received one year's annuity and all the rest of his savings will have gone to the public treasury.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. FIELDING. The percentage of those who die is calculated, and you are enabled to pay to the others these annuities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not much consolation to the man who dies at the age of 56.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the principle of annuities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It may be the principle of annuities, but it does not appear to me to be a very satisfactory principle so far as the great bulk of the population are concerned. However, the details will perhaps be fully discussed when the Bill is before us.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any provision by which a man may pay in a lump sum for an annuity ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BARR. What age would be the oldest at which he could pay in—after sixty or before ?

Mr. FIELDING. The lump sum can be paid in at any age. It is a mere matter of calculation what is the value of the money.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister provides that the payments shall go into the consolidated revenue fund ; that is, they will be treated as a part of the revenue of Canada for the year, and will be expended by the government, I suppose, the same as savings bank deposits are expended ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. There will have to be a special account showing how that account stands at the end of the year.

Mr. FOSTER. But at the end of the year, if the government continues to spend at the rate that it has spent, the money might all have been spent and the account might show a liability against the government. Has the minister considered the advisability of making a special fund, and investing these moneys in a way to keep them at the credit of the fund ?

Mr. FIELDING. We give to the annuitant all the credit of Canada as a guarantee of his money. I do not know any better investment that the Dominion of Canada could make of any money that comes to it than to invest it in some way to the credit of the Dominion itself. It is a mere matter of account. To put this money into some fund and borrow money somewhere else would not be good business.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this measure based on the law of the same kind that exists in England ?

Mr. FIELDING. In principle it is the same. They have post office annuities in England.

Mr. BERGERON. Will this be administered in the same way, through the Post Office Department ?

Mr. FIELDING. No. We propose to have it administered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce ; but it may be assigned at any time to the Post Office Department.

Mr. PORTER. I fail to see any provision in the Bill to be introduced under this resolution for anything that is not already provided by the insurance companies authorized to do business in this country. I do not believe it is a correct principle for the government to enter into competition with corporations that have been chartered by parliament to do the same kind of business in this country. It seems to me that there is considerable in the remark made by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) that this measure will seriously affect fraternal societies. While these societies do not do an annuity business, they do business with a class of people who will be likely to take advantage of this measure. In that way the support of fraternal societies will be removed from them and transferred to the government insurance scheme ; so that it will have the effect of decreasing and perhaps destroying the business of fraternal societies. I also think the government ought not to go into competition in this line of business with insurance companies or other corporations chartered by this parliament to do the same kind of business, and offering no greater inducements or privileges than the insurance companies offer. The hon. minister says there are two things that recommend this measure. The first is absolute security. Does my hon. friend say there is not absolute security now given by the insurance companies transacting this kind of business ? The other recommendation is the cheapness of the administration. I doubt very much whether this business can be managed by the government, judging by the manner in which their departments are managed, as cheaply as the insurance companies manage it. The object of the Insurance Act now is to give insurance at the lowest possible rate at which it can be given by the companies. It seems to me that these considerations are not sufficient to outweigh those which I have mentioned. I think it is a good thing to provide in every way we possibly can for the support of the people when they reach the age limit mentioned in this resolution ; but at the same time we must guard the interests of the persons who engage in that business.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister of Finance give to the House any information as to the pressure put upon the government for this legislation ? Were there any petitions or demands made for it?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not aware of any. Certainly there was no pressure.

Mr. BERGERON. Will canvassers be employed by the government to go through the country ?

Mr. FIELDING. It would be possible. The minister might make regulations to that effect.

Resolution reported, read the first and the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 120) to authorize the Issue of Government Annuities for Old Age.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

### SUPPLY—ADVERTISEMENTS FOR TENDERS.

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

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss for a few moments a matter which I think is very important. As we all know, the expenditure of this country has now reached an amount over one hundred million dollars per annum. That expenditure has been steadily growing year by year for the last ten or twelve years. In connection with that extravagant outlay, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the manner in which a great portion of it is being expended in the disposing of our public coal and mining lands, in the payment for dredging, in contracts for railway supplies, in grazing leases, and in the various vicious forms of awarding public contracts. For instance the manner in which the government frequently call for tenders is by writing letters to some of their own friends, instead of advertising for tenders. A great many supplies they purchase without calling for tenders at all; and when they do advertise publicly the advertisements are drafted in such a way as to prevent healthy competition. I claim that no tender should be invited at all by letter. Every contract by the government over a certain sum—I would limit it to $2,000—should be let after publicly advertising for tenders. Therefore, I wish to enter my strong protest against the system which has been going on so many years of asking by letter. I also object to the system, which has been in force since 1902, of examining tenders. The system that prevailed until 1902 was as follows : I have in my hand an advertisement taken from one of the newspapers calling for tenders for the Department of Railways and Canals, and I shall read this to illustrate the point I am about to make :

Sealed tenders addressed to the undersigned and endorsed 'Tender for Trent canal,' will be received until 16 o'clock on Thursday, the 12th of March, 1908, for the works connected with the construction of section No. 3, of the Ontario and Rice Lake division of the canal.

According to that advertisement, the tenders were to be sealed and addressed to L. K. Jones, secretary of the Railway Department. I have also another advertisement which reads as follows :

Sealed tenders addressed to the undersigned and endorsed 'Tender for Chute a Blondin,' Prescott county, will be received at this office until March the 18th, 1908, exclusive, for the construction of the landing at Chute a Blondin, Prescott county.

That is signed by Alfred Gelinas, Secretary of the Department of Public Works. You will see by this tender that no particular hour is given, until which tenders may be received up to March the 18th, 1908. What occurs after these tenders are received by the secretary, is what we are strongly objecting to. Previous to 1902, according to the statement of the hon. member for Lanark, ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), the system that existed in the Railway Department was this. The tenders were supposed to be sealed when received. The hour of receipt by the secretary was marked on the envelope, the envelope was put into the safe, and all the envelopes were opened at the same time in the presence of two officials of the department. I understand that that system was in force up to that time, in every department of the government, and we then did not hear any complaints of any of the tenders not having been properly treated. That was the system followed until 1902, both by the late Conservative government and I believe by its successor. But the system in other countries is a little different even from that which was until then carried on in Canada. As I understand, the system which is in force, in the government departments of the United States, and in a great many cities, is simply this. They insert in the advertisement that tenders will be received up to a certain hour, on a certain day, and will be there and then opened in public. In order to explain that more clearly, let me just read one or two of the advertisements taken from some of the American papers. Here is one from the Boston 'Herald,' of Monday, February 17, 1908.

Sealed proposals will be received at the office of the water and sewer commissioners, 13 Highgate street, Medford, Massachusetts, until 8 o'clock p.m., of Wednesday, February 26, 1908, when the same will be opened in public, for furnishing the city of Medford with about 6,500 feet of cast-iron water pipe. Further information for bidders as to contract and specifications will be furnished on application at this office. Proposals should be made, sealed and endorsed 'proposals for water pipe.' The commissioners reserve the right to reject any or all proposals or any part thereof, and to accept the proposal deemed best for the city. Allison M. Stickney, chairman ; Frank G. Grady, Frederick E. Gow, water and sewer commissioners, Medford, Massachusetts. February 14, 1908. Fred. L. Cushing, clerk.

And here is another advertisement :

The penal institutions commissioner of Boston invites bids for 1,000 tons of steaming coal, to be delivered alongside of wharf at Deer island, Boston harbour, and giving bond of a surety company in $1,500. Only bids on forms obtained at the office of the penal institutions commissioner, at 22 Trement street, signed by bidder, and there left before 12 noon of Monday, February 24, with a certified check for $500, payable to and to be the property of, the city if the bid is not carried out will then and there be publicly opened and read——

And so on. I have another advertisement that appears in the Boston 'Herald' of March 7, in which the commonwealth of Massachusetts Board of Harbour and Land Commissioners advertise :

Sealed bids or proposals for dredging opposite Cunard pier Grand Junction wharfs at East Boston, will be received at the office of the Board of Harbour and Land Commissioner, room 131, State House, Boston, Massachussetts, until two o'clock p.m., Friday, March 20, 1908, and then and there will be publicly opened and read.

I have also another from the Chicago 'Record-Herald' :

Sealed proposals in triplicate will be received until twelve o'clock noon, Wednesday, March 11, 1908, and then opened.

I could give many instances besides these to show that this is the system throughout the United States in respect of receiving and opening tenders. I have advertisements here in English newspapers which illustrate the system in use there. For instance, in the 'Daily Telegraph' of February 26 last there is the following advertisement :

Sealed tenders, endorsed with the name of tender, must be delivered at my office not later than two p.m., on Monday, the 9th March, 1908, on which day they will be opened and considered.

Mr. TALBOT. In connection with what?

Mr. J. D. REID. That is the tender of the city of Westminster.

Mr. TALBOT. A municipal tender.

Mr. J. D. REID. Here is another relating to an army contract. I understand from my reading of these advertisements, and from other information I have received, that the system in England is that tenders are received and opened by a board appointed by the government. But the advertisements I have read from American papers will show that, at least in that country, the

tender must be sealed and at a certain hour they are opened, and every man who has tendered, if he wishes to do so, can be present and see his tender opened. Then there is no question in the mind of the public but that everything is fair and right.

As I understand it, under this government, there are several departments in which tenders are opened by one individual. That system was not always in use, but the old system was changed, for what reason I do not know. It seems to me that the old system was much better. But I believe that the system I have to propose will be an improvement even upon our old system. I propose that, in the first place, we must advertise in the public press for all contracts, for dredging, canal work, railway work, sale of lands, and other public matters. Tenders must be sealed and put in a place of safekeeping until the hour when they are to be received. They must then be opened in the presence of 3 officials of the government and those tendering, if those persons desire to attend and in public. I believe the government should accept that proposition; it is not only in the interest of the public, but in the interest of the government as well. What has developed within the past two or three years shows that the present way of handling tenders is one that should not be continued. Improvement is absolutely needed. Of course, I do not suggest that in all the departments the system with which I find fault is in use. It may be that in some departments tenders are opened in the presence of two or more officials. I think that no minister should have changed the system which was in use for a great many years in all the departments. I wish to state, further, that, so far as I am concerned, I believe the time has come when we should advertise publicly for everything we want above a certain amount. For my part, I would place it at about $3,000 or $4,000. Under that amount any government should have the right to purchase without tenders. But when we consider that the amount expended by the government in dredging, railway contracts, supplies and other things runs up to $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 a year, I cannot but think that the public is losing a very large sum annually through our present system of opening tenders. I do not wish to take up time. I simply lay this matter before the House in the following amendment, seconded by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), and ask for it the careful and favourable consideration of hon. members :

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be omitted, and the following substituted instead thereof:

That, in the opinion of this House, tenders received in any department of government should be immediately placed in safe custody under seal so as to prevent any possibility or suspicion of tampering and should be opened in public at the time and place mentioned in the advertisement, and in the presence of at least three principal officials of the department; and the persons so tendering or their duly authorized agents, should be at liberty to attend at the said time and place and see such tenders opened and recorded, if they so desire.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am free to say to my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) that, with but one single exception, I would be disposed to agree with him in all the observations he has addressed to the House ; and even upon that exception I cannot say that I have formed an absolute judgment. But the matter is altogether new to me, and I think new to the House, so I would not like to express an opinion at this moment. The hon. gentleman says that we should have public tenders invited for all the contracts which call for an expenditure of money or the granting of lands and other property of the government. With regard to timber limits, as my hon. friend says, for some time the practice has prevailed in the Department of the Interior of opening them only by one official. But my hon. friend is aware that a new policy is now being introduced, and at this moment timber limits in the Northwest are no longer disposed of in the manner they were before, when they were sold by all governments. We have adopted the system which prevails in Ontario and Quebec, namely, that all timber limits are to be disposed of by public auction, which system I am sure will be found satisfactory. It has been found satisfactory in both Ontario and Quebec. In this regard, therefore, the observations of my hon. friend cannot apply, because a different system has now been adopted. I may say to my hon. friend that apart from the Department of the Interior, all tenders are opened by more than one official. The great spending departments are the Department of Public Works and the Department of Railways. In the Department of Public Works tenders are opened by the minister and the deputy minister ; in the Department of Railways they are opened by the secretary and another official, and referred at once to the chief engineer. There are two or three suggestions made by the hon. gentleman which I think we could adopt. First of all, that tenders should be opened immediately they are received. I see no objection to that ; I think the suggestion should be adopted. According to the advertisements my hon. friend read coming from the United States and England, I notice that tenders are to be opened immediately.

Mr. J. D. REID. In public.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In the United States, not in England.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood that a time and place were fixed in the advertisement at which tenders should be opened.

They are to be received before a certain hour and then opened.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I understood the advertisement from the United States, tenders are to be received up to a certain hour and opened in public, when they are all in. The English practice is, they must all be in by a certain hour and disposed of at once. There is no objection to that; it is a good idea. They should be opened before one, two or three officials, certainly not one alone. The only exception I take to the motion of my hon. friend is that tenders should be opened in public. That has never been the practice in this country. With my little information upon this subject, I would admit there might be some security in having them opened in public. I notice that is the case in the United States. But it is not the case in England; according to the advertisement he has read they do not say that tenders are to be opened in public, they simply say that they are to be opened and disposed of. I think that is the language of the advertisement that he read from an English newspaper.

Now, what is the reason that one system prevails in England and another in the United States? I have always understood there was some objection to having tenders opened in public. Our practice has been not to give information with regard to tenders until the contract has been awarded. We know that many times information has been asked as to who the tenderers are on such a contract, and the answer has always been that we could not give the information because the contract had not been awarded. This has been the policy, not only of this administration, but of previous administrations. Now, if that has been the policy adopted, there must be some good reason for it. I would not be disposed, for my part, to condemn our system and adopt the American system in preference. Before forming a conclusion on this point, I would like to consult the old officials of the spending departments, for instance, Mr. Schreiber and Mr. Butler, to ascertain why we have adopted the system of not giving information until the contract has been awarded. Therefore, I am not prepared at this moment to accept this part of the resolution. I do not condemn it either. I might go further, and say without hesitation that if I were to follow my own judgment I would prefer the system of opening tenders in public. But my hon. friend will realize that when a system has been in existence ever since confederation, it would not be wise on the part of the government to accept such a radical change as he proposes until we have had an opportunity of consulting our own experts on the matter. Were it not for this latter portion of my hon. friend's motion, I would be disposed to accept it immediately. But I will say this to my hon. friend, I think it is due to the House that we should at an early date lay before the House a regulation providing that tenders shall be opened by more than one official. I think it would be well to lay on the table of the House some rules and regulations whereby everybody may know what the system is in every department as regards the opening of tenders. While I cannot accept my hon. friend's motion, I accept the sense of it, and in the best spirit. But I do not think it is possible to accept it in its entirety. I regret the manner in which he has brought this matter to the attention of the House, not that I complain of the spirit of his remarks, but because by the rules of the House we cannot amend his motion, we must either accept it in its entirety or reject it in its entirety. Under such circumstances there is nothing for us to do, for the reasons which I have given, but to decline to accept the motion of my hon. friend. But I may say, in concluding that this subject, having been brought to the attention of the House it is one that must engage our attention, and we will place the result of our consideration of it before the House at an early date.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had notice of the fact that my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) would move this motion some days ago. That notice, although it varies to some extent from what is now before the House, calls attention to the same fact and the pre-eminent fact in the motion which is moved to-night; that is that tenders should be opened in public. That seems to be the crucial point as regards the discussion at the present time and I must say that I am very glad that the right hon. gentleman has stated that it is the determination of the government in future to make an improvement as regards the disposal of timber berths by having these berths put up to public auction and sold to the highest bidder. That will indeed be a marked improvement upon the condition of things that has existed for the last few years. There has perhaps been nothing more marked in what I may denominate the mal-administration of this government than the manner in which timber lands have been disposed of in the last seven or eight years or the facility with which a number of speculators have been enabled to grasp large portions of the public domain at a very trifling expenditure of money. It is announced to-night, probably by reason of the efforts the opposition have made, that the government have determined that they shall follow the system prevailing in Ontario of putting public lands up to competition at public auction; yet, that does not at all dispose of the wide range which is covered by the motion which is moved by my hon. friend to-night. We have still a vast number of contracts into

which the government enter and of cases of disposing of property to which this resolution will apply. One of the notable cases where that amendment is so much desired is in the matter of dredging contracts. There is great reason to believe that the system of awarding dredging contracts which has prevailed in the past has not been in the interest of the public. Next to the matter of the disposal of timber lands the question of the contracts for dredging is one that requires immediate attention. The system of purchasing supplies is another matter that has been called to the attention of the House and the public very significantly in the last few years. The system has not resulted in the public getting the supplies that are wanted at reasonable prices; it has resulted in extravagant prices and great public disadvantage. Here again there is a necessity for some remedy. Now, the right hon. gentleman says he understands my hon. friend who moved the motion to say that tenders should be opened immediately they are received. That is not the argument put forward and that is not the purport of the motion. It says that a certain stated hour should be mentioned, that when that time has arrived the tenders shall be opened, but that in the meantime they shall be kept in close and safe custody or, to quote the words of the resolution that 'they shall be immediately placed in safe custody under seal.' This proposal is made in order that all suspicion and all possibility of wrong doing shall be removed. In a word, the object of the motion is that we shall secure publicity in this matter so that there cannot be a system by which the public will be defrauded and certain parties, who are favoured for some reason or other, may have their interests advanced. What is the reason that we propose this? There is a good reason why it should be proposed. One of the reasons is that we have found by investigation, notably in the case of timber lands, but in other cases as well, that the manner in which the tenders have been put in and the manner in which they have been dealt with are such as to invite suspicion and rob the public of the confidence which they ought to have in the administration of the department. Nothing has perhaps more increased the feeling of insecurity that is abroad in the public mind at the present time than the attitude taken by the government when it was proposed that we should further investigate into this matter. We admit that if the government had come down at once without any question and had shown a disposition to furnish us with the proper information instead of taking the attitude they did, and if they had granted us an immediate examination of the original documents instead of waiting until they were practically driven by the opposition to concede our demand and to permit us to examine the public records, that suspicion would not be as great as it is today. When at last the government were compelled to bring down the papers this suspicion we found not to be groundless and every time that public records have been brought down it has been found that a certain suspicion surrounds the tenders that have been put in showing the absolute necessity of an examination of the public records. We have in the last few weeks developed a knowledge of a very peculiar system of tendering in reference to the public lands. First, we have a blank tender; that is, we have a tender put in in which the amount is left in blank to be filled in at a subsequent time for what purpose it is not very hard to surmise and one of the reasons why we ask that the system shall be changed is that it has in the past proved most disadvantageous to the public interest. If these tenders can be opened in a secret place, in a closet if you like, with only one man present and the tender is in blank we have nothing to stand for the rights of the public except the absolute honesty of the official who opens that tender and that, of course, cannot always be guaranteed. The person who opens the tender may be perfectly reliable and honest, but the public has no guarantee of the honesty of the official and therefore has no guarantee of the bona fides of the tender or that the property goes to the proper person. We have elicited also in the last few weeks that there is this system of tender; a letter stating that the person tendering incloses a tender herewith; he mentions no amount whatever, and what is called a tender is a letter not written on any printed form of the government but a simple letter saying: I inclose herewith tender for such a property and accompanying that is cash. That is a very dangerous system of tendering. The cash could be increased or decreased at the will of persons who want to manipulate the tender. There is absolutely no guard. The advertisement is for a tender accompanied by a certified cheque, but as a matter of practice in the department the tender is not accompanied by a certified cheque in all cases but is frequently accompanied by cash which can be raised or lowered to suit the circumstances of the case according to the amount of the tenders which precede it. That is a second class of tender we have found to exist which is in itself suspicious and should not be allowed, or if allowed there should be publicity in the opening of these tenders so that there can be no substitution or varying of the amount. Then, we have a similar letter accompanied by cheques; mark you, Mr. Speaker, not by one cheque but by cheques and the letter says 'tender herewith inclosed.' Now, the tender is two cheques or more than two cheques. What are two cheques for? I do not know why

there should be two cheques but I can very well understand how that could be worked dishonestly if the opening of these tenders is to be a secret transaction. A man tenders at $5,000 and then another tender comes in with one cheque for $4,000 and another cheque for $6,000. The $4,500 cheque can be used if no higher tender comes in, but if a tender higher than $4,500 comes in then the $6,000 cheque can be used. But if a tender comes in of $10,000 then the $4,500 and the $6,000 can be added together and by this alternative method in the one case and cumulative method in the other the tenderer who has the favour of the official can secure the interest for which he tendered. Then, by the system we have at present of not requiring the parties tendering to affix their signatures to their tender, if you can imagine a case of such gross dishonesty, we could have a tender substituted by the official after the other tenders were opened, because the tenderers are not to use a form, no amount may be stated, it can be left in blank until the last moment, the deposit can be in cash, there is nothing in the world to prevent a dishonest official after all the other tenders are in, to himself virtually be a tenderer in the case. An examination of the documents that have been brought down to the Public Works Committee seems to show that all these things could occur and that there is no guarantee to the public that this kind of thing has not occurred in the past. In fact, the developments go to show that there is the very gravest reason for suspecting that dishonesty has occurred in the past, and it is absolutely necessary that we should have these tenders when they are received kept in safe custody until the proper time for opening and that they should be opened then in the broad daylight and before the people who are interested in the result. I have been unable to appreciate the strength of the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman as to the rule which says that until the tenders are awarded no information will be given to the House even about them. The governments are not too hasty in giving results to the House at any time but I venture to say there is no good reason why when tenders are duly advertised for and tenders are put in—guarded if you like by the statement that the tender will not be awarded to the highest or the lowest tenderer—with these provisions inserted in the advertisement there is no good reason why the public should not be made aware at once of what the result of the opening of the tender has been and the result recorded in such a way that it shall be accessible to the public and duly verified for all time to come. Until 1902 the practice set forth in the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) was followed to the extent at all events that the tenders were opened in the presence of at least two principal officials of the department. Why that practice has been departed from it is hard to say. But it happens to be coincident with the time when the bars were taken down and the field was opened very wide for certain speculators to come in and speculate upon the public lands of the country. And it is unfortunate it appears to me for the reputation of the government and of the department to which it particularly refers, that at the very time this occurred and from that time on there seems to have been a prevailing system in the department which has not conduced to the benefit of the public, and which certainly has not been calculated to inspire the public with that confidence which it is desirable the people should have in the administration of the public affairs of the country. I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution moved by my hon. friend.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (East Hamilton). I desire to say but a very few words upon this subject and I speak only because from what I have seen and heard in the Public Accounts Committee I am astounded to think that any government, or that any member of the government would tolerate what has been going on in the Department of the Interior. It is so outrageous, so unbusinesslike, that I can hardly believe that it has been fully known to the head of the department. I cannot even understand how any official having any regard for his own character would allow himself to be mixed up with such a procedure. It is simply this: That in the Department of the Interior since 1902 it has become a practice to receive tenders in which the person tendering does not state in his tender any sum whatever that he offers for the property or the interest he is tendering for—not a word, not a figure is stated in his tender as to his bid. But the practice has grown, a practice susceptible of fraud; it is difficult to understand how it ever should be allowed to become a practice without the knowledge that it was open fraud, and I believe, I may even go so far as to say that it was only tolerated because it was open to fraud. With that tender the tenderer, not having said one word in his tender as to the amount of his bid, inclosed a cheque, and we are told by officers of the Interior Department that they assumed that the amount of that cheque was the sum which the bidder intended to offer. The departmental regulations called for a tender, and for the tender to be accompanied by a cheque. He makes no tender according to the practice of the department. He makes a tender in blank, giving no figures, and simply slipping a cheque into the envelope. Everybody can see how open that is to gross fraud. No one can understand how that ever was begun except with a view to fraud, and I cannot understand that it was tolerated except

with the knowledge that it would be likely to lead to fraud. But it does not end there. We find that again and again the people who made tenders in that irregular form have put in, not one cheque, but two. One man will perhaps bid $5,000 by his cheque, another bids perhaps $5,500, and number one manages somehow to get in another cheque, say for $1,000, so that his tender becomes $6,000, $1,000 advance on that. Is it possible to conceive that men who have any knowledge of business and who know how ready people are to take advantage when they can, would tolerate a thing of that kind? In fact there have been cases in which three cheques were put in; if No. 1 was not sufficient to carry, No. 2 was there; and if No. 2 did not carry, No. 3 was there. That has been the system carried on in that department. That has been proved on oath before the Public Accounts Committee, and I say, in the presence of the right hon. the Prime Minister that he ought not to allow that to continue for one hour under his regime. I do not care whether it is the Prime Minister or the head of the department, I say that no man who has any regard for the public rights ought to allow that to continue for a moment.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, I wish to add one word in support of the amendment which has been moved by my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid). It must be obvious that to get the best results from a system of tendering by public competition, it is a matter of the very first importance to inspire confidence among the tenderers. There should be confidence in the mind of every tenderer that his tender will receive fair play and the fullest consideration, and that the various tenders that come in will be adjudged upon their merits. It must be obvious also that if you fail to inspire confidence among the men who tender for government contracts, you are losing money and doing a great injustice to public service; because naturally men will not go to the trouble and expense of making calculations to find out what bid they can make unless they have every confidence that their tender will receive fair consideration on the part of the officials who open the tenders. If a large proportion of the people who tender do not believe that their tenders will receive fair consideration at the hands of the officials who open them, then the amount of competition is bound to grow less, and the public service will suffer in consequence. It is only fair to the officials themselves that there should be some well understood system in calling for tenders and opening tenders. I have noticed in a small local paper advertisements calling for tenders for two or three different departments of this government, and in all of them there is some difference. In one department the requirement is that the tender shall be made on a certain form to be supplied by the department, and the tenderer shall sign his tender with his own name in his own handwriting. If that had been done in some instances to which public attention has been called in regard to tenders for public lands, it would have been a good thing. I believe that it should be the aim of this government to adopt some such system as that proposed by my hon. friend and make it general for all the departments. Under that system the time occupied by the officials would be a mere trifle—merely to open the tenders, in the presence of any of the tenderers or their representatives who might wish to be present, to record the amounts received, to draw up a schedule of those amounts, and to award the contract, if there is nothing unusual, to the lowest tenderer. Of course, I can well understand that circumstances might arise in which it would be necessary to refer to the head of the department, the minister himself; but it could do no harm to the public service to allow all the men who put in tenders to know exactly what their competitors tendered. I was very glad to hear that the Prime Minister had stated that he could agree with the greater part of the resolution which has been proposed, and I trust that he will later on see his way to agree to the whole resolution and allow the opening of tenders to be made in public. In the speech which he addressed to the House just now, he called attention to the fact that in one of the departments the tenders are opened by the Minister and the deputy. It seems to me that it is a very remarkable system and a very wrong one, to bring the political head of the department into a question of this kind in the first instance. I think it should be left to the permanent officials of the government to open the tenders and to decide them if there is nothing extraordinary in them. Of course, I realize that in every such case it may be necessary, before the award of the contract, to make a reference to the political head of the department, who will have to bear the responsibility of awarding a contract if it is not awarded to the highest tenderer. The hon. member for Leeds has referred to the practice which obtains in some other countries, he has made a reference to the practice which obtains in Great Britain.

I have some personal knowledge of the mode of proceeding in, at any rate, one of the great spending departments in that country. The greatest care is there taken of the tenders. There is a special box into which each tender is placed as it is received and this box has two separate locks. The two keys are kept by two officials in two different branches of that department, and it is impossible to open that box unless both are present. Thus the greatest care is taken to avoid the slightest suspicion of any possible collusion with regard to the opening of tenders. Further, the greatest care is taken to avoid the possibility of any

collusion among the tenderers themselves. If such suspicious circumstances had appeared on the face of any of the tenders received in that department, or in any department of the British service, as have appeared on some of the tenders received in the Department of the Interior and adjudicated upon, I am satisfied the contract would never have been awarded until an inquiry had been made into the circumstances. In making this reference to the Department of the Interior I have in mind the fact that in one particular case—one in which we had the original documents laid on the table—the same person had put in two different tenders under two different names, and the amount in one of the tenders had been inserted after the tender had been sent in and received by the department. It is only in the case of some of the tenders received by the Department of the Interior that I have had the advantage of seeing the original documents. I do not think I need add anything to what my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has said to emphasize the absolute necessity of a reformation in the system of opening tenders and awarding contracts. As regards the tenders received in that particular department, it will be noticed that the envelopes themselves had, in some cases, pencilled or written figures upon them, stating the date and hour when they were received. In my opinion each envelope containing a tender should receive the stamp of the department immediately, showing the date and hour of its receipt before placing it in the tender box. I noticed further that some of the tenders themselves had no stamp of the department until they reached the branch to which they belonged, several days apparently after the contracts were awarded. The whole thing is most careless and slipshod and open to any amount of suspicion.

I do not know that I need add very much to what has been said. But I would like to point out one procedure which obtains in Great Britain. In the form of tender, which has to be used by all who tender for public contracts, there is a proviso that the contractor shall furnish within seven days after the acceptance of his tender the names of all the persons who are associated with him, or the partners of the contracting firm, or, in the case of a company with limited liability, the names of all the directors. That procedure I would strongly commend to this government. If that practice had been in vogue in our service, in one case, that of the North Atlantic Trading Company we would not have had these terrible threats of suicide should the names of the members of that company be made public. And if this government had insisted on such a proviso in their contracts with the Imperial Pulp Company it would not be necessary for us to call witnesses from different parts of the country in order to find out who the members of that company are.

Mr. LAKE.

Mr. H. B. AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine). The resolution of my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) is one which appeals to my approval and support. The right hon. the First Minister has told us that it is not the practice generally in this country to open tenders in the presence of the interested parties. In reply to that statement I would like to lay before him the experience I have had during eight years in the Montreal city council in matters of this kind. It is our universal custom in every civic department of Montreal to demand that all tenders be delivered to the city clerk on or before noon on a certain day specified in the advertisement. The city clerk, with seal and stamp, places his mark on every envelope as it comes in. When the hour of noon arrives on the day fixed, the entire package, with the hour of receipt written on each envelope, is tied together and placed in a locked safe and there remains until such hour as the committee fix to open the tenders and award the contract. On that afternoon when the committee is sitting and that item is reached, an employee of the department is sent to the city clerk's office and the city clerk himself comes down with the tenders in this large sealed envelope and opens the envelope and takes from it all the tenders that have come in. He then opens each tender in the presence of the committee and of the parties interested, for every contractor who tenders has the privilege of being there. Each tender is passed around the committee so that each of the seven members could see it and a record is made by the clerk of the committee, and the result is read out and laid before the chairman in the presence of all the interested parties. In that way it is absolutely impossible for any collusion to take place, and I would recommend that some such method should be adopted by this government. This system has worked in the Montreal city council very satisfactorily. During the eight years I was there I do not remember an instance of the slightest suspicion being raised that the tenders were not in every case valid and legitimate. The state of affairs which we know to have existed for a considerable period in the Department of the Interior I am precluded from commenting upon at this time, inasmuch as the investigation is now going on in the Public Accounts Committee, but when that committee sees fit to make a report the facts will be laid before this House for adjudication. I know personally of gentlemen who came from a very long distance in order that they might be present when the tenders were being opened in the Department of the Interior, being under the impression that it was customary in this department, as in many other bodies, to allow the interested parties to be present when the tenders were opened. These gentlemen were greatly disappointed when they were told that so long

as they remained there the tenders would not be opened, but that at some future date, when the Land Commissioner might see fit, they would be opened and the contracts awarded. But if those tenders had been opened in the presence of the interested parties there could certainly have been none of the peculiar proceedings which we now find on investigation undoubtedly took place in that department.

A further suggestion has been made, and that is that each tender should be on a printed form of the department. This is exceedingly important. This has been in the main the practice of the Department of the Interior followed by outsiders, who were apparently not in the ring and who thought it was necessary to tender on printed forms. It was only special friends of the government who utilized the short line, blank tender, double cheque method. I have, therefore, much pleasure in supporting this motion in its entirety.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). I wish to express my approval of the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) and to make a suggestion to the government with respect to the tender system now in vogue. I am sure that it will be a matter of regret to the people of Canada that such a resolution is necessary in parliament at this time in our history. I am of opinion that, when making changes in the system, the government should adopt the plan of duplicate tendering; that is, a man who tenders for any work should be required to send in a duplicate tender, one copy to go to the Auditor General, who is not an employee of any department, but is an employee of this House, and the other, of course, to the department for which the work is to be done. Then, I think, that when the tenders are opened in any department the Auditor General should be present or some one representing him. These are matters that should receive the attention of the government when framing the new system which the Prime Minister has spoken of.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I think the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will agree that the utmost possible publicity consistent with the conservation of the public interest should be insisted upon in connection with the opening of tenders, and not only in connection with the opening of tenders, but in connection with the safeguarding of tenders, after they are received by the proper officer of the government. It is not only desirable that every care should be taken to prevent collusion, whether between the tenderer and any offical of the department or between the tenderers themselves, but it is eminently desirable that every precaution should be taken to prevent even the suspicion of any collusion or wrong doing. Under these circumstances, it seems astounding to me that in any department of this government, an official should have seen fit to adopt a system by which tenders were opened by himself alone behind the closed doors of his private office. And it seems still more amazing that any government having regard for its own character or the public interest would have allowed such a system to continue. It is absolutely incomprehensible to me why it should have been tolerated for one moment after it came to the attention of any member of this administration. The resolution of my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) desires to establish by a declaration of this House, certain conditions which, while they may not bring about a perfect system, certainly make a very distinct and desirable advance upon the system which has prevailed in some departments of the government. He invites the House to declare that tenders received by any department of the government should be immediately placed in safe custody under seal so as to prevent any possibility or suspicion of tampering, and should be opened in public at the time and place mentioned in the advertisement, and in the presence of at least three of the principal officials of the department, and that the persons so tendering, or their duly authorized agent, should be at liberty to attend at the said time and place and see such tenders opened and recorded if they so desire. Now, is there anything in that which can militate against the public interest ? The right hon. Prime Minister accepted the idea of the resolution and the spirit of the resolution, and indeed the words of the resolution, with the exception of the declaration that the tenders should be opened in public. Why should not the tenders be opened in public? Why should it not be stated in the advertisement calling for tenders that, in a certain room in the department, in the presence of three officials of the department, and of the tenderers, or their authorized agents, these tenders will be opened ? It would not necessarily follow from the words of the resolution that the amounts of the tenders should be made public. I see no reason, however, why they should not be made public. My hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) has made it abundantly clear that in the city of Montreal that system is carried out with most wholesome results. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) invokes the custom of the departments. I have as much respect as any man, I trust, for long established custom ; but unless it can be established by some convincing reason, I do not know of any particular ground for rejecting a proposition of this kind which, apart from that, seems to be eminently and absolutely in the public interest. I was in hopes that the amendment would be accepted in its entirety by the Prime Minister. But, at any rate, my

hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) is to be congratulated upon bringing this matter to the attention of parliament and the people. He is to be congratulated upon having evoked from the Prime Minister of Canada the statement that a public declaration will be made in parliament at an early day as to regulations very much in line, if not altogether in line, with the proposals set forth in the resolution of my hon. friend. I sincerely trust that the declaration of the government will be given to parliament at an early day, and that we shall have a uniform system carried out in every department of the government which is in the habit of receiving tenders, a system by reason of which suspicions have been rife in this country during the past will be allayed and the people will be sure that the public interest in these respects is safeguarded by the resolutions or regulations to be laid before the House.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Though we cannot accept the form of this resolution I am glad to know there is not much difference between the two sides of the House as to the manner in which tenders should be dealt with. Our chief differences arise on the last words of my hon. friend's (Mr. J. D. Reid's) motion. Regarding the manner of dealing with timber limits, it was explained some time ago by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) that a new system had been adopted and that these limits were to be sold by public auction. Whatever may be said of the past system, this gives the public, I think, every assurance that could be desired. I agree with the suggestion that no one person should open tenders; it is not sound business. I believe it would be the part of wisdom, in every case, to have two officials open tenders, and if it be insisted that there should be three I would not quarrel with that portion of my hon. friend's motion. But when it declares that it is necessary in the interest of justice and fairness to open these tenders publicly, I am bound to say that in the light of present information, I hesitate to accept that, as did my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I can conceive reasons why the public interest would best be served by tenders not being opened and made public immediately. Possibly, two tenders might be put in collusively. And, suppose the tender put in had come from the party who was interested in another tender, and it becomes known at once what the amounts of the several tenders are, there would be a strong inducement for the man with the lowest tender to withdraw and let the work go to the next man. It will be said that there is the deposit to be made and that that is our protection against such collusive action. It is quite possible that the deposit may not be large enough to afford protection in such a case. It is possible that the man who puts in the lowest tender could well afford to forfeit his deposit and let the work go to the next tenderer. I think a moment's reflection will show my hon. friend that it is quite possible that a case may arise in which this publicity will do harm to the public interest which all parties desire to conserve. There are some branches of the public service, I believe, in which tenders for small amounts are not accompanied with deposits. I think that in the Post Office Department, in their smaller contracts, they do not demand deposits. In that case, if the tenders were opened in public and everybody were made aware of the amount of the tenders, just such difficulties as I have suggested in the case of larger transactions, could take place.

Mr. R L BORDEN. But would not the public interest be safeguarded by the usual provision that the government is not obliged to accept any tender?

Mr. FIELDING. No, because the government should not be constantly calling for new tenders. Assuming now that all the tenders were opened by two or more persons—I would not quarrel with the rule that there should be three—it is hardly conceivable that three public officials in any department would enter into a conspiracy to manipulate tenders. If by opening the tenders in the presence of two or three officials you get the assurance that no one man shall be exposed to the temptation of interfering with them, then what gain comes to the public by opening the tenders in the public eye? I think the observations I have made of possible difficulties of that character probably explain the reason why in all past time it has been deemed wise that these tenders should be kept in the departments and should not be made public until after the signing of the contract. Again and again that has been stated in parliament as the reason, and up to this moment the propriety of that reason has never been questioned. I would therefore suggest to my hon friend, whose object in this matter is the same as ours, that they should consider whether any good purpose will be served by insisting on publicity in that way. It seems to me, and I speak subject to correction, that there might be good reasons why the public interest would not be advanced by the opening of tenders in this public way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is it that the hon. gentleman objects to?

Mr. FIELDING That they must be opened in the presence of the parties tendering.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You do not object to the words 'in public'?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, anything which gives the parties tendering a knowledge of

their competitive tenderers before the matter has been determined and the contract signed.

Mr. FOSTER. Would there be any objection in naming the successful tenderer?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend will see that if that were done the successful tenderer would probably state to his neighbours what was the amount of his tender. Cases have been known where, after the tenders have been put in, these parties communicate with one another, and they are able to get a pretty good idea of the various tenders even before public announcement is made.

Mr. FOSTER. If they communicate in one case they can in another.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. Even under present conditions there are difficulties in the way. I know of cases where there has been reason to suspect that the tenderers were trying to arrange so that one might retire and another be allowed to do the work. However, I think that is the reason why in the past, under all governments, it has not been thought wise to open these tenders in public.

Mr. AMES. It was often our practice in the Montreal city council when tenders were opened, not to adjudicate and award the contract until a subsequent reading. The tenders were opened, the public were made cognizant of all the facts, and perhaps a week later the contract was awarded.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). So far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned, I do not care what rule you make about opening tenders. I have every confidence in the officials of that department. At present they are opened before two officials; you may make it a dozen if you like, you may open them any way you choose, because they will be treated with perfect good faith in that department. What the department wants and what the government wants is the protection of the public interest in the awarding of these contracts. The remarks made by the Finance Minister are very practical. Those who have not gone through the experience will not understand as fully as he does that any department, in asking for and receiving tenders, has to deal with the shrewdest men that live in this country. I am not at all insinuating anything against the honesty of contractors in saying that they are the shrewdest men perhaps that we have to deal with. Now in the interest of the public I am of the opinion, from what experience I have had, that it would not be wise to let these contractors know all the figures of the various tenderers the days the tenders are opened. They should be opened at one time, as they are, they should be kept in a safe place until the day of opening. But to hand out the figures publicly when the tenders are opened, would be a mistake in the public interest, for the reasons given by my hon. friend. Now contractors do sometimes enter into collusion, or are suspected of doing so; they work with each other, and it is easy, after the tenders are opened and the figures are known, for a certain tenderer to drop out, and even lose his deposit, which could easily be paid by the next highest tenderer taking the lower tenderer into partnership perhaps. That can easily be done. There is another point that was not brought out clearly, that in the large spending departments such as the Department of Public Works and the Department of Railways and Canals, the tenders may not be let in bulk at schedule prices for certain classes of work. Now it takes days perhaps for the chief engineer to figure out which tenderer is the cheapest. It is impossible at once to say who will get the contract, and holding them for a week to foot up the schedule prices affords an opportunity for collusion among the contractors. We would have the engineers from various firms of contractors coming to the department, perhaps accompanied by solicitors, trying to convince the department that figuring out at their particular schedule prices would bring about the best results. It would hamper the department in coming to the solution which it would wish to reach, namely, which is the cheapest tender, everything taken into consideration. One tenderer may have a lower price for a certain class of material, and a higher price for another class. It takes the best men in the department to work out who has made the lowest tender, and if the tenderers knew all the details of the various tenders, instead of being in the interest of the public, it would open the door wide to irregularities.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). On broad lines I think the Minister of Railways is pretty correct. But it is understood to-day by the public that whenever invitations to tender are given out by this government they are sent around to friends of the government not to the public generally. According to law, no contract should be given for any public work costing over $5,000 without the public generally being invited to tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY Does the hon. gentleman say that is not the case at present?

Mr. BERGERON. Certainly, and if my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works will make an examination in his department he will find that one of his predecessors was the father of this system, by which invitations are sent only to the friends of the government and not to the public at large. We have seen an instance in the case of furniture for these buildings,

where two or three companies are formed composed of friends of the government, and to whom invitations to tender are sent. It is in the public interest that invitations to tender should be sent all over the Dominion, just as a private individual would do, in order to get his work done at the cheapest rate. But that has not been done by this government for the past ten years. Therefore when tenders are sent in only by friends of the government, and opened by one man, it is easy to see how fraud can be practised. The purpose of the motion which is made here to-night is to avoid that. It is put in a very broad sense; no tender should be opened except in public and by certain officials of the department. It goes farther and says that the tenderers themselves should be present. The government are not obliged to give the work to the lowest tenderer but they should exercise their judgment as to who should get the contract, having regard to the best interests of the country. Those who know something about how tenders have been awarded by this government are aware that the system pursued is not that which has been referred to by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. I think the government would do well to accept this motion. There is no harm in it. It is a declaration by the House of Commons that for the public good no tender should be opened except before three officers of the department and in a public way so that there will be no more hiding about it. I think it is a good motion and I cannot understand why the government should not accept it.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) saying that the custom of all the departments of the government—I suppose he included the Public Works Department—was simply to invite tenders from their friends. Now, my hon. friend must know that there is no foundation whatever for that statement. The hon. gentleman says when tenders are invited the advertisement should be spread broadcast all over Canada. How absurd that would be! Suppose a post office were to be erected in the city of Charlottetown, P.E.I., would you advertise for tenders in British Columbia, Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Alberta? It would cost very much more than the building.

Mr. J. D. REID. You do that now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we do not.

Mr. BERGERON The other day my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) himself read a whole page of advertisements in all the papers of Canada for a small bit of work down in some parish where nobody could tender except those in the place where the work was to be done. In that case the government spent $500 or $600 for advertising in the newspapers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will see how inconsistent he is. In one breath he says we do not advertise and in the next breath he says that we have advertised too widely. In that particular case to which the hon. gentleman refers the advertisements were all in newspapers which might be said to be in the district in which the public work was built. We have a large number of newspapers upon the list in various sections of the country. We divide Canada into sections and if a public work is to be constructed in one section then the advertisements are given to the newspapers in that particular section. I am sure you are aware, Mr. Speaker, and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken is not aware of the fact, that in the case of all public works where the amount involved is over $5,000 public tenders must be asked for and in every case that I am aware of public tenders are called by advertisement. In the case of supplies and fittings for buildings it is different. In some cases notices are given in the public papers and in other cases a considerable number of those who are engaged in the business are asked to tender for the fittings and supplies. The rule is that in the case of public buildings tenders are invited by public advertisement. My hon friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), as well as my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) have, I think, afforded us good reason why the resolution should not carry. I am satisfied that in the Public Works Department there would be very serious objection to allowing the tenders to become public before the contract had been awarded. There would be, in the case of large contracts, opportunities for collusion, opportunities for contractors to put their heads together, to get the lowest tenderer to retire and then the government would be obliged either to invite new tenders or to award the work to another tenderer for a larger amount. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) who, I believed, seconded the resolution, said that there appeared in the Public Accounts Committee——

Mr. LENNOX. I did not mention the Public Accounts Committee to-night.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then I understood my hon. friend to say that in the case of all original documents which had been brought down in connection with the various departments there appeared grounds for suspicion.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, very great grounds.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have followed the business of the Public Accounts Committee, not very closely, but at all events I have been at a number of meetings, I have seen

the evidence which has been taken and I am not aware that, in so far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, there has been any evidence of any collusion, or anything improper, or any fraud in connection with the receiving of tenders or awarding of contracts. Therefore, my hon. friend can point to no case——

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman is discussing what took place in the Public Accounts Committee. I understand that is highly improper and I did not refer to the Public Accounts Committee at all. I was referring to documents that have been brought down on the order of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is aware that all original documents, all tenders for public works, all contracts, all vouchers in connection with expenditure may be called for by the Public Accounts Committee and that they are always produced before that committee. I am not aware of any document which has been produced before the House in reference to the Department of Public Works which has shown that there has been anything wrong, any collusion or any fraud in connection with the awarding of contracts or any ground for suspicion. In considering as to whether it is desirable to give publicity to tenders before the contract is awarded, we might well have regard to what has been, I think, the almost universal practice in this country and what appears to be the practice in Great Britain. The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution (Mr. J. D. Reid) read from the advertisement contained in the London 'Daily Telegraph' and these advertisements are practically the same as the advertisements which are being put out by the Department of Public Works. They state that tenders will be received up to a certain date and there is no intimation that they will be opened in the presence of those who tender. Then, if it is true that it has not been the practice in this country, as far as the federal government is concerned, since confederation, that tenders should be opened in the presence of the public, I think I am right in saying also that in respect to the provinces of Canada, whether the governments have been Liberal or Conservative, the practice is the same as it is in the departments of this government, which is that tenders are opened by some of the officials of the department and they are not made public until the contract has been awarded. As far as the Public Works Department is concerned the practice is adopted, as I was informed when I became the minister, of having the tenders opened in the presence of the deputy minister and of the minister. The tenders are received, every precaution is taken, just as the hon. gentleman suggests it should be taken; they are under seal and they are given into the custody of the secretary. They are kept in his custody in a vault in the department, and when the period for receiving tenders expires they are produced by the deputy minister and opened by him or by the minister, both being present and both seeing the envelope which is opened and seeing the tender. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) said he though it was very improper that the minister should be present at the opening of tenders. I entirely disagree with that view. I think it is very desirable that in the case of awarding large contracts the minister, who is responsible to parliament and who is entrusted with the discharge of these important duties, should be present and take part in the opening of all tenders.

It seems to me it is very desirable that this should be the case, and that this important work should not be entrusted solely to the permanent officials of the department. You have, of course, the safeguard that you have one or two of the permanent officials present also at the time of the opening of the tenders. This also, I think, should be borne in mind when considering as to the necessity or otherwise of this resolution, that so far as the Public Works Department is concerned—and I am not sure that it does not apply to other departments—the lowest tenderer must receive the contract, unless for special reasons, which must be set forth in the recommendation to the Privy Council, and which must be passed upon and approved by the Governor in Council. It seems to me that we might very well discuss an important question like this without saying anything unpleasant, and I deeply regret that my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) should have made the statement that there is an impression throughout this country that only the friends of the government are invited to tender for these public works. I can assure my hon. friend that so far as the Public Works Department is concerned, I have seen no evidence that any such course was pursued by my predecessors, and I defy my hon. friend to show that in any case—and there have been a good many cases in which contracts have been let since I became minister—I defy him to show that in a single case only friends of the government have been invited to tender, except in the case of some fittings and some supplies. But in respect to all public buildings the public generally are invited to tender, and when the tenders are awarded no distinction is made between political friend or foe. Whoever happens to be the lowest tenderer in all cases (with the exception of one I am able to call to mind) since I became minister the contracts have been awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister stated that the practice in this country is the same as in England. The citation I made seems to show that in England tenders are received

until a certain hour and then and there opened.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The English advertisement reads :

On which day they will be opened and considered.

In England the advertisement does not say at what hour they shall consider them, but on which day they shall be considered. I know that whenever tenders are called for my deputy comes to me and says : To-day the time will close for tenders for such a public work; and on that day, if it is at all possible to do so, or at the earliest convenient time, the tenders are opened. We follow out what apparently is the practice in England.

Mr. J. D. REID. Here is an advertisement by the Department of Railways which says : 'Tenders will be received until 16 o'clock on Thursday, 12th of March, 1908,' whereas in the Public Works Department the advertisement reads that tenders will be received on a certain day, and you may have until 12 o'clock that night to put in tenders. I myself, during the present session, met a man in Ottawa going to the officers of the department at 11 o'clock at night to put in a tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When was that?

Mr. J. D. REID. Within the last two months.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to name the work?

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. gentleman would not wish me to give the contractor away.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can say to my hon. friend that if he went to the department at 11 o'clock at night, I do not think he would find any one there to receive the tender.

Mr. J. D. REID. I said he was going to the secretary's house, or whoever it was, to hand the tenders to him.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no hour fixed in that advertisement of the Public Works Department, and it is presumed the time would not expire until 12 o'clock of the night of the day mentioned.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would take it to mean the closing of office hours.

Mr. J. D. REID. It would certainly mean the entire day, and the secretary would have all the tenders opened up to the hour of closing the office——

Mr. PUGSLEY. The secretary who received the tenders would not venture to open them, and he never does open them. He certainly has not done so since I have been minister. If no hour is named in the advertisement, then the following morning after the day mentioned the practice of the deputy minister is to bring the tenders into the minister's office all sealed as they have come from the secretary, and they are opened in the presence of the deputy minister. That is the practice, and I do not see how the public interest could be safeguarded any better by providing that they would be received up to a certain hour. For these reasons, I am unable to see what public good would be served by the passage of the resolution. In fact the only criticism which has been made—it is not necessary for me to say now whether it has been fairly made or unfairly made—against the Department of the Interior has from time to time been dealt with, and the Prime Minister has stated, and so has the Minister of the Interior upon several occasions, that a different practice entirely had been adopted so far as the public lands are concerned ; that now they are disposed of by public auction and given to the highest bidder. There has been no criticism made by any of the other gentlemen who have spoken with regard to the different departments, so far as I have heard. My hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) has cited the practice of the city council of Montreal, which differs from the practice of this government for the past forty years and from the practice of every government in Canada. I do not wish to unduly criticise the city council of Montreal, but this is the first time I have heard that the city council of Montreal could always safely be held up as a model for other governing bodies in this country.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). The speech of the Minister of Public Works has amply demonstrated the necessity for three gentlemen being present at the opening of these tenders in his department, because the minister states that himself and his deputy open tenders in his department, and I am sure that a gentleman of his innocence would be so easily imposed upon that it is absolutely necessary to have some one with the deputy minister. The hon. gentleman states, in a most bland manner, that if tenders are called for on the 2nd of July, for instance, that means that they are to be in during office hours, and that if a tenderer were to mail a tender at 4 o'clock to the department, and if the departmental messenger received it from the post office at 5 o'clock, it would be a bad tender. If the minister is so innocent as all that, there is absolute necessity for a second party to assist him and his deputy in opening tenders. Moreover, the minister said that he had been a constant attendant in the Public Accounts Committee when matters were discussed appertaining to his department. We will all agree upon that, but the innocence of the hon. gentleman is very apparent when he says that in all that has transpired he saw nothing of wrong-doing in his department. Could innocence go further?

Let me recall, for the benefit of hon. gentlemen and the House, that last year two men were assigned to do duty looking after two dredges, and one of these men went to the other——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend pardon me? I did not intend to invite a general discussion as to the department; what I said was that I did not observe that there had been any evidence of wrong-doing, or of any fraud, or any collusion, in connection with the awarding of contracts.

Mr. BENNETT. It is a question of what is wrong-doing, and that is what I propose to deal with. When a witness plainly states that he has stolen from the country $120 odd, the minister says there is nothing wrong in that. It was proved in a certain case in which a contract had been awarded that the tenders of the rival tenderers were in the business envelopes of one concern that was tendering; yet the minister says there is nothing wrong about that or nothing to cause suspicion. When the minister can see nothing wrong about that sort of thing I think he is the most innocent man who ever opened a tender. The minister has been very brave in inviting discussion and investigation of his department. Is he honest and sincere in that? If so will he allow an investigation of his department and not take advantage of any technical rule?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is doing it every day.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister pledge himself that he will not take advantage of any technical defence to prevent the exposure of a case of wrong-doing in his own department? I ask the minister a fair question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman might assume that we will allow the fullest investigation.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister will not bind himself publicly to do that, for this reason. I can prove that in his own department the tenders of rival tenderers were written out by one party. Will the minister allow an investigation into that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When did the hon. gentleman say that was?

Mr. BENNETT. If I bring that case into the Public Accounts Committee the minister will be the first man to rise and say: no item of this expenditure is in the Auditor General's Report of this year. The minister has taken a stand here to-night before the House and the country, and he will have to be judged by that stand. He has been judged in his own province lately, and has been found wanting. Does he want to be found wanting here to-night before the country? I tell the Minister of Public Works that I can produce a set of tenders from his department which Liberal members of the committee have admitted to me show fraud on their face, and it will be proved to any man that can read handwriting that it is a fraud—that the two tenders are in the same handwriting.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me a moment? Let me ask him this question. Does he state that in any case the Public Accounts Committee has failed to have all the original documents, all the tenders, all the accounts, all the contracts brought before them?

Mr. BENNETT. I never said that at all and had it not been that through the innocence of some person in the hon. gentleman's department the papers were brought down, myself or the public would never have seen them. The minister is on trial before the country to-night, and I make this challenge, that if he allows these tenders to be brought before the Public Accounts Committee I will prove it up to the hilt that one man wrote the tenders and filled in the figures.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but he knows perfectly well that the minister cannot prevent the committee having all the tenders, all the accounts and vouchers, and everything else produced before it.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister knows as well as I know that day in and day out he has heard the objection taken in the committee, that an item is not in the Auditor General's Report for this year. The minister makes a display of wanting to be fair and wanting to conduct his department in a way that is above suspicion, and I challenge him now to say yea or nay—will he allow an investigation into that single case of fraud?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot prevent it.

Mr. BENNETT. He can prevent it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will say to my hon. friend now, that if he has any charge of fraud to make against my department or against anybody connected with it, and makes it here in the House, he will have the fullest opportunity of investigating it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the discussion is wandering from the question before the House.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me to complete, I make the charge now, and the minister has pledged himself before the House that he will order a full investigation into the case. Do I take the minister aright in that?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is quite apart from the motion before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. A fair challenge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman knows how to make the charge perfectly.

Mr. BENNETT. If you, Mr. Speaker, will allow it, I will make the charge and name the contract and the parties.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have ruled that the matter is not pertinent to the question before the House.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, Mr. Speaker, now that I have pledged the minister that when I introduce the matter again, he will make a full and thorough investigation into it, I will let it go at that.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman will persist, after a ruling has been made, there will be no other course for the Chair to take than the course which is necessary under these circumstances.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, Mr. Speaker, there has arisen in this country a necessity for having tenders and contracts well looked into. What do we see on the part of contractors who have been exposed in this House? What has been exposed in the case of Bowman-Whalen Company coming and displaying their dual tenders to this Public Works Department where hundreds of thousands of dollars have been swindled out of the country in the past few years on dredging operations, and these swindlings connived at by ministers of the Crown?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must see that that is plainly out of order. The hon. member has said that members have connived at swindles in conectinon with contracts. That must be withdrawn.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I withdraw those words, Sir. What has the public seen? It has seen this firm, called the Great Lakes Dredging Company placing their tenders for dredging at Port Arthur and Fort William at 9 cents per cubic yard, and an individual member of that firm placing his tender at 22 cents per cubic yard. What did that mean? It meant that if no other tenderer had intervened, that firm would have been permitted to withdraw their lower tender and substitute the higher one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The very best argument against this resolution.

Mr. BENNETT. It proves the estimate that firm had of the hon. Mr. Hyman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Hyman is not a member of this House, for very good reason, so there is nothing out of order in that. The hon. gentleman who cries order brought Mr. Hyman's trouble upon him to a very great extent, so he had better keep quiet. What do the public think of that? When they see a contractor putting in two sets of tenders on one particular work, what conclusion can they come to? I cannot characterize this as I would like in this House, but the public will estimate it at its true value. They will not hesitate to say that it is anything but fair and square and above board. But so long as we have ministers as innocent as is the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), according to his own showing, there will be the greatest possible necessity for some fully grown able-bodied adult, endowed with all his sense and without the innocent confiding disposition of the minister, to open the tenders that from time to time require opening in the department.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I cannot quite agree with my hon. friend from Simcoe as to the innocence of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). True he spoke to us this evening in the tone of a man who has been through a long course of lenten exercises; but in spite of all that, in spite of his sanctimonious countenance I cannot at all agree that things are as regular and proper in the department as he says they are. I have not occupied the position of head of the department, but I have followed this department closely for many years, and there are examples without number of contracts given there without any call for tenders or with calls for tenders in a manner which is absolutely improper and ridiculous and extravagant. Just look at the file I have in my hand. I find here an example on the 17th of February of tenders having been received—that is one of the things we complain of—which were invited only from friends of the government. On page 3341 of Hansard in answer to a question put by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) as follows?

1. Were tenders called for the furnishing of hard pine for the Intercolonial Railway for the season of 1908?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not in my department.

Mr. MONK. We had this answer from the Minister of Public Works. He said that tenders had been received from the Georgia Pine Company, of Baltimore; Thomas Nagle & Company, St. John; Hirsch Lumber Company, New York; Rose Curry & Company, S. S. Ryan, Eppinger & Russel, W. Hilyard Shaw, Jos. A. Likely, Macon Lumber Company, G. H. Barnes, St. Louis; Mason Gordon & Company, Sumner & Company, St John. The contract was given to S. S. Ryan.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a pretty large list on both sides of politics.

Mr. MONK. That is not the information I have.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Sumner is one of the gentlemen who just ran for the county of Westmoreland.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend said that was not a party contest.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The newspapers said so but not I.

Mr. BENNETT. And you could not guess the politics of the people down there.

Mr. BERGERON. He can do it now.

Mr. MONK. I am beginning to think there is really an element of innocence in my hon. friend, of which I had no idea before. These tenders were invited from certain parties only, and the contract was given by the government to its own friends. My hon. friend from Beauharnois spoke of the necessity of advertising tenders. Here in the department of my hon. friend is a sample in the case of the post office of Nicolet. It was not a considerable contract there, some $14,000. That one seems to have been advertised very extensively, but strange to say it was advertised only in Liberal newspapers. That was altogether unfair. Why should not everybody be invited to tender, and the tenders be advertised through the public press generally.

Mr. BUREAU. Another innocent man.

Mr. MONK. Will the House bear with me a moment while I show how this contract was advertised? It was advertised in: 'Le Progrès,' Nicolet; 'Le Soleil,' Quebec; 'Telegraph,' Quebec; 'La Semaine Commerciale,' Quebec; 'La Presse,' Montreal; 'La Patrie,' Montreal; 'Herald,' Montreal; 'Le Canada,' Montreal; 'Witness,' Montreal; 'Sunday World,' Montreal; 'Le Bulletin,' Montreal; 'Argus,' Montreal; 'L'Industriel,' Shawinigan Falls; 'L'Union des Cantons de l'Est,' Arthabaskaville; 'Le Courrier,' Drummondville; 'La Revenue d'Acton,' Acton Vale; 'La Tribune,' St. Hyacinthe; 'L'Union,' St. Hyacinthe; 'Le Courrier,' Sorel; 'La Gazette,' Berthier; 'L'Etoile du Nord,' Joliette; 'Le Progrès de l'Est,' Sherbrooke; 'Times,' Richmond; 'L'Album Universel,' Montreal.

For heating apparatus:

'Le Progrès,' Nicolet; 'Le Soleil,' Quebec; Telegraph,' Quebec; 'L'Union des Cantons de l'Est,' Arthabaskaville; 'La Patrie,' Montreal; 'La Presse,' Montreal; 'Le Canada,' Montreal; 'Herald,' Montreal; 'Witness,' Montreal; 'Le Bulletin,' Montreal; 'Shareholder,' Montreal; 'Le Progrès du Golfe,' Rimouski.

Mr. BUREAU. What about 'La Patrie'?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend must not think that I am as innocent as the Minister of Public Works. What does the House think was paid for advertising that contract of $14,000. I venture to say that the amount paid was a considerable percentage on the amount of the contract. I have often advocated that we should not advertise public contracts through the newspapers because the advertisement takes the form I have just indicated. The advertisements are only put in a certain set of newspapers. A very extravagant amount is paid for the advertising and yet the public in general are not reached. I have advocated time and again that we should adopt another method of advertising for tenders. We have post offices all through the country. Those men who desire to tender should know that tenders are invited by a poster put up in each post office, or some other method should be adopted by which the calling for tenders may be publicly advertised throughout the country. I do not believe that the advertisement should be limited to any particular place. I believe that is done in certain countries. I do not see why we should spend enormous amounts in the distribution of funds to the press of the party in power, when we can obtain the same objects without that expenditure. I do not wish to take up more of the time of the House on this point, but I wish to add another word.

It is well known how tenders for supplies are called for in England, and I believe in most of the countries in Europe. At the beginning of the year a list is made up of the articles the government will need during the year. The government places on that list the prices, beyond which it will not go. That list is circulated among all those who ask for it and are prepared to give the government satisfactory security of their ability to carry out their contracts. The government then gives a contract upon each of those articles to the lowest tenderer. These lists are public property. They are communicated to parliament and are open to public inspection, and I believe that is the way in France and in most other countries. Why does not this government adopt that method in respect of the articles it requires. But we know how things are done, in my province at least, and I believe it is the same in every other province. The government purchases those articles without tender from its own friends. I venture to say that we pay for these articles twenty, thirty, fifty per cent more than we should because we do not wish to adopt a common-sense system. But, Sir, the same principle pervades the whole administration. I have not had occasion this session, though I believe there is a motion on the paper, to refer to the particular point of the public service. In the public service, are we rewarding merit? Are we giving positions in and making promotions in the public service on ground of merit and deserving? We are wandering further and further from the system in regard to the civil service which was adopted in England nearly fifty years ago, and which they are

more and more adopting in the civil service of the United States, which service twenty-five years ago, was polluted by the same abuses which exist here to-day and are being fostered by this government and are increasing every year. Although the reasons for saying and voting that this government has outgrown its utility are very numerous and memorable, the principal reason for a change in the system of administration resides in this very motion, and I cannot see why it is not supported by everybody in this House.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I am sure we all appreciate the position taken by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) and the splendid resolution which he has brought before the House. I approve it heartily. And, as we are dealing with different forms of tender, I wish to read a tender that I received from the Montreal 'Herald' within the last day or two:

Montreal, February 29, 1908.

Dear sir,—In canvassing your county before election, did it ever strike you that the quiet 'heart to heart' talk was more effective than the public meeting, though both are necessary. There is another thing more quietly effective, that is a good paper.

Fifty or one hundred dollars spent in sending the Montreal 'Daily Herald' to some of your most important Conservative friends (the kind who call everybody fools unless you think as they do) will do more good than all talking; as it gets at them 320 times a year; they may not like it at first, but it is the constant dropping that wins.

For the next fifteen days I am authorized to offer the 'Herald' in lots of 10 or more at $1 per year each, and will be pleased to hear from you with list and cheque to cover same. Send three or four extra names, as some of the parties may take it, and I will check lists to show there are no names duplicated.

Yours truly,
JOB. W. TAYLOR.

And then in writing I notice the following:

New Brunswick sounds warning. You cannot start a good bunch of 'Heralds' to your county any too soon.

Here is a form of tender which the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) might well take into his consideration.

House divided on amendment (Mr. J. D. Reid):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Ames,
Armstrong,
Barker,
Barr,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Bristol,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Cockshutt,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Ganong,
Henderson,
Herron,
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lennox,
Lewis,
Macdonell,
MacLaren,
McCarthy (Calgary),
Monk,
Morin,
Northrup,
Osler,
Owen,
Paquet,
Perley,
Porter,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Smith (Wentworth),
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Ward,
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka)—50.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Beland,
Bickerdike,
Bourbonnais,
Brodeur,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carney,
Caron,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Conmee,
Copp,
Delisle,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Dubeau,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlayson,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gladu,
Gordon,
Graham,
Guthrie,
Hall,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Knowles,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Law,
LeBlanc,
Macdonald,
Macpherson,
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLean (York, C.),
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Robitaille,
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Schell (Oxford),
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Talbot,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turcotte,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Watson,
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—95.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

| Ministerial. | Opposition. |
|---|---|
| Logan, | Lefurgey, |
| Telford, | Tisdale, |

| | |
|---|---|
| Dyment, | Beattie, |
| Schell (Glengarry), | Sproule, |
| Borden (Sir Frederick), | Hughes (Victoria), |
| Fisher, | Maclean (York, S.), |
| Maclean (Lunenburg), | Seagram, |
| McIntyre (Perth), | Lancaster, |
| Black, | Fowler, |
| McLean (Huron, S.), | Avery, |
| Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.), | Leonard, |
| Wilson (Russell), | Martin (Queens, P.E.I.), |
| Crawford, | Pringle, |
| Harty, | Clare, |
| Emmerson, | Crocket, |
| Clarke, | Marshall, |
| Grant, | Lalor, |
| German, | Clements, |
| Lemieux, | Forget, |
| McCarthy (Simcoe), | Stanfield, |
| Devlin, | Christie, |
| Greenway, | Haggart, |
| Boyer, | McLean (Queens, P.E.I.), |
| Loggie. | Thompson. |

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) has not voted.

Mr. BEATTIE. I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

## JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before you leave the Chair I would like to draw the attention of the government to a report of a recent debate in the Japanese Diet, which appears in the Victoria 'Daily Colonist' of the 1st of March. It says:

Japanese newspapers received in yesterday's mails give stenographic reports of the discussion in the Diet at Tokio regarding the question of Japanese immigration to Canada. Count Hayashi, Foreign Minister, in the course of a long speech is reported as having declared that after the Vancouver riots Canada asked Japan to negotiate a treaty differentiating labour immigration from her shores and that the Japanese government had replied that it could not possibly negotiate any treaty differentiating injuriously against its own nationalists, and that all negotiations having that object must be futile.

The speech as reported in this journal, then proceeds as follows:

Nevertheless, Canada has sent Hon. Mr. Lemieux to this country last November, with instructions to negotiate such a convention if possible. In that respect the envoy's mission had failed, but he had received assurances from the Japanese government that it would continue to exercise to the full all the functions delegated to it by law in this matter. Mr. Lemieux had asked for an interchange of documents in that sense, and despatches were given which have already been published. The question then arose as to exactly what immigrants were to be vetoed, and it had been agreed that no restriction whatever should be imposed with regard to the following, namely: first, travellers, merchants and students; secondly, Japanese subjects who, although belonging to the labouring class, had their wives and families in Canada; thirdly, labourers who had returned to Japan from Canada and who contemplated going back to Canada; fourthly, contract labourers, that is to say, men having fixed employment; fifthly, Japanese subjects discharging the duties of domestic servants and accompanying their employers; and, sixthly agricultural labourers. Obviously the only labourers not included in this category were those who drifted to Canada without any resources of their own and on the chance of finding employment. The Japanese government have been frequently urged by its own consuls to check the immigration of such men. As for the prohibition just imposed upon labourers destined for Hawaii, this was to be assigned to a different reason, namely, the state of affairs in Hawaii itself, where Japanese immigrants, their exodus to the United States and Canada being checked, found their number in excess of the local demand and were threatened with much distress. They themselves had petitioned their government to impose a restriction.

If this report of the Minister of Foreign Affairs for Japan be correct, it seems to me there is a material difference in the understanding, because, according to the statement of Viscount Hayashi, the only persons proposed to be restricted are labourers of a roving character who have no fixed employment and who come to Canada without any resources of their own on the chance of finding employment. The six classes who are to be permitted, according to the statement of the Foreign Minister as here reported, to come to Canada, are very comprehensive. I thought it right to bring the matter to the attention of the government. The hon. Minister of Labour is not here to-night, but possibly the Prime Minister would be able to state to the House whether this is the understanding of the present government in respect to the result of Mr. Lemieux's mission to Japan. Another somewhat important statement to which I have alluded is that which declares that after the Vancouver riots, Canada had asked Japan to negotiate a treaty limiting the labour immigration from her shores to Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not difficult to realize that that report coming from Japan by telegraph, and the speech being delivered in the Japanese language and transmitted over the wires, is very susceptible of being misunderstood or misreported.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman misunderstood me. That has reference to Japanese mails just received, and the report is a stenographic report of the speech of the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Japanese Diet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At all events, it is a speech delivered in a foreign language with which few people in this

country are familiar. For my part I do not think the report is correct. I am satisfied of one thing, that any statement in the reported speech of Count Hayashi which in any way would differ from the statement made by my hon. friend here the Postmaster General, is absolutely incorrect. The arrangements are substantially those reported by the Postmaster General. As to the reported demand for the negotiation of a treaty, there has been no demand, as appears in the correspondence brought down some time ago.

SQUATTERS ON FOREST RESERVES.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). Before you leave the Chair I would like to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a matter of considerable importance to the persons concerned. Last session when the Land Bill was before the House, which was afterwards withdrawn, we discussed the matter of squatters on forest reserves, and I asked what steps would be taken to deal with the so-called squatters. If I remember correctly, the minister assured me that they would be well dealt with. Now the forest reserves to which I refer are situated in the Turtle Mountains, south of the town of Boissevain, in township 1, range 21, west of 1st meridian. These squatters last fall were ordered to leave the reserve, and were guaranteed that they would receive in the place to which they were sent, land, and hay and cattle and anything else which they had on the reserve. There has been considerable dissatisfaction in connection with the matter, and I have received several letters from some of the squatters who have not left the reserve, asking me to bring this matter to the attention of the Minister of the Interior. I hold in my hand the Boissevain 'Globe.' The hon. Minister of the Interior will not for one moment think that this is a Conservative paper, because he is well acquainted with the editor. This is what the Boissevain 'Globe' says in referring to this matter:

The Squatters' Grievances.

It will be remembered that exclusive mention was made in the 'Globe' last September of the removal of some of the squatters from their location in the Turtle Mountain timber reserve to the neighbourhood of Benito, in township 34, range 29 west. At the time of the announcement the terms of agreement entered into by the government with those people was made public, and with arrangements thus made the squatters were satisfied. Information reached the 'Globe' a few days ago that the government has failed to carry out its part of the contract, inasmuch as the squatters removed have not been able to procure the building material promised; neither have they been given the feed for their stock as promised; have not been able to get an entry for land selected, the land agent at Dauphin telling one of them, Mr. Hunter, that the quarter applied for by him was not open for entry, while a letter from Ottawa over the signature of Dr. Cash, M.P., states that the same quarter-section, on investigation was open for entry. Who is to blame for the irregularities? Furthermore, no allowance has been made to the people removed from their holdings. A valuation of the improvements made by the squatters was made and accepted by the government, but as yet no results have accrued from this transaction. When it is known that those who were removed were forced to leave behind them the winter's hay put up for their stock, and none available where they were removed to short of $25 a ton, how was it to be expected that those people could winter their stock, when in most instances they were without the price. The grievances thus cited should be looked into at once.

Another matter has been drawn to the attention of the 'Globe.' When the squatters were removed the buildings occupied by some of them were razed to the ground, while others were left standing. Last Wednesday F. O. Chisholm, one of the 'deported,' visited the Foster estate, on which he was formerly domiciled, with an order to demolish the buildings, but on his arrival there was met by a man who ordered him off at the point of a gun. The occupant proved to be a man from across the line who had taken possession of the buildings, alleging that he had authority to do so by order of an official. Is this the truth? If so, why, after Canadian settlers or squatters have been evicted, are foreigners permitted to occupy the premises thus vacated?

These matters, as cited, have been reported to the 'Globe,' and if correct should, in all justice to the people interested, be righted to their satisfaction.

The Minister of the Interior knows that the editor of this paper is a very strong Liberal. I agree with him that an injustice has been done to these squatters. If it is according to law I am not objecting to the fact that they have been forced to leave that land, but I think they were compelled to leave it at a very inopportune time. This township 121 west of the first meridian will certainly never make a forest reserve. I took the pains last summer to drive over every section of it and I found that the timber is very small, averaging from 2 to 6 inches in diameter, and that all there is could be put very easily in two sections. In that township there is quite a number of settlers who have been living there for some years and the township is grown over with hay some two or three feet high and quite thick. The Minister of the Interior, being a westerner, will know that it is absolutely impossible for hay and trees to grow on the same land. I promised these men that I would bring this matter to the attention of the minister. I am confident that if the minister was there himself or had a suitable man to examine this section, he would be absolutely certain that it could never be made into a forest reserve. The men in this district raise grain and cattle. Many of them have quite a large number

of cattle. After putting their hay up for the winter they were ordered off in November, I think, to this northern country, 100 or 150 miles from the reserve in which they were living, and it seems to me, according to the report of this strong Liberal paper, that these people have not been fairly dealt with. I draw the attention of the minister to it and I would like to have a statement from him if it is convenient to-night; if he has not the information I would like him to procure it so that I may inform these people of the reasons which actuated the department. There is one family in particular which had a large number of cattle and horses last fall and it was absolutely impossible to sell the horses or cattle. They have these horses and cattle still on the reserve, but they have been ordered off finally and notified to go on the 1st of April. That will be a very great hardship and I would ask the minister to at least give those who are still remaining on this reserve until later in the season, say the 1st of June, to remove, because that is as early as cattle will be able to exist without being fed with hay.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I am very glad that this matter has been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend (Mr. Schaffner). I have had no notice of the condition mentioned by him. There is no doubt that the removal of people from a reserve is necessarily accompanied by a measure of hardship. It is an unfortunate condition and no one sympathizes more strongly with these people than I do. However, I am not here to exercise sympathy, but to carry out the will of parliament. The reserve as it exists is practically as it was set apart many years ago by departmental order, and I presume on what might be supposed to be sufficient information; and the Act of parliament fixing it as a forest reserve which was passed two years ago merely confirmed the boundaries or limits that had already been set.

There is perhaps a misapprehension in regard to the purpose of these forest reserves. The fact that a certain area is set apart as a forest reserve is not intended to be a guarantee that there is upon that area merchantable timber. If the matter is looked into I think it will be found that the reservations which have been made in the prairie part of the west have been made with a view rather of conserving the sources of water supply for the surrounding prairie than for the purpose especially of preserving the large timber growing upon the land. There are certain elevated portions of the prairie country, the Turtle mountains being one. The crest of this elevation is the source of water supply for the surrounding prairie and it was considered to be in the interest of the country that the timber covering these sources of water supply shoud be preserved so that the supply might be protected.

I repeat that the forest reservations are rather for the purpose of conserving the water supply of the surrounding prairie than for the mere purpose of protecting the timber that is growing on them, or even for the purpose of reproducing timber upon them. In regard to the removal of the squatters, it of course will be understood that they are not there by any legal right and that they are subject to ejectment by legal process. However, recognizing the hardship that might be inflicted, instructions given have been to the effect that every means to secure an amicable removal should be exhausted before any legal measures were taken. And if those parties went away from the reserve last fall it was because it suited them to go last fall according to the terms that were proposed to them, rather than remain until spring. The fact that some of the squatters on the reserve are still there and are only subject to go in the spring, is evidence that all might have remained there until spring had it so suited them to do. It may be possible that the offers made to these people in order to secure their removal have not been fully carried out. If they have not, the government is in fault and it will be my business to inquire very carefully into that matter and see that any promises made are fulfilled if they can be fulfilled, and if they cannot then something else that is as good or nearly as good will be provided. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Schaffner) that the matter will have my very best attention. And while carrying out the express will of parliament in establishing the reserve and in securing its clearance of settlers every effort will be made that the distasteful work shall be done with as little friction as possible. In regard to the suggestion made that the squatters hitherto there have been removed and other people have been permitted to come in and squat in their place, I do not think my hon. friend will treat that suggestion seriously. There is no foundation for such a suggestion and I am very sorry it should have been made. I can assure my hon. friend and the House that there is certainly no warrant for it. Once the squatters who have been in residence there for some time and who have acquired in some way some right of possession by reason of occupation, once they are dealt with, any one who comes on the reserve after that and undertakes to assume possession will be dealt with according to the letter of the law.

## FLOODS AT CHATHAM.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a matter which I have already brought before the House on several occasions and which is a most import

ant matter to my constituents. I refer to the damage done by ice jams and floods on the Thames river and its vicinity and the great loss which is suffered by the people living in the locality. At the mouth of the river the water has risen on occasions to 27 or 28 feet because of the jamming of the ice, and vast damage has occurred. Two years ago I brought the matter to the attention of Mr. Hyman then Minister of Public Works, and he agreed with me that something should be done to avert the loss which annually occurs there. To-night I appeal to the present Minister of Public Works that he should send at once an ice breaker or tug to the mouth of the river to break up the ice for say five miles surrounding, and I believe that if that is done immediately there will be averted the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of property. I believe that the sending of an ice breaker there is the only possible way to provide a remedy at the present time, although, if I were to enter into the subject at length I might suggest some more permanent remedies. The ice is only 15 or 16 inches thick at the mouth of the river and the minister can procure a tug from Sarnia or from Detroit to run up there in half a day. At a comparatively trifling cost I believe the ice-jam could be broken up and the property of the people of Chatham and its vicinity saved from destruction. I have seen the suggestion made that the ice should be dynamited, but I think the minister who has had considerable experience will agree with me that it would be no use to dynamite ice in the condition that ice is in, and that the only prevention of this loss is by sending an ice breaker there. I ask the Minister of Public Works to give this matter his immediate attention.

Mr. D. A. GORDON (East Kent). I wish to supplement the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements). I know something of the conditions in that neighbourhood and I am satisfied that the best results will be obtained by getting a boat to break up the ice. I believe that at the present time it would be futile to attempt any other means of preventing an ice jam. I sometimes think that in the past the government has been to some extent responsible for these floods by allowing bridges to be erected over the river. In the city of Chatham the bridges have been undoubtedly an obstruction, so much so that far above the city we have seen 2 or 3 feet of water in the streets of the towns and villages along that stream. I do not think it would cost more than $1,000 or $2,000 to make the experiment which has been suggested, and I believe it would be successful. The greatest difficulty would be in getting a tug through lake St. Clair up there, as possibly the ice on the lake is more solid than in the river itself. But if a tug can be got there I think the results would be satisfactory. There have been many suggestions made to remedy this evil, but in my opinion if a cut off were put there to relieve the stream, the result would be much worse than if the stream was left to take care of itself and relief given in the way now suggested.



## FLOODS AT BELLEVILLE.

Mr. GUS. PORTER (West Hastings). Some two or three weeks ago in the absence of the Minister of Public Works I took occasion to call the attention of the government to a similar state of affairs existing in the city of Belleville. The trouble there is caused by anchor ice forming in the river. The ice comes down to a point where it reaches the harbour, and the harbour is so shallow there, that there is not sufficient current to carry the anchor ice out into the harbour. If the ice could float out into the harbour the water is of such depth that no damage would be caused. But when it comes to the shallow part of the harbour, the anchor ice sinks and forms a perfeet dam at the mouth of the river, the result being that the flow of water is entirely stopped, and that very soon freezes over. Once the river is frozen over, the water can find no escape except by flowing over the ice so formed and out over the banks of the river, with the result that the principal business houses in the city of Belleville, which are built along the banks of the River Moira, have their cellars flooded, the fires in their furnaces extinguished and a large amount of merchandise destroyed or damaged annually. Some years ago the government of the day was invited to make an investigation of the conditions existing there, with a view of determining whether or not something could be done to relieve the city from the difficulties which then existed and which continue to exist. An engineer of the department was sent to Belleville at that time, and what was termed an investigation was made; but what the result of that investigation was I have so far been unable to ascertain. Sufficient to say that nothing was done in regard to the matter unless it was upon the recommendation of the engineer that the harbour at that point should be deepened; because since that time some dredging has been done in the harbour. Various opinions have been expressed by those more or less competent to express an opinion as to how relief could be afforded, and it would require a very small expenditure of money to relieve the difficulty if any of the schemes which have been proposed would do it. Various means have been used by the city of Belleville. For instance, they have endeavoured to clear out the dam which is formed by the anchor ice, by using dynamite; but, as the hon. member for Kent has just said, it is utterly useless to attempt any relief in that direction; we have tried that to our perfect satisfaction. I may add that the harbour of

Belleville, being a Dominion harbour controlled by commissioners appointed by this government, the municipal council of Belleville have no jurisdiction, and are not able to do anything; but I have no hesitation in stating that the municipality would be very glad to do anything in their power to assist the government in affording the relief which is so much needed. It is necessary, I think, that an inspection of the harbour and the conditions existing there should be made at this particular time, when the river is very high and the ice is there, and when an expert engineer could better determine what should be done than he could at a season of the year when these conditions were not present. I would therefore urge the hon. Minister of Public Works, as I did the First Minister when I called attention to this matter before, that an expert be sent to make a complete and thorough investigation of the conditions, with a view to seeing whether some remedy could not be applied that would bring permanent relief from these disastrous floods to that section of the country.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I sympathize very warmly with the desire expressed by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken that relief should in some way be afforded to the respective towns to which they have referred. But of course, involved in this question is the very important one as to whether or not this is a matter for the federal government to deal with, or whether it should not be dealt with by the municipalities interested or by the province. Under the terms of the British North America Act there are certain fairly well-defined lines as between federal and provincial jurisdiction. As I understand the matter, neither in the case of Chatham nor in that of Belleville is the question of navigation in any way involved; and if the federal government were to assume the burden of breaking the ice by means of ice-breakers or of dynamiting the ice in all cases where there is danger of flooding, its obligations would be vastly increased, because it would be called upon from one end of this Dominion to the other to endeavour to do the same thing in many localities where at the present time the people interested look on the matter as one for the local authorities to deal with.

Mr. PORTER. Would the hon. minister permit me to repeat what I said, that the harbour of Belleville, where the relief is to be worked out, is within the jurisdiction of this government. Neither the municipality nor the local government would have any control or jurisdiction over it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend seeks to draw a distinction between the case of Belleville and the case of Chatham. If this is a matter that belongs to the harbour commissioners, they would of course have the power to borrow money from the government, and whatever they borrowed would become a charge, I presume, under the terms of the Act by virtue of which they have been appointed. But my hon. friend is asking me as Minister of Public Works to undertake this. There is no appropriation made by parliament that I am aware of which would enable me to undertake the work at the present time, and, as I have pointed out, there is the broader question involved as to how far the federal government should undertake this work of local improvement or of guarding different towns and cities from the danger of flooding. In many of the provinces of Canada there are similar dangers which will increase as towns and villages are built up along the banks of rivers, and the demands upon the federal treasury would, I fear, become so large as to prove very burdensome.

Mr. PORTER. But the commissioners are officers under the hon. gentleman's department, are they not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they are appointed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It does seem to me that if this flooding can be prevented at a small cost, it would be better for the local authorities of Belleville and Chatham to take hold of the matter; and I am sure, so far as Belleville is concerned, that the harbour commissioners would assist the town council in doing whatever is reasonable and necessary in order to prevent the flooding of the locality. I do not say that I would not feel like recommending to the government that this should be done, but I do not think I ought to hold out hopes which might not be realized. It would be better for the local authorities to take the matter up in earnest, do the work which appears to be urgent and for which there is no appropriation at my disposal, and as regards future operations, the matter might be considered, but I hope the local authorities will not be induced by any words of mine to delay taking the steps necessary for the proper protection of property.

Mr. PORTER. Will the hon. gentleman send an expert from his department to look over the situation and recommend what ought to be done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will do that, and will be pleased to do the same with regard to the flooding of the Thames river at Chatham.

Mr. PORTER. And we will be given notice so that we may meet the expert?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would like to say a word——

Mr. SPEAKER. The only motion is to go in to Supply and the hon. member has already spoken. He has no right to speak again without the permission of the House.

Mr. CLEMENTS. With the permission of the House I would say that the hon. minister hardly realizes the seriousness of the situation. Those who know the vicinity will agree that there is no other position so serious in the Dominion as that particular stream, and that trouble arises eighteen miles from the city of Chatham. You can hardly expect the city to undertake that work. It is beyond doubt a federal matter. The stream is a navigable one and the government spends large sums at its mouth every year. When the Hon. Mr. Hyman had charge of the department he knew the seriousness of this matter as he lived in London, and he undertook to get a tug to break the ice up, but unfortunately he was unable to get a tug. We are in the same position to-day. We fear a very severe flood, and I am satisfied that $300,000 would not pay for the loss of property, let alone the loss of life.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does the hon. gentleman think the cost would be?

Mr. CLEMENTS. $500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is that too large an amount for the town of Chatham to spend for this very important work?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is a federal matter, and it is hardly fair that Chatham should be put to the expense. When you consider the vast amount spent on ice-breakers throughout the Dominion there ought to be no objection to an expenditure of $500 to $1,000 in that section to avert so serious a calamity.

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

To provide for the maintenance of vessels employed in patrolling the waters in the northern portion of Canada, also for establishing and maintaining police and customs ports on the mainland or islands as may be deemed necessary from time to time. $50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had considerable discussion over that item, and whether we succeeded in getting much information from the minister I do not know. But I am a trifle curious for another little bit of information. Will the minister tell us what he proposes to do with this steamer on the voyage which is to cost $50,000 ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The steamer will start as soon as the ice will permit—probably about the beginning of July. Then it will go north and patrol the islands along Bylot island, Lancaster sound and all those islands around where there are some whalers carrying on their operations. It is proposed to go there specially for the purpose of collecting the licenses and customs duties, also to get a little more west than they went last year. It is proposed to go and reclaim three islands which are lying a little more west than the Magdalen islands. I laid on the table the other day the map. Then if there is some time left they will go a little more north.

Mr. FOSTER. When the hon. gentleman speaks about reclaiming islands does he mean that these are islands which have never been under the jurisdiction of Canada? In what way does he reclaim them?

Mr. BRODEUR. We assert our jurisdiction by doing the same as was done with regard to the islands visited last summer.

Mr. FOSTER. What was that?

Mr. BRODEUR. We put a flag upon the islands to assert our jurisdiction over them and we collected fishing licenses from the whalers.

Mr. FOSTER. How long does a flag stay there? Does it have to be replaced every year?

Mr. BRODEUR. The flag, I understand, is covered. It may stand there a great number of years.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the remaining question is this: We are spending $50,000 to collect something from the sealers and some customs. I had the idea that wherever it was possible to collect customs you had a customs officer taken from the Northwest Mounted Police and established him permanently there. But is it intended every year to send this steamer to collect customs and licenses of whalers? Or is it the idea that we should have certain posts in those waters where you would have a customs officer, say a mounted policeman, as at present? It is a very expensive method of collecting a few whaling licenses and some customs to send out this boat at a cost of $50,000. How long is this thing to go on? Is that $50,000 expenditure every year to be perpetual?

Mr. BRODEUR. The idea will be to establish later on a permanent post at Pond's inlet. The permanent posts now in existence are in the Hudson bay, but we propose to get one further north.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the vessel carry some mounted policemen?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, for the station at the entrance to Lancaster Sound.

Mr. FOSTER. How long does the minister think this large expenditure for patrol in these waters will have to be carried on?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is hard to say. If we have one post at the mouth of Lancaster Sound, I suppose it will cover all that territory. But we may be obliged to go further north. It depends altogether upon where the whalers go. It is proposed to go further west than Melville island to see the American whalers, as information reaches the de-

partment that there are American whalers off these western islands.

Mr. FOSTER. I should think that as jurisdiction has been asserted for several years, and there can hardly be any question of the whalers being law-abiding people, the service might be more cheaply performed. If it is understood that the whalers are going into Canadian territory and must pay a license and also their customs dues, I should think there must be points which they must pass where they could be required, by regulation, to call and take out their license, or they could take them out before they start. Arrangements might be made by which whalers going into these northern waters would be supplied with licenses at Bedford or Gloucester, or wherever else they start from.

Mr. BRODEUR. But we shall always require a vessel to go there to provision the other posts. I suppose the posts in the Hudson bay might be provisioned, to a certain extent, by the liners, so to call them, which come from the other side. But some whalers have not been reached yet, and the main object is to reach them. Captain Bernier tells me that there are fifteen whalers that used to go through from the west. It is proposed to go there and collect licenses and customs dues from these whalers, and then start a permanent post at Lancaster Sound.

Mr. FOSTER. Where do they start from, as a rule?

Mr. BRODEUR. San Francisco. And they go through by Behring sea.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there no way of meeting them on the other side?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have no jurisdiction there. They remain in the Pacific ocean and Behring sea until they establish themselves in the islands of the north.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that the minister has had a new vessel constructed in the shipyards at Sorel. She is called the 'Rouville.' Is it intended to have this vessel engaged in patrolling the northern waters?

Mr. BRODEUR. No; for the time we shall use the 'Arctic.' The 'Rouville' has been used for the purpose of the service in the St. Lawrence, and we shall probably use her this year for the same service.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the vessel was specially constructed for the purpose of patrolling the northern waters. Can the minister tell us why she was found to be such a dismal failure?

Mr. BRODEUR. She is a very much smaller boat than the 'Arctic.' It was intended to use her between the posts established in Hudson bay. She is not large enough to go into the open ocean.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister might bring down a statement of the licenses issued and the customs dues collected.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think I have that here. The total amount collected for licenses is $500 from ten vessels. The amount of customs is $1,180.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the result of the trial of the 'Rouville'? I understood that she did not turn out the sort of vessel she was supposed to be. The minister might tell us the crew placed upon her, and also whether she was a success in the speed trial or not.

Mr. BRODEUR. She gave a speed of 9½ knots. She has been giving satisfaction so far as speed is concerned.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the crew?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was an ordinary crew, selected mostly from people from Sorel and Quebec.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is she in the service now?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not now during the winter.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is the 'Arctic' now?

Mr. BRODEUR. She is being overhauled at Quebec. The crew has been discharged, but the captain, the second mate and two watchmen are under pay.

Mr. BENNETT. Under the vote of expenses for schools of navigation—I was at home the other day, and I met Captain Cole of Collingwood, and I understood he was giving instructions to a class of mariners. Does the minister intend to establish a school for mariners at Midland like the one at Collingwood?

Mr. BRODEUR. The matter is under consideration.

Mr. BENNETT. There are a large number of mariners at Midland, and I think that place deserves a school as well as Collingwood.

Mr. ALCORN. Are there any islands or lands in those northern waters which the government has reason to believe are being claimed by the United States?

Mr. BRODEUR. We claim that all that territory forms part of Canada, and we are not aware that the American government is claiming any part of these lands as belonging to them. Many fishing boats are there, but they do not make any claim to the territory as belonging to the United States.

Mr. ALCORN. I understood that Captain Bernier had stated that some of the islands up there were claimed by some other power, I do not know what power.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no report to that effect in the department.

Mr. BENNETT. I moved for a return in reference to the payment of $3,900 last year to the Marine Towing and Wrecking Company, for removing the dredge 'Tasmania' at Lime Kiln Crossing, and the minister brought down the return to-day. There are two tenders, the Reed Wrecking Company at $6,000, and the Midland Wrecking Company at $3,900. I do not think the work was properly advertised. A few bills were issued which were posted in the customs houses. Any work for the removing of wrecks should be better advertised. I think notice in a Windsor newspaper would have called out more competition. In addition to the notice being placed in these custom houses, a bill was sent to each one of these two concerns as well. I think in future, having knowledge of the foxy character of these mariners, it would be better to advertise the work more publicly.

Mr. BRODEUR. I found the practice in the department was to advertise in this way for the removal of wrecks, that is to say, notices were sent out to the different ports and posters were distributed for the information of the public. I am told this practice has given general satisfaction. However in cases where the contract involves a large sum, it is proposed to advertise in newspapers as well.

Mr. FOSTER. The first item in 210 is contentious, that is, regarding the St. Lawrence ship channel; the minister might take the next one.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. member for North Toronto has asked me for a return showing the amount of money which has been spent for the board of each man on these steamers. This report has taken some time to prepare because we had to ascertain how long each of these vessels had been in the service. In the meantime there are the cases of the 'Minto,' the 'Stanley' and the 'Champlain' carrying passengers. I do not know how it would be possible to separate the amounts spent for the crew and the amount spent for passengers. If my hon. friend would be satisfied with the other vessels, without including these passenger vessels, the report might be ready immediately.

Mr. FOSTER. Bring down that part of it and the other later.

Purchase of yard property at Sorel (revote), $30,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Public Works Department have made a contract with the McCarthy estate for this property at Sorel. It was in the nature of a lease, while at the same time we had the right to purchase the property. But the matter has never been adjusted, and I am taking this vote to get it adjusted.

Mr. FOSTER. How many acres in the property?

Mr. BRODEUR. About 50 acres, all from the McCarthy estate.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there any middlemen in this purchase?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the negotiations are carried out directly between the director of the ship yard and the estate.

Amount required for permanent piers in Lake St. Peter, $100,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The intention is to spend that money in the construction of piers at Grondines and near Cap La Roche. We started the construction of these piers some years ago in Lake St. Peter and vicinity. We have built a large number of piers in Lake St. Peter near Port St. Francis and this year it is proposed to finish the pier at Port St. Francis and to build piers at Grondines, Batiscan and Cap à La Roche.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the purpose of these piers in the middle of Lake St. Peter?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are three piers which serve for the crossing from Nicolet to the middle of Lake St. Peter and then there are piers from the middle of Lake St. Peter to Stone Island.

Mr. FOSTER. For the crossing ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, we put lights upon these piers.

Mr. BENNETT. Where is the expenditure of last year to be found in the Auditor General's Report ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Fraser informs me that it was not kept separately in the Auditor General's Report last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does it appear in any statement of expenditure ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, at page P—87 under 'Nicolet, Que., $26,795.83.'

Mr. TAYLOR. But it is chargeable to 'construction of lights, aids to navigation, &c.' ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The auditor put all these expenditures under this heading. The money is taken out of the vote for 'construction of lights, aids to navigation, &c.' for Isle du Pads, page P—85 and Isle du Moine P—85.

Mr. TAYLOR. But my hon. friend will see that we voted a very large sum for 'construction of lights, aids to navigation, &c.' last year and this is chargeable against that fund.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, they are piers upon which we put lights.

Mr. TAYLOR. But this is all taken out of the vote for the construction of lights and aids to navigation. My hon. friend is asking for $100,000 when $120,000 was voted last year for the ship channel. There does

not appear to be any statement of the expenditure of that $120,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The auditor has not kept any special account for that purpose. He put all these expenditures under the heading of 'construction of lights and aids to navigation, &c.'

Mr. BENNETT. How many items of this kind were there last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We will start at the beginning and go through the list as follows : Gallia Bay, P—83 ; Gentilly, P—83 ; Isle au Raisins, P—84 ; Isle des Barques, P—84; Isle du Moine, P—85, Isle du Pads, P—85, and Nicolet, P—87. These are all charged against the vote for the construction of piers in Lake St. Peter.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these built by tender and contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Most of this work is done by day's labour. Colonel Anderson is strongly of the opinion that it is less expensive for us to do it in that way than by contract. It is in the St. Lawrence and the stone, cement and all the materials have to be carried out from the mainland to these works. This requires boats, we have our own equipment for it and it is considered to be less expensive to do it in that way.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that Colonel Anderson's opinion ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the material bought by public tender ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, the cement and stone are bought by tender.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Estimates he will see that $1,360,000 was voted last year for the construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation including apparatus, submarine signals and providing suitable boats for carrying on construction work in the gulf of St. Lawrence and elsewhere in the Dominion. In the Auditor General's Report, at page P—78 and following on to page P—99, will be found the accounts in which are included these wharfs or piers that the hon. gentleman refers to. The expenditure was $1,162,000, so that there was a surplus left from that vote, not interfering with the $120,000 which was voted in the other items.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think my friend has taken the vote for 1908-9. This money was expended during 1906-7 and I do not think he will find it under the heading of 'construction of lighthouses' of that we had a vote of $1,162,000 in 1906-7. We took a vote for these special piers which are mentioned under the 'St. Lawrence ship channel' but I see that the Auditor General has put all the expenditures together in his report.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the whole thing only amounts to $1,162,000 up to the 31st March, 1907.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think we had a vote of $1,162,000 for the construction of lights for the year 1906-7.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is for 1907-8.

Mr. BENNETT. You have a tug called the 'Hackett' hired at $25 a day, amounting, for 62 days, to $1,550. What is the size of that tug?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am told she is about 90 feet long.

Mr. BENNETT. That seems an enormous price to pay for a tug. Are tenders invited for furnishing tugs?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Fraser tells me that this is the cheapest tug he could get. She is a very powerful boat, and we have a regular contract with the owners.

Amount required to provide for the completion and construction of dredging plant for the River St. Lawrence from Montreal to Father Point, $213,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is proposed with this vote to construct a new dredge to be used at Cap à la Roche, where we have been dredging for some time. This will be a more powerful dredge to cope with the material there, which is shale rock.

Mr. FOSTER. How much will she cost?

Mr. BRODEUR. $150,000. She is being built in our own yards at Sorel.

Mr. BENNETT. We purchased a dredge called the 'Galveston' for $150,000 ; what about the 'Galveston'?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Galveston' was built in Europe and sent to Galveston, Texas, but was not suitable for the work on the Mississippi. She was almost new, and we got her for $140,000, which was much less than cost. She was purchased by Mr. Cowie, our chief engineer, who went to Galveston for that purpose. She is a suction dredge, and has been giving the best satisfaction we have ever had from a dredge. I am told she has done as much as 10,000 yards a day in coarse sand.

Mr. BENNETT. You had better get a dredge like that on the Georgian bay.

Mr. FOSTER. The new dredge is to cost $150,000 ; what do you do with the rest of the vote?

Mr. BRODEUR. A stone lifter will be built at Sorel, which will cost about $30,000, and then there is the expense of running the dredge for a portion of the year if she is completed in time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Between last year and this you got a vote for $400,000 for this purpose.

Mr. BRODEUR. We completed a vote last year which is to be used for dredging at Beaujeu Bank, opposite Montmagny. We have been requested by the Canadian Pacific Railway and by the Shipping Federation to dredge this place, which has only 22 feet of water at low tide, and which is the only part of the St. Lawrence below Quebec which has not 30 feet. The dredging will be one mile in length and one thousand feet in width.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the 'Galveston' throw out soft sand?

Mr. BRODEUR. Soft sand and soft clay, but the material at Beaujeu Bank is coarse sand. At this place the salt water meets the fresh water, and a deposit of sand is constantly being made, and it became necessary to dredge there in order to obtain a depth of 30 feet.

Mr. FOSTER. Where do you put the sand that you take out?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is put towards the shore of Montmagny, deposited there by the dredge itself.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this similar material to what is taken out at Port Arthur and Fort William?

Mr. BRODEUR. The officer does not know the material taken out at Port Arthur and Fort William.

Mr. BENNETT. As I understand, it is soft clay and sand, and at 10 cents a yard this boat would do $10,000 worth of work per day.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think a dredge like the 'Galveston' could dredge there; it is clay. It could be done perhaps with the 'Tarte,' which has a knife to cut the material and raise it by suction.

Mr. BENNETT. How much will the 'Tarte' lift per day?

Mr. BRODEUR. 30,000 yards.

Lighthouses and coast service—salaries and allowances to light keepers, $300,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The increase is for the purpose of giving the ordinary increases to the light-keepers. I may say that I have given instructions to have a classification of all the lighthouses in the country. I found that there was no regular system of fixing or increasing salaries. Colonel Anderson is now working on that, and it will soon be completed. We have officers from different parts of the country coming here and conferring as to how that classification should be made.

Mr. TAYLOR. If my hon. friend will look at what this service cost previous to the introduction of this new lighting system, he will find that he is paying much more now. We had the promise from the minister that when the acetylene gas service was established there would be a very large saving, because the lightkeepers would be practically dispensed with altogether. Yet the hon. gentleman has practically the same staff now as he had before. The only lightkeepers in the whole system who have been suspended, so far as I know, have been three or four in the Thousand islands.

Mr. BRODEUR. There must be some misunderstanding on that point, because we cannot dispense with light keepers. There has never been any proposition for getting rid of them. They are an absolute necessity.

Mr. BENNETT. When the matter was discussed both by Mr. Prefontaine and Mr. Sutherland it was plainly held out that where three or four lighthouses were contiguous one man would be able to do the work of three or four men. Now it turns out that all these lightkeepers are going to be kept. I heard that some of these lights in the St. Lawrence went out owing to the fact that the lightkeepers left the lighthouses for weeks at a time. Under the oil system the men had to stay at the lighthouses day and night. The western light, the most important in the whole of Georgian bay, is lighted with carbide.

Mr. BRODEUR. At one time it was proposed to instal that system in some parts of the St. Lawrence between Kingston and Montreal, but in the other parts of the country we are having the same light keepers we have always had. I understand, however, that at certain places between Montreal and Kingston three or four lights have been grouped together and one man has been put in charge of them.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon gentleman's predecessor promised that the lighthouses would not cost as much as formerly, but we have just as many as ever. On the route between Kingston and Montreal we have the 'Scout' with a big crew and the 'Reserve' with another big crew and a tug with a floating blacksmith shop looking after the same number of lights and the same number of lighthouses. This is simply for the purpose of giving an opportunity to the government to purchase from some of their own ministers who are stockholders in the manufacture of acetylene gas, and put the country to these millions of dollars of expense. And the system is no better than the coal oil system. There are just as many accidents as under the old system. In fact, the mariners say that the acetylene gas is not as good in summer as the coal oil because in some places the men do not pay attention to the lights. They are covered with flies and there is no one to look after them.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is certainly labouring under a false impression.

He is referring to the lighthouse keepers on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. TAYLOR. Between Montreal and Kingston.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that the number of lightkeepers has been decreased.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, three or four put off.

Mr. BRODEUR. There were 35 stations from Montreal to Kingston in 1895-6 and now there are only 25. On the other hand, there were 44 lights then and now there are 50, while the keepers' salaries were $8,090 in 1896 and now they are only $5,930. In the country generally we have the same lightkeepers and we have been obliged to increase largely, at the request of the marine associations, the number of lighthouses and gas buoys also. The system of acetylene gas buoys has given great satisfaction. My hon. friend may consult the marine association, the shipping federation and the Canadian Pacific Railway and he will find that all mariners without exception, are pressing loudly on the government for the installation of new lights. We have increased very materially the number of lights, and we are carefully studying all the requests made to us for these improvements to navigation. If my hon. friend will read the papers to-night he will find that our system of gas buoys is now being adopted by the British authorities in the Mersey. Canada was the first to adopt that system and now it is being adopted by so high an authority as the Mersey Dock Association. The American government have purchased acetylene gas buoys for New York and some other ports of the United States. Brazil government, the Argentine Republic, and some other countries, have been purchasing these buoys manufactured in Canada. The government should be commended because it has been the first to instal in Canada this automatic gas system.

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) Must I understand that Colonel Anderson is employed only on the classification of the lighthouses; or is he not also looking after the classification of the salaries which is going on presently in the department?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) The salaries will necessarily be fixed according to the classification of the lighthouses. The intention of the department is to classify all the lighthouses according to their importance, the locality and the means of access. Once this classification is established the salary of the guardian will be fixed according to the importance of the lighthouses.

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) I would not like to do anything that would look as obstruction, but the hon. the minister knows the interests I am taking towards these public servants. I would like to know if he really believes that in the near future—say for during the next season of navigation—he will be in a position to increase the salaries of these employees.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) My hon. friend will see that we have an increase of $15,000 in the estimates of this year. This sum will be employed for the increase of the salaries as soon as the classification will be finished.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. I would draw the attention of the minister to the condition of some of the lights on the north shore of Lake Erie. I have referred to Port Stanley. Up to a few years ago the light filled the bill there all right, but within the last few years the village has installed an electric light plant and since then the electric lights are stronger than the lighthouse lights, and I am informed by captains that it is consequently very difficult to make Port Stanley harbour, as it is very difficult for them to distinguish this navigation light from the other lights. There are hills around Port Stanley and the electric lights are stronger than the old lights. The light at Port Stanley should be made stronger as it is a very difficult harbour to make on a dark night.

Mr. BRODEUR. This has been brought to the attention of the department and will be referred to the lighthouse board for consideration.

Mr. LAW. Is this vote large enough to allow of a general increase to the lighthouse keepers?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, it is proposed to give increases of salaries to the lighthouse keepers. Last year there was an amount voted for that purpose, but the classification of the lights was not completed. As soon as it is completed, we will give an increase of salary to a large number of lighthouse keepers.

Mr. LAW. If there is any class in the Dominion in the employ of the government who require an increase in salary it is the lighthouse keepers. Complaints no doubt are sent to the department, as they are made to me by the lighthouse keepers in my county. I know of cases where men are getting $325 a year, living away from the mainland with large families on this mere pittance. It is a disgrace to the government and to the department. One of the most important lights on our coast is at Port Yarmouth. That light requires the services of two skilled engineers besides a helper, and all they get among them is the sum of $800. When it comes to dividing $800 among two men and a helper, that leaves a very small salary to the lighthouse keeper.

Mr. SINCLAIR. If the lighthouse keepers on the coast in my constituency receiv-

ed such princely salaries as $300, they would think themselves fortunate. Some are paid $150 and a great many $200 or $250. It is not creditable to the department or to the country that we have allowed this to go on for so many years. Many of these men are retired sea captains, reliable men, who give all their time to our business. These men are called to task for the slightest neglect of duty, notwithstanding that they are paid such miserable salaries. I have drawn this matter to the attention of the department a number of times. I am glad that my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Law) has spoken as he has done. I hope another year will not be allowed to pass without something being done to improve the position of these faithful men who are engaged in such important duties. With regard to the progress made in the lighting service, I must bear testimony to what the minister has said. I think we have every reason to be proud of the splendid work of the department in lighting the coast. You need no better illustration of this than to go up the St. Lawrence on our side of the channel from Prescott to Kingston, and then take the American side on the way down. You will be struck with the improvement we have made over our neighbours in lights. The gas buoys along the coast of Nova Scotia, in my constituency and in the constituency of Halifax, are most useful and most acceptable to the mariner.

Mr. TAYLOR. In view of what my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) has said about the St. Lawrence, how does he explain the fact that twenty vessels go down the American side for one that goes down our side?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not wish to delay the vote, but merely to add my voice to those that have already been heard in favour of at least some increase in the salaries of the lighthouse keepers. At the same time, I would like to warn the minister——

Mr. FOSTER. If this matter is to be discussed, it would be better to adjourn now. Evidently hon. gentlemen are interested in the matter and wish to spend time upon it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I have very little to say. I do not know what classification of lightkeepers the minister has in his mind, but I understood that it was based on the idea of giving salaries according to the power of the light which is to be kept. I want to impress upon the minister the fact that the keeper of the small light, owing to the location, may have just as important duties as the keeper of the powerful light, and he has to spend his time in our service in just the same way.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.30 a.m., Wednesday.

Mr. SINCLAIR.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 11, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

### QUESTIONS.

### COST OF HOUSE OF COMMONS AND SENATE.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Blain—asked :

What was the cost, outside of the indemnity, of the House of Commons and Senate, respectively, for the sessions of 1905 and 1906-7?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

No rule, or standard, exists by which the sessional expenses of parliament can be distinguished from the annual.

Speaking generally, it may be said that all the parliamentary expenses of the year are for the purposes of the session.

The following presents an estimate of the cost, outside of the indemnity, of the House of Commons during the sessions 1905 and 1906-7 respectively, based upon a pro rata calculation and a deduction of the charges which are deemed to be of a permanent nature :—

| — | Sessions. | |
|---|---|---|
| | January 11 to July 20, 1905. | November 20 to April 27, 1906-7. |
| | $ | $ |
| Speaker | 4,000 00 | 4,000 00 |
| Deputy Speaker | 2,000 00 | 2,000 00 |
| Permanent Officers' salaries | 41,753 40 | 34,867 33 |
| Indexing Journals | 1,400 00 | |
| Committees, Sessional and Extra Clerks, &c. | 42,099 28 | 36,171 97 |
| Contingencies | 42,922 21 | 31,240 48 |
| Publishing debates | 90,999 50 | 59,644 37 |
| Sergeant at Arms branch (including the permanent messengers and charwomen, sessional and extra charwomen, pages, servants, messengers and attendants and other items | 64,445 02 | 42,967 31 |
| Total | $289,619 41 | $210,891 46 |

The above statement does not include expenditure by the Department of Public Works, nor the printing of parliament.

The inquiry as to cost of Senate will stand as notice of motion.

## SASKATCHEWAN VALLEY LAND COMPANY.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Had the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company fulfilled all the conditions on or before the 24th May, 1907, entitling them to purchase 250,000 acres of even-numbered sections in accordance with their contract with the government ?

2. If not, in respect of how many acres were the conditions fulfilled at that date.

3. Have all the lands they were entitled to purchase at that date been selected, and have patents been issued for them? If not, what was the cause of the delay?

4. Have they earned, selected, or been allowed to purchase any even-numbered sections since the 24th May, 1907? If so, how many?

5. Has the whole land grant of 860,000 acres, more or less, acquired from the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company been selected and patents issued to the company? If not, how much still remains to be patented, and what is the reason of the delay?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Yes, but patents have not been issued for all lands selected, pending the final adjustment of the account.

4. No.

5. All the lands selected by the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, Limited, on account of the area assigned to it by the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company have been patented except one parcel which is selected. The area yet due the company is 251·19 acres. This small area has been held pending the final adjustment.

## POST OFFICES BUILT SINCE 1904.

Mr. VERVILLE asked :

1. How many post offices have been built since 1904?

2. In what places?

3. What has been the cost of each one of them?

4. (a) How many are now under construction; (b and c) in what places, and at what cost?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Ten.

2 and 3.

| Name. | Expenditure. |
|---|---|
| Antigonish, N.S. | $ 7,915 11 |
| Canso, N.S. | 20,690 50 |
| Souris, P.E.I. | 19,740 07 |
| Hawkesbury, Ont. | 22,230 11 |
| Sandwich, Ont. | 20,043 08 |
| Toronto, Postal Station 'F' | 114,108 46 |
| Wingham, Ont. | 31,860 27 |
| Calgary, Alta. | 106,861 58 |
| Moosejaw, Sask. | 39,859 35 |
| Prince Albert, Sask. | 103,965 74 |

4. (a) Thirty-one.

(b) and (c).

| Name. | Amount of Contract. |
|---|---|
| Chicoutimi, P.Q. | $ 22,472 00 |
| Lévis, P.Q. | 22,000 00 |
| Winnipeg, Man. | 529,485 00 |
| Inverness, N.S. | 14,559 00 |
| Iberville, P.Q. | 8,150 00 |
| Montreal, Postal Station 'B' | 57,500 00 |
| Montmagny, P.Q. | 5,725 00 |
| Nicolet, P.Q. | 14,500 00 |
| St. Johns, P.Q. | 28,000 00 |
| North Bay, Ont. | 33,879 00 |
| St. Marys, Ont. | 22,500 00 |
| Medicine Hat, Alta. | 25,550 00 |
| Regina, Sask. | 162,362 00 |
| Vancouver, B.C. | 434,500 00 |
| Bridgewater, N.S. | 23,500 00 |
| Glace Bay, N.S. | 34,500 00 |
| Shelburne, N.S. | 22,500 00 |
| Westville, N.S. | 12,997 00 |
| Lachute, P.Q. | 14,971 00 |
| Montreal, P.Q. | 487,537 00 |
| Kincardine, Ont. | 17,700 00 |
| Owen Sound, Ont. | 63,424 00 |
| St. Boniface, Man. | 20,255 00 |
| Selkirk, Man | 24,000 00 |
| Winnipeg, Postal Station 'B' | 46,500 00 |
| Saskatoon, Sask. | 64,500 00 |
| Edmonton, Alta. | 214,552 00 |
| Cumberland, B.C. | 25,000 00 |
| Fernie, B.C. | 43,750 00 |
| Simcoe, Ont. | 25,400 00 |
| Maple Creek, Sask | 20,600 00 |

## HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. LAKE asked :

In respect of the northwest quarter of section 35, township 31, range 6, west of second meridian, what is the history of this land in regard to homestead entry, applications for cancellation, sales or otherwise, and the names, dates, considerations, &c.?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

The northwest quarter of section 35, township 31, range 6, west of the 2nd meridian was homesteaded by Dimitry Soochochen, a Doukhobor, 27th April, 1903; abandoned by Dimitry Soochochen 27th June, 1905.

Halfbreed scrip located on south half of the quarter by Annie Isabel Sinclair 5th August, 1905. Assigned by her to M. O. Ramsland and patented to him 26th February, 1906.

North half of the quarter homesteaded by M. O. Ramsland 5th August, 1905.

North half abandoned by M. O. Ramsland 29th April, 1907.

Half-breed scrip of Moses Berger located on north half of the quarter 7th June, 1907. Assigned to M. O. Ramsland and patented to him 19th August, 1907.

ROBBINS IRRIGATION COMPANY.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What amount has been expended to date on works erected and established by the Robbins Irrigation Company under the provisions of the Northwest Irrigation Act?

2. Has the said company completed purchase and taken title of any part of the lands applied for? If so, to what extent?

3. Have letters patent been issued to the said company or to any person on its behalf for any portion of the said lands? If so, to what extent?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The government has not been officially notified as to the expenditures made in construction work by the Robbins Irrigation Company. An inquiry of the Southern Alberta Land Company as to the nature of work done brought the reply that the company had spent $55,000 to date in surveys and other work.

2. No.

3. No.

FRENCH TREATY—SHIPMENTS FROM CANADA.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Under article viii. of the French Treaty of 1907, will goods, the product of Canada and granted the benefit of the French minimum tariff, shipped from Canada to France via Liverpool or Glasgow, be subject to the 'surtaxes d'entrepot,' provided by the French customs law, against products of a non-European country imported into France from a European country?

2. Will it be possible, under article viii. of said treaty of 1907, for goods the product of Canada, which enjoy the benefit of the French minimum tariff, as provided in the treaty, to conserve the benefit of the said tariff, even if shipped from Canada to France through the port of a country enjoying in part only the benefits of the French minimum tariff?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. The surtaxes d'entrepôt under the French Customs law apply to Canadian goods shipped from ports in the United Kingdom to France. But such products of Canada as are granted the benefits of the French minimum tariff under the Franco-Canadian Convention of 1907, would not be subject to such surtaxes if carried by ship from a Canadian port to a port in France via a port in the United Kingdom without transhipment in the United Kingdom.

2. In the opinion of the government, the products so shipped would not be entitled to the benefits of the treaty. In the first part of Article viii. respecting the conveyance of French products to Canada by way of a country enjoying the Intermediate Tariff, we hold that the words 'Intermediate Tariff' mean the whole Intermediate Tariff, and not a part of it. The same view would necessarily apply to the second part of the article respecting the conveyance of Canadian products to France by way of a country enjoying the French Minimum Tariff. The words 'French Minimum Tariff' would in this view mean the whole minimum tariff, and not a part of it.

MONTREAL DIRECTORY.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Monk—asked :

Why is not the Montreal Directory for the present year in the Parliamentary Library, as are those of the other cities?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

I am informed by the clerk of the House that the Montreal Directory for 1907-8 is to be found in the library.

LAW AGENTS FOR GOVERNMENT, P.E.I.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Who were law agents for the Dominion government in the years 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907, in Prince Edward Island?

2. Were they paid by salary or fees?

3. How much did each receive for the years 1906 and 1907 for salary or fees?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. F. L. Haszard, K.C., of Charlottetown. Occasionally other lawyers have been retained in special cases or a special class of cases.

2. By fees.

3. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, $2,503.06 ; for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1907, $109.18. The amounts paid to the other lawyers retained in Prince Edward Island will be found in the Auditor General's Reports collected under the heading of 'Legal expenses and taxed costs.'

DREDGING THE SPANISH RIVER.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What amount of money has been expended by the government in taking levels, preparing plans and obtaining information, regarding the dredging at the mouth of and along Spanish river?

2. What is the estimated amount required to complete the work according to plans ?

3. Has the work been commenced? If not, when is it the intention of the government to commence it, and how long will it take to complete it?

4. What representations by public bodies were made to the government as to the necessity for this work, and have any counter representations been made with respect thereto? If so, by whom, when, and how have they been dealt with?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $752.62.

2. $52,347.50.

3. (a) No.

(b) The matter is receiving the careful attention of the department, but I am un-

able to state when the work will be commenced.

(c) A year at least will be required to complete work according to what is proposed.

4. Several petitions presented in favour of doing the work, but no counter petitions received.

EMBARGO ON CANADIAN HAY AND STRAW.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. Is the government aware that the British parliament has placed an embargo on Canadian hay and straw?

2. If the government is advised regarding this embargo, what action has it taken in regard to the matter?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (for the Minister of Agriculture). No. The Minister of Agriculture cabled the High Commissioner on the 5th instant for information respecting the press report on the subject. An answer was received on the 6th instant stating that the importation of hay and straw from many countries had been prohibited but that Canada was not included in the list of countries scheduled. The High Commissioner was assured of this by the board of agriculture.

JAMES WAUGH, IMMIGRATION AGENT.

Mr. CLEMENTS—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has James Waugh, immigration agent, refunded to the Interior Department $556 which the government have demanded ?

2. If not, is it the intention of the government to take action for the recovery of the money? If not, what does the government intend doing in the matter?

Hon FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. No.

2. If such action becomes necessary, yes.

O. B. SMITH, WINNIPEG.

Mr. STAPLES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Is Mr. O. B. Smith, of the city of Winnipeg, employed by the government?

2. If so, in what capacity, and what remuneration has he received for his services?

3. What are the several items of the total amount he has received ?

4. How long has he been in the employment of the government?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). As far as the Department of the Interior is concerned,

No.

As far as the Department of Indian Affairs is concerned,

No.

PROFESSOR SHORTT AND INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. In what cases has Professor Shortt acted as chairman under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act?

2. What amount of money has he received for such service?

3. What is his per diem allowance?

4. Is he an employee of the Dominion government?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour) :

1. (a) Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and machinists; (b) Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and locomotive engineers; (c) Canadian Pacific Railway and railway telegraphers; (d) Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and railway telegraphers; (e) Canadian Northern Railway Company and firemen, enginemen and hostlers; (f) Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and carmen; (g) McKinley-Darragh Mining Company of Cobalt, Ont., and employees; (h) Dominion Coal Company of Dominion, C.B., and employees.

2. Fees as chairman, $640; expenses, $248.45.

3. Twenty dollars per day, as provided by section 51 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

4. No.

While the above sums represent the amounts paid Professor Shortt for services and expenses in connection with various boards, there remain yet unpaid a number of accounts relating to recent boards. It should be mentioned also that Prof. Shortt accepted the chairmanship of several of these boards only on the urgent desire either of the parties concerned or of the Minister of Labour, the work imposed on him by successive investigations having proved a serious interference with his normal duties and engagements.

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What railroad companies have been permitted to satisfy their grants by the selection within the area embracing townships 24 to 36, inclusive, ranges 9 to 29, west of the 3rd meridian ?

2. What is the quantity of land granted to each of said railroad companies within this area?

3. Have any other companies, besides railway companies, been permitted to purchase, or otherwise obtain, odd-numbered sections, exclusive of school lands, within said area? If so, what are the names of the companies, and the number of acres granted?

Hon FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Souris branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway permitted to select in townships 35 and 36, ranges 9 to 29 west of the 3rd meridian.

Canadian Northern Railway permitted to select in townships 27 to 34 inclusive, ranges 9 to 29 west of the 3rd meridian.

Manitoba and South Eastern Railway

permitted to select in townships 27 to 34 inclusive, ranges 9 to 29 west of the 3rd meridian; townships 24, 25 and 26, ranges 28 and 29 W. 3rd, and townships 35 and 36, ranges 13 to 28 inclusive, W. 3rd.

2. Souris branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway did not select any land.

Canadian Northern Railway selected 888,479·04 acres.

Manitoba and South Eastern Railway selected 235,371·10 acres.

3. The Grand Trunk Pacific Town and Development Company has been permitted to purchase all 31, township 35, range 14, W. 3rd; S.W.¼ 5, township 36, range 14, W. 3rd; all 1, township 36, range 15, W. 3rd—1,440 acres.

CENTRAL RAILWAY OF CANADA.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. Has parliament granted a charter to a company known as the Central Railway of Canada for a line from Hawkesbury to Ottawa?

2. Did the said company make a deposit with the government at the time when the charter was granted? If so, for what amount?

3. Is this guarantee sum still intact in the hands of the government?

4. Is the government aware that many persons engaged upon survey and other work in connection with said railroad have not yet been paid for services rendered?

5. Is it the intention of the government to use any portion of the guarantee fund for the payment of legitimate claims against the said company?

6. Under what Act has the company secured its rights of construction?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes.

2. Yes; $25,000.

3. Yes.

4. Yes, several claims have been sent in.

5. No, there is no way at present by which this money can be retained or dealt with by the government to pay claims against the company.

6. Section 6 of 4 and 5 Edward VII., chapter 79.

DREDGING IN HOLLAND RIVER.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

Who was the divisional engineer, and who was his assistant, by whom dredging operations on the Holland river, Trent Valley Canal, were supervised?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). A. T. Kerr was divisional engineer and his assistant was E. E. Malone. The latter's services were not required very much, as the work in connection with the dredging was looked after by Mr. Kerr himself.

SOREL PAY-ROLLS, &c.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. Was an inquiry instituted by the Department of Marine within the past two years as to certain suspected improprieties at Sorel in the years 1905, 1906, 1907, in the matter of bogus or padded pay-rolls and non-delivery of broken stone, cement and other articles by contractors or others?

2. If there was an inquiry, who conducted same, and has a report of findings been made to the department? If such report was made, when was it received by the department?

3. Did counsel appear on such investigation representing any of the parties? If so, who were such persons and whom did they represent?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes. An order in council was passed on the 14th February, 1907, ordering an investigation into irregularities complained of respecting pay-rolls and measurement of stone. No irregularity respecting cement or other articles has ever been brought to my attention.

2. Mr. Victor Gaudet, of Montreal, barrister. No report yet made.

3. No.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. JUSTICE DRYSDALE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. When did the Hon. Arthur Drysdale accept the appointment of Justice of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia?

2. Was his acceptance orally or by telegram or letter, and what was the date of such letter or telegram?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. When sworn in as such justice.

2. Only by taking the oath of office.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not hear the date given in the answer to this question. Would the minister kindly repeat it?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It is a matter of public record, but there is no record of it in the Department of Justice.

LAW AGENTS IN MARITIME PROVINCES.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

1. Who are the law agents of the Dominion government in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island?

2. What is the residence of each such agent, and the amount of his salary or remuneration?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. R. T. MacIlreith for Nova Scotia.

There is no standing agent of the Minister of Justice for the province of New Brunswick; lawyers are retained for any legal work there may be, as from time to time occasion may arise.

F. I. Haszard, K.C., for Prince Edward Island, though occasionally other lawyers are retained in special matters.

2. Mr. MacIlreith resides at Halifax and Mr. Haszard at Charlottetown.

All agents of the Minister of Justice are paid entirely by fees, and the amounts so

paid are published annually in the Auditor General's Report under the head of 'Legal expenses and taxed costs.'

## JOHN CAMERON, HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Was John Cameron, of Edmonton, homestead inspector, employed during the fall of 1902, upon the work of inspecting timber on the headwaters of the North Saskatchewan river or its tributaries?
2. If so, between what dates was he so employed?
3. What were his instructions, and what was the nature of his report?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.
2. Between the 4th and 21st November.
3. He was instructed by the superintendent of forestry to make a visit to the Upper Saskatchewan, especially in the neighbourhood of the Brazeau river, and to report as to the approximate quantity, quality and size of the timber near the mouth of the Brazeau, with a view to determining whether or not it was mature timber that should be sold. His report was to the effect that he did not see any use of reserving any of the timber in that section of country, as the belt of timber at and near the Brazeau river was completely surrounded by a belt of fire killed and dry timber which would seriously endanger the green timber in case of fire. He suggested that all the timber in that section of country should be put on the market so soon as applications were received for the same.

## CANADIAN AGENT IN JAPAN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, as the orders of the day are not likely to be reached to-day, might I be permitted at this stage to inquire whether or not Mr. R. L. Drury, Victoria, B.C., has been appointed as representative of the Canadian government in Japan in connection with the agreement arranged by Hon. R. Lemieux regarding emigration to Canada ; and, if so, whether or not the statement in the press that he will discharge his duties under Sir Claude Macdonald is correct?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Drury has been appointed agent in Japan. I will bring down the order in council.

## IMMIGRATION BONUSES.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to give notice that the first time the House is moved into Committee of Supply, and I can conveniently do so, I will move in amendment a motion having for its object the abolition of the bonus or bounty system in regard to immigration.



## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—COMMISSIONERS FOR THE PLAINS OF ABRAHAM.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE (Montmagny). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, may I be permitted to raise a question of privilege? An announcement appeared in 'Le Canada,' to the effect that during the debate on the Quebec tercentenary celebration, I had opposed the appointment, or rather that I had expressed a wish to see French Canadians only appointed as commissioners for the reclamation of the Plains of Abraham.

'Le Canada' has since thought fit to correct its statement, but, in my opinion, has made matters rather worse. Here is what I read in its report of our proceedings, issued this morning:

> We also note a protest voiced by Mr. Lavergne against a report published in the Saturday number of 'Le Canada,' wherein he is made to say that the commissioners appointed for the Plains of Abraham should be French Canadians. Our sessional letters are not supposed to give a verbatim report of the speeches delivered; their general purport only is indicated.
>
> Mr. Lavergne having taken exception to the contemplated appointment of Toronto people, as announced by the Prime Minister, it was in harmony with his speech and his theories to write what we have written. It is for Mr. Lavergne and not for us to set matters right, and that is what he has just done.

I had not requested the appointment of French Canadian commissioners only. Neither did I take exception to the appointment of commissioners hailing from Toronto. The statement made by 'Le Canada,' as usual, is incorrect. I do not object in any way to the appointment of commissioners from Toronto or elsewhere, provided they are Canadians.

What I did object to was the appointment in Canada of foreign commissioners, who might come here from the four corners of the earth.

## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE — MR. PRINGLE, M.P.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Stormont). I beg to bring to the attention of the House, as a question of privilege, an article which I find in 'The Financial Post of Canada' with reference to myself. The article reads in part :

> The 'Post' has been asked why, as a financial and banking paper, it has not devoted more attention to the Bill introduced by Mr. R. A. Pringle, member for Stormont, in the Dominion House of Commons, providing for a revision of the Bank Act. In view of the heavy pressure which has been laid on our space during the past two months we did not consider the matter of sufficient importance to warrant any extended notice and contented ourselves with pointing out that

the decennial period was the proper time for a revision of the Bank Act, and as the charters expire in 1911, any changes in the Bank Act could then be most effectually made after all the miasmata that gather around a panic year had been cleared away and the lessons had been fully conned by the light of time and experience. Hon. W. S. Fielding disposed of the matter by expressing similar views.

Whatever value Mr. Pringle's informing speech may have had was destroyed by a malicious attack on one of our leading banking institutions. In his conclusion Mr. Pringle said : 'It will be stated that Mr. Pringle has attacked the banks. Mr. Pringle has not attacked the banks.

On this point we must take issue with Mr. Pringle, and state the fact that he has been most successful in his 'attacks' on two banks now in process of liquidation. Acting in a fiduciary capacity he 'attacked' the Ontario Bank so successfully that he secured a very large sum of money at the Cornwall branch, and this money (some tens of thousands) has never been repaid. His 'attack' on the Sovereign Bank was also successful. If Mr. Pringle had confined himself to theoretical 'attacks' on the floor of the House, the same exception could not have been taken to his remarks. A proposal to reform the banking system, &c.

Now, in regard to the first portion of this article which says that I made a malicious attack on one of our leading banks, I say it is absolutely false. I did take the language of the report of the Royal Insurance Commission which dealt with the gambling of a certain bank in this country; I did say that the bank was shown by that report to be the biggest gambling institution in Canada. I have nothing to withdraw. It is not my attack ; it is the attack of the gentlemen who composed that commission and who were appointed by this government and whom I presume did their duty well and fearlessly. And if you take up the evidence upon which they based their attack you can come to no other conclusion than that they let the Hon. George A. Cox and the Canadian Bank of Commerce down just as lightly as it was possible for these commissioners to let them down. But, Sir, because I as a member of this House dared to mention what is in evidence, to mention the report of this Royal Insurance Commission, I am subjected to attack by this organ which I have no doubt is controlled largely by these interests.

Now, then, in regard to the other portion of the article I do not intend to take up one minute of the time of the House. That is a matter that I will settle with the publishers of this journal in a civil action, and the moment my attention was called to it I instructed my solicitor to take the proper proceedings to bring that matter into the courts of this land and I will abide by their decision. But I will say that the statement is absolutely untrue. It is false and it is libellous, and I am prepared to take the necessary legal steps to put myself in a proper position before the country in regard to that. I am not thin-skinned, I like criticism, fair criticism, reasonable criticism; I don't care how severe the criticism is, but I will not stand under any such imputation as is found in that paper. The 'Monetary Times,' published on the 7th day of March, again referring to this discussion, says :

Now he falls foul of a particular bank. This is the Canadian Bank of Commerce, which he terms the most speculative bank in Canada. If his purpose be to tickle the ears of the groundlings with this sort of invective, he may succeed in getting some ignorant folk to follow him. But intelligent people have too much confidence in the man who has so long been general manager, and is now president of that institution, to approve of such ill-founded criticism.

Let me say that I said no word against Byron E. Walker except the word that is in the Insurance Report : That Byron E. Walker was handled by the Hon. George A. Cox; that he was directed to buy 1,000 shares of this stock at one time and 1,000 shares of this stock at another time; that he had dipped down into the trust funds of the Bank of Commerce and bought it at the bidding of the Hon. George A. Cox, and it is there in the report of the Insurance Commission, that Byron E. Walker got his bank, the Canadian Bank of Commerce, to join in a pool for the purpose of speculating in these stocks in which nearly $3,000,000 was placed. I will stand absolutely upon the evidence, and if any hon. gentleman takes this volume 2 of the evidence taken before the Royal Insurance Commission he will find what is stated by these commissioners is absolutely true. Now, then, Sir, in another portion of their paper —and they are at least giving me some notoriety by these articles—they say :

Mr. Pringle was at times vitriolic and never uninteresting.

I was not aware that I was vitriolic at any time. I do not think that the Hon. George A. Cox and those high financiers should be so immune from criticism that the moment a man stands up in the House to refer to what are official documents, to declare what has been reported by men appointed by this government to make an investigation, he should be subjected to these attacks. However, Sir, they can go on with their attacks; it will not swerve me from doing what I think is in the interest of the public of this country, and in so far as the article of the 'Financial Post' is concerned my instructions have been given and that matter will be disposed of in the civil courts. I thought, Mr. Speaker, it was only due to myself that I should the first moment my attention was called to this matter bring it before the House. I may say, Sir, that before going into Supply I will very shortly move a resolution which will

probably bring this matter up in such a manner that it will be thoroughly investigated, and we will then see if the report of the Royal Insurance Commission is right or if it is wrong with regard to that particular bank, the Bank of Commerce. I think this House would grant me, if I ask for it, a committee to have that bank and to have this report thoroughly investigated. That is a matter I am considering, and I will decide in a very short time whether I will not move that resolution so that we may have the full light of day in regard to this transaction.

## MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence between the government or any department thereof, and the Ross Rifle Company, or any representative thereof, or between the government and any bank or other institution which has made advances under the contract between the government and said company, or any representative of such bank or institution, relating to the accounts and financial or other affairs of the Ross Rifle Company, including any letters or correspondence from any official of the Bank of Montreal to the Auditor General.—Mr. Worthington.

For a copy of all orders in council, reports, correspondence, documents, letters and papers, not already brought down, relating to a grant by His Majesty of any Indian reserves in the province of British Columbia to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, or to any officer of the company, or to any person on behalf of that company.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of contract and all correspondence in connection with purchase of cement from E. A. Walberg by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, to heighten Heath Point.—Mr. Staples—by Mr. J. D. Reid.

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, reports, applications, surveyors plans and maps, in reference to the homestead entries for the southwest quarter of section 27, township 18, range 10, east, in the province of Manitoba.—Mr. Staples—by Mr. J. D. Reid.

For a copy of all petitions letters and applications, by or on behalf of 'La Société Canadienne d'immigration et de placement,' for assistance from the government, and the answer by the government or its officials to the same.—Mr. Monk.

For a copy of all certificates by A. G. McDonald, immigration agent for Prince Edward county, Ontario, claiming payment for immigrants by him alleged to have been placed with farmers or other employers; also, a copy of all certificates or communications by such farmers or other employers received by the Department of the Interior relating to immigants so claimed as placed by said A. G. McDonald, giving in each case the name and post office address of the immigrant and of the farmer or the employer.—Mr. Alcorn.

For a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence and other papers in connection with the application to establish a post office at North Grove, in the county of Grenville.—Mr. J. D. Reid.

For a return showing: 1. All lands or interests in lands granted by the government to the Temperance Colonization Society, together with the dates of such grants, description of lands granted, consideration paid, or terms upon which such lands were granted, and all other particulars of sale.

2. Showing the terms of settlement or otherwise upon which such lands were granted, or held by the society and the conditions or regulations in force from time to time regarding such grants, and the holding thereof respectively.

3. Showing wherein or in what respect and with respect to what lands, the said society lived up to, and complied with such conditions and regulations, and wherein the society failed to comply therewith.

4. Showing what lands, if any, have been reclaimed by the government from the society for such non-compliance, with such times and conditions, or for any other cause or reason.

5. Showing what lands the said society still hold, as far as known.

6. Showing whether the said society is still in existence, and if so, who compose the same, as far as known.

7. Also for a copy of all correspondence, reports, memoranda, orders in council, or other documents in possession of the government, relating to the said society or the lands granted thereto.—Mr. Macdonell—by Mr. Blain.

## THE EXPORT OF PULP WOOD.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved:

That in the opinion of this House such an export duty should be placed on the export of pulp wood as will be sufficient to induce its manufacture into paper in Canada, and thus save to the labour of Canada the six millions of dollars now lost.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my object in proposing this resolution is to bring to the notice of this House and of the government of Canada the question of the pulp wood industry and of whether or not it is advisable for the government to take such steps as will encourage the manufacture of pulp wood into paper in this country, and thus save to the working people of Canada the many millions of dollars now lost to them.

President Roosevelt said recently in reference to the timber and pulp question:

No other question of equal gravity is now before the nation.

Certainly for the United States this wood question has a dark look; but we in Canada have no desire for our cousins across the border to be without their daily paper. All we wish is that the product of our forests shall be manufactured in Canada and then shipped to them. With our help they must follow the views of a celebrated United States editor, of whom a brother journalist once said: 'To him every cloud has a silver lining; if it has not, he's just the man to climb up and paint one on.'

Earl Grey says :

There are no more melancholy reflections than those suggested by the sight of a country once rich and supplied with all the majesty and panoply of power which has become a waste and stony desert through the reckless improvidence of its own people.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier not long ago said:

We can calculate the number of years and the number is not very great when there will not be another tree of the original forest to be cut upon the limits of the Canadian lumberman.

We are told that the country to the south of us, once covered with a grand majestic forest, one of the main sources of wealth and power of that great nation, is now a dreary waste, a vast void, so to speak, and that such void will soon be duplicated in Canada.

Now, Sir, I am an optimist, and I believe that no government of Canadians will be so lax as to allow such to occur here. I can see no dreary waste, no void for Canada.

Between optimist and pessimist the difference is droll.

The optimist sees the doughnut, the pessimist sees the hole.

Manager Clouston, of the Bank of Montreal, says : 'Canada is fast using up her timber resources. He calls a halt and urges action towards preserving the nation's wealth. The following from the pen of William Banks, jr., the 'Globe' envoy who made a special study of the pulp question on the spot, appeared in the 'Globe' of July 11 :

In other words, Canada is furnishing to Wisconsin, New York and other states of the republic to the south, the raw material to be manufactured into goods which come into competition with the manufactures of this country in the markets of the world. What is Canada getting in return? Practically nothing. True, the land is left; there are also stumps of trees; a comparatively small amount is obtained for labour and transportation, and that is all; while around the American mills, whose hungry maws would have no food, or not enough to satisfy them, at any rate, were it not for the raw material furnished from the Canadian side, there are busy, thriving and expanding communities. The Americans are taking pulp wood, while the sun shines, so to speak, and without being unkindly it would at least seem as though their attitude while they are so doing, is that of the man who smiles at his neighbour's uneasiness and occasionally puts his tongue in his cheek when the situation is made the subject of conversation.

I appear for the people as against the great corporations, both in Canada and across the border ; but I regret to say that generally the people are handicapped, either by the lack of concerted action or the lack of funds from utilizing to the full the great power of the press.

Mr. LEWIS.

The newspaper press is the great dominant and practically irresistible force in all great questions. The corporations realize this and hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent annually in promoting the corporation side of questions which affect them : railways, telephone companies, insurance companies, mining companies, fill to overflowing the advertising space of our prominent daily papers in the United States and Canada, and I ask, at whose expense ?

It is naturally so, human nature is human nature, and papers must live, but again I ask, Mr. Speaker, who pays for the full page advertisements of those fine mining allurements 'The Golden Dog' or the 'Silver Fox' in which half the produce of the stock goes to the promoters and half to the newspapers. The development frequently goes minus and the shareholders ditto.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that I have a subject now, a live subject and a vital one in which I feel sure the press will use its great influence solely on the side of the people, partly because it is the right side and partly because there is no other great question in which the press is so closely interested as the pulp wood question.

For years, we have grumbled because England made bad business arrangements for us with the United States. Now we have the opportunity to make our own bargain or laws in a vital issue affecting our national prosperity, and future. Let us do so in a national manner, and in a way befitting a nation not from a political or other point of view. Let us throw aside and reject all advice or pressure which may induce us to do or make a political deal. Joseph Clark, a well known Canadian writer, said : 'Canada has been mentioned in the despatches, the United States high protectionist, as it is, has spoken. President Roosevelt in his message to Congress says : 'We are out of pulp wood, we supply the world with paper. I advise you to, if possible, to make a bargain with Canada. Take off the United States duty on pulp wood, if Canada will agree not to impose an export duty.''

And Mr. Clark further said : 'There is one thing about these neighbours of ours, they always know what they want and why they want it.' They barred out our pulp just as long as they had pulp of their own. Now they say: We are up against a paper famine, we already feel the pressure of it, the price of news paper has doubled. Don't do what we would do in your place. Do not force our paper mills to move to Canada, do not draw this vast industry to yourselves, feed your forests into our mills.'

Statesmen at Washington have laughed until their sides ached when jurists of repute returned and told of the deals they had pulled off.

The United States Wall Street 'Journal'

says the International Paper Company which controls over thirty mills has in a little over a year acquired 1,255,000 acres more of timber limits most of them in Canada. It is apparent that if the export of pulp wood from Canada were cut off, the paper manufacturing of the United States would collapse

You will notice, Sir, that I am not forcing any opinion of my own on the House, I am simply stating facts and conclusions formed from those facts, and giving opinions of gentlemen of experience and knowledge in the premises. Here are two statements, one from prominent political Quebec leaders, the other from a congressman of the United States. Let me quote from the 'Gazette,' March 6, 1908:

The government congratulated themselves, Mr. Leblanc went on, over their Crown land reports. It showed that 100,936 cords of pulp wood had been exported during the year. For this, Canadians received $6 per cord. The speaker asked his hearers to go to the directors of Canadian paper manufacturies and find out that for every cord of pulp wood turned into paper in Canada, Candians received from $48 to $50, most of which meant wages for Canadian workmen.

The premier, Hon. Mr. Gouin, in reply, said:

Hon. Mr. Leblanc had blamed the government for the exporting of the pulp wood, but the government was not to blame for that, as there was only one power that had the right to impose an export duty on pulp wood, and that was the federal adminstration. The premier thought it would be a good idea to have a commission to investigate this question and report whether a duty should be imposed.

Let me now quote what Mr. J. Tirrell said in the Washington House of Representatives:

If there are gentlemen on this floor who wish to see that industry wiped out, who wish to throw out of employment tens of thousands of American wage earners and have them walking and moaning on the streets; if they wish to see the smoke and fires extinguished of the 108 mills now in the State of New York, and the mills of the west, and the industry hampered so that it no longer becomes a factor in the commercial development of the country, then it is only necessary to wipe out the tariff on pulp and paper and give to Canada the power to pass prohibitive export laws and close all the mills of the United States!

While, Sir, pulp wood is a raw material of comparatively low value, it produces manufactured articles of high cost.

Millions upon millions of spruce logs, hundreds of thousands of cords of pulp wood go yearly from Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to feed the pulp and paper mills of the eastern, middle and western states.

What does Canada get for this?

1. The government, not $1 a cord.

2. The chopper, the loader, the river driver, the teamster, the peeler, not much more.

3. The railways a low rate on coarse freight. The whole result $6, or $7 per cord left in Canada—I give a maximum figure; $6 is absolute. Why, Sir, they don't even allow us to carry the pulp wood in Canadian vessels. I have here a list of fourteen steamships carrying pulp wood last season from Quebec ports to Wisconsin ports, 12 of which are United States vessels and two Norwegian.

Now, I repeat again—$6, or $7, left in Canada for every cord of pulp wood leaving it. Watch, the value grows afterwards. Every cord of wood ground to pulp has a value of $20. Every cord of wood made into fibre has a value of $30 to $32. Every cord of wood made into paper has a value of $40 to $45 and up. My resolution asks this government to take such action as will save to the labour men of Canada the $6,000,000 lost annually. I firmly believe that $20,000,000 would be nearer the mark. The United States shuts out our finished product paper, but takes our crude product pulp wood, makes it into paper and undersells us in Europe with their surplus dump.

If the facts were properly placed before the farmer who has pulp wood for sale, he would see that he would be helped by an export duty more than any one else. The sale would be just as great and more people would live in his neighbourhood to use his other products and make his farm more valuable. If an export duty were to be put in force, sufficient mills could be removed to or built in Canada in 18 months to supply the world.

The pulp and paper industry gives more healthy and steady day and night employment to a larger number of men and women at higher wages all the year round than any other industry in Canada.

We have no desire to prevent our American cousins having newspapers to read, but let them get our forests in the shape of the manufactured article. What happened when the Liberal government of Ontario restricted the export of saw logs? Saw mills started humming in all directions, factories followed, the United States sawmills men came over here, and we were glad to have them. We will welcome the paper manufacturers also. The leading pulp and paper journal of the United States asked a question of the trade as to the results of an export duty. One answer was:

Would probably mean United States capital would cross the border and build mills, payrolls would go to Canadian labour instead of United States.

Another answer was:

It will simply build up the industry of Canada.

Now, let me give a few statistics on this subject. I would ask hon. members to bear

in mind the difference between the wood pulp referred to in the first of these tables and wood for pulp. The following figures show the value of wood pulp and wood sent to the United States for the year ending June 30, 1907:

| | |
|---|---|
| Canadian wood pulp exported to United States, year ending June 30, 1907.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $3,230,272 |
| Wood for pulp, 650,366 cords.. .. .. | 2,792,751 |
| Total.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $6,023,023 |

Now, according to United States Bulletin No. 80, pages 18 and 19, the value of paper per ton ranged in 1906 from $41.61 for heavy wrapping to $348.02 for fine Massachusetts. The tariff of 1887, which places a duty on Canadian pulp, contains this provision:

If any country shall impose an export duty on pulp wood to the United States, the amount of such export duty shall be added as an additional duty to the duties herein imposed upon wood pulp imported from such country.

I say that is an insult to Canada, for that is aimed at us. I read the other day the remarks of a congressman in the United States who prefaced one of his statements by saying 'If we allow Canada to do so.' What right have they to 'allow' Canada to do this or that? We are friendly to our neighbours and they to us, but why should we not look after our own interest? My attention was drawn to this matter by a gentleman living in the United States and well acquainted with this business. He is a Canadian by birth and his feelings incline toward the flag under which he first lived. He told me that they were laughing at us over there.

Here is another object lesson: Japan imports 5,000,000 pounds of British paper and 8,500,000 of American paper—Canada is not mentioned. England imports $28,369,075 worth of paper—principally from the United States—where does she get her wood pulp? From Canada. Yet Canada is not mentioned. It has been stated in some of these documents from the United States that the paper and pulp mills in the United States number 1,200. Now, I have verified every statement I make here. I am not making a speech—I do not make speeches. I am putting in facts and trying to draw to them the attention of this House. Instead of 1,200 paper and pulp mills, there were in the United States, in 1905, the last year for which reliable figures are available, 761 pulp and paper mills. These had an average capital of $364,579. There are 41 paper mills in Wisconsin alone. Where do they get their pulpwood? Why, where do these 12 American vessels and 2 Norwegian vessels of which I have spoken carry their pulpwood?

Now what has Canada? Fifty-eight pulp mills, making 2,361 tons of paper in 1907, and 46 paper mills, making 966 tons per day. The retention of forests is needed to save the water supply, prevent droughts and freshets and save water power for manufactures as well as for the pulp wood and timber. As to forestry, the question is not 'can the trees be replaced as cut and how,' but 'who shall do it?' I think that is quite feasible. I have had correspondence with a gentleman in the state of Carolina, he is engaged in the forestry business and is a millionaire; and his opinion is that it is possible to make trees grow in the open field, but that this can be done much more easily where small trees are left after cutting down the large ones. We often read of statements made on the other side of the line as to the amount of pulp wood that is left, and how many years it is going to last. I have this from a gentleman who has absolute knowledge in the matter: that very little spruce if any is left in New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin and Illinois, some in Maine and Wyoming. There is none left in Colorado and Dakota. Norway and Sweden are almost denuded. A mill in Herkimer, New York, took a ten years contract to furnish an English company with paper, and they are taking their pulp from Canada by rail.

Now there is the question of retaliation which has been mentioned. I wish to state this to the government and to the House in general, that I have no fear of retaliation. I have questioned gentlemen who have knowledge of the matter, and they say that there are other interests in the United States who would oppose retaliation, even if that were attempted; other interests who are opposed to the paper manufacturers are too strong to permit it. Now here is a fact that may not be known to many in this House. In volume 1, page 736, of Storey on the constitution of the United States, he gives these words from section 9, clause 5, of the constitution:

No tax or duty shall be laid on an article exported from any state.

Now, Sir, with the permission of the House I will proceed to read a few extracts taken from the pulp wood number of the 'Globe' of March 7. I have cut out only those that are pertinent to this question. Here is what Mr. Biggar says:

A few years ago the United States believed, as we do now, that their supply of timber was inexhaustible. When theirs is done they have no place to turn but to Canada. We have the whip hand and control their supply.

Now as to the question whether the farmer would be able to sell his pulpwood if an export duty was put on, I wish to say that his health, his comfort and his interest would be greatly enhanced if such a duty were imposed; besides he would be able to sell his pulp wood in other directions. Here is an example of the benefits following the manufacture of paper in Canada,

which we find in the Laurentides Paper Company at Grand-Mere, Quebec :

The town of Grand-Mere is a striking example of what the paper industry would do for Canada. Five thousand well-to-do, contented people live there.

Before the paper mill came to it, Grand-Mere was a small struggling village with a few score of inhabitants; now it is a hustling, growing town, with over 5,000 inhabitants, and shows all the earmarks of prosperity.

At Batiscan, one of the centres of the wood pulp export business, there are some 300 people, yet at one time this village was a larger place than Grand-Mere. Batiscan is one of the chief shipping centres of the International Paper Company and ships to the United States about as much pulpwood as is used by the Laurentide Paper Company. In one case all is exported and a struggling village of 300 barely holds its own. In the other case, it is manufactured and a town of 5,000 people is prospering and growing.

The Laurentide Paper Company have about 1,200 men on their pay-roll, and have built this thriving town simply 'on paper.' This company take their supplies from the St. Maurice river, which enter one end of their modern plant as logs and come out at the other end as pure white paper of the finest texture.

They consume 100,000 cords of pulp wood every year, and when manufactured this means $3,000,000. On the other hand, there are exported annually from Quebec 600,000 cords of pulp wood. This leaves in the country about $3,000,000. Thus there is as much money left in the country from 100,000 cords manufactured as from 600,000 cords exported.

Or to make another comparison. A cord of pulp wood exported as such yields to Canada and all Canadian interests for cutting, handling, stumpage, transportation, &c., $6, the same cord converted into paper yields $38. Thus there are over six times as much in it for Canada by the conversion of her spruce wood into paper at home as is to be got by letting it be manufactured abroad.

Further, the contention of the Laurentide Paper Company is that the manufacture of paper in Canada means the creation and assistance of many other industries. To the railroads there is a big gain. In one case their cars go in empty and carry out pulp wood. In the other case they carry in coal, marble, machinery and mill supplies, and all the merchandise necessary to feed and clothe a large population. It would assist our coal companies, as every ton of paper manufactured requires half a ton of coal. Thus the Laurentide Paper Company alone consumes over 30,000 tons yearly. It would assist our banks by the circulation of money, would encourage skilled labour and give a chance for our people to earn good wages. Around the mills in the United States large towns and cities have arisen, manned largely by people from the province of Quebec, who were unable to find profitable employment at home.

Let me here suggest that there is no better plan of repatriating our Canadians from Quebec who have gone to the States than by the establishment of paper mills at home. I say this advisedly, because I contend with the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) that there is only one class of Canadians in this country. These Canadians from the province of Quebec could be brought back to Canada easier by this method than by immigration methods. I am sure the hon. member for Wolfe (Mr. Tobin) will confirm this from his experience. Here is another statement by this gentleman, Mr. Biggar :

The subsequent progress of the pulp and paper industry is recorded in the Pulp and Paper Handbook of Canada in the various editions as follows:

Pulp mills.

| Year. | No. of mills. | Total capacity in tons per 24 hours. |
|---|---|---|
| 1888.. .. .. .. .. .. | 34 | 154 |
| 1892.. .. .. .. .. .. | 37 | 312 |
| 1899.. .. .. .. .. .. | 39 | 1,245 |
| 1907.. .. .. .. .. .. | 58 | 2,361 |

The total capacity of the mills producing chemical pulp by the sulphite and soda processes in 1899 was about 50 tons per day, and in 1907 about 550 tons per day, so that the increase in the last eight years has been almost wholly in mechanical or ground wood pulp.

Paper mills.

| Year. | No. of mills. | Total capacity in tons per 24 hours. |
|---|---|---|
| 1888.. .. .. .. .. .. | 40 | 173 |
| 1892.. .. .. .. .. .. | 38 | 209 |
| 1899.. .. .. .. .. .. | 33 | 328 |
| 1907.. .. .. .. .. .. | 46 | 966 |

The era of manufacturing pulp from wood in Canada began in the decade of 1880-90. The yearly capacity of its pulp mills at the present time is about 700,000 tons of pulp and 290,000 tons of paper. Pulp first figures in the trade and navigation returns of Canada in 1890, when the total export was valued at $168,180, of which $460 went to Great Britain, $147,098 to the United States, and $20,662 to other countries. In 1897 the total export was $741,959.

If this be true—and certainly 'The Paper Mill' can have no object in making matters appear worse than they are—the newspaper publishers of Canada, and the newspaper readers as well—for in this their interests are identical—may well ask themselves a few questions.

There are in the United States seventy mills engaged in the manufacture of white paper, the daily output of which fluctuates between 4,000 and 5,000 tons—say 4,500 daily Should it come about that Canada will be called upon to supply the spruce for all this output, not less than 5,000 cords of wood would be required daily. On a basis of four cords to an acre, which, I believe, is considered a fair estimate, we would see in this country 1,800 acres of standing spruce skinned off every day in the year to keep the pulp and paper mills of the United States running. In every 365 days—the Sunday paper is the greatest gourmand of them all—511,000 acres of Canadian spruce land will have been left bare.

Until within recent months the newspaper publishers of this continent were as indifferent to a prospective famine in their raw ma-

terial as are the grist-millers of the country Nor is this to be greatly wondered at, for from the lips of engineers and explorers, and even from the pages of the government reports, they for years heard of 'the boundless areas,' 'the inexhaustible supplies,' etc., of spruce wood and timber. Thus lulled to sleep, the publishers have given their attention to problems which they knew to be real and which were pressing them at closer range.

But to-day the signs of a sudden awakening are visible in all quarters. The publishers of the large daily papers throughout the United States met in New York last October, and made no effort to conceal the alarm with which they viewed the situation. They declared in no uncertain manner that they were face to face with a problem of the most vital nature, and passed resolutions calling upon president and congress to adopt measures which only a couple of years ago would have been considered rampantly radical.

That the situation in Canada is equally serious no one for a moment suggests, but that it is possible to become so in a comparatively short time, unless prudence is displayed at this critical juncture, few will deny.

Canadians were hardly prepared to read in 'The Paper Mill,' the recognized organ of the paper and pulp makers of the United States, such an astounding admission as the following, taken from a January, 1908, issue of that journal :

The wood situation to-day is a very serious matter. There is not a mill in the United States manufacturing paper and pulp that is not to a very large extent depending on Canada for its wood, and there is no basis to work upon, for the reason that there is no established price for wood either in this country or in Canada, and owing to this fact there is no basis for the paper manufacturer to work upon to establish a price for the finished product.

Now, when the mills in Wisconsin—planted in the midst of what was regarded as a perpetual supply—have had to import pulp wood to the extent of 70,000 cords during the past season, all the way from Quebec by rail, while some of the paper mills of Maine—the state of 'inexhaustible' spruce limits—are getting supplies of wood from New Brunswick and Quebec, the American famine in pulp wood can no longer be denied.

The famine was inevitable, but, like most other famines, it was neither foreseen nor provided against by the average man concerned. In ten years after the introduction of the wood pulp paper process the price of news print was brought down from an average of 9 cents a pound to 4 cents, and since then the improvements in machinery and the increased capacity of the mills have further reduced it, till it recently sold at 2 cents a pound. This cheapening has, in turn, made possible the enormous increase in the size and circulation of the modern daily newspaper—one of the marvels of the age, and as fearful in its power for evil as grand in its possibilities for good to the world. The increased demand for wood to maintain other industries, added to this remarkable development of the paper industry, explains the wood famine which is now giving the statesmen of the United States such concern, and explains why each year the United States is becoming more dependent on Canada for the raw material for its paper mills.

During the year ending June, 1907, the United States imported pulp wood from Canada to the amount of 650,366 cords, or enough to manufacture, say 520,000 tons of news paper, while its imports of ground pulp from Canada were 149,827 tons, valued at $3,230,272.

As the 'Globe' has said in its special pulp wood number, one of the greatest, perhaps the greatest of the problems confronting Canada at the present time is the preservation of her forests. While there have been good laws passed regulating our tariffs, restricting our fisheries, controlling our mines and exploiting our agricultural areas, the forest has been largely neglected.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking before the Canadian Forestry Association, said :

We can calculate the number of years—and the number is not very great—when there will not be another tree of the original forest to be cut upon the limits of the Canadian lumbermen. But, trees have grown and trees ought to grow again.

I should like to impress upon every Canadian farmer the necessity of covering with trees every rocky hill and the bank of every running stream. It is very easily done. He has only to scatter the seeds on the ground, fence it and nature will do the rest.

It is evident that Sir Wilfrid Laurier at that time appreciated, and he must now more thoroughly appreciate the fact, that a wood famine in Canada is imminent unless proper precautions are taken.

Earl Grey, addressing the same convention, said :

There are no more melancholy reflections than those suggested by the sight of a country once rich and equipped with all the majesty and panoply of power, which has become a waste and a stony desert through the reckless improvidence of its own people.

It is the object of this convention to fix the attention of the people of the Dominion on the warning which these and other countries hold out to us as the practices we should carefully avoid, if Canada is to realize the high destiny which awaits her, or which will be realized if this generation is gifted with sufficient foresight and self-control to husband the resources so abundantly lavished upon the Dominion by a bountiful Providence.

Mr. Gifford Pinchot, chief of the Forest Service of the United States, is a renowned authority on forestry. He is worth millions of money, but owing to the great interest he takes in this subject gives his services to the government of the United States for the small sum of $5,000 a year. Writing in the New York 'Outlook' Mr. Pinchot says :

The most prosperous nation of to-day is the United States. Our unexampled wealth and well-being are directly due to the superb natural resources of our country, and to the use which has been made of them by our citizens, both in the present and in the past. We are prosperous because our forefathers be-

queathed to us a land of marvellous resources still unexhausted. Shall we conserve those resources, and in our turn transmit them, still unexhausted, to our descendants. Till now we have allowed our forests to be depleted, our timber, lumber and pulp wood to be exported, and to-day we have very little to show for our prodigal wastefulness.

Bound up with the question of forest preservation are many national questions of vital importance. A survey of history shows that the decline of many of the great nations of the world can be traced to the destruction of their forests. Mesopotamia among ancient nations and Spain among modern being examples. Again it has been demonstrated that the planting of forests in a treeless country has increased and regulated the rainfall. Many of the floods from which countries suffer are due to the clearing of forests around the sources of rivers. When we consider the growing importance of water-power as a generator of electricity we can readily see the importance of preserving our waterfalls and streams unimpaired. Particularly is this true of a large part of Ontario and Quebec, where there is no coal and where our manufacturers must depend upon water-power.

Assets so vast as these cannot be left at the mercy of 'politics.' Let us have a Forest Commission, independent of party politics, to protect our forests, and thereby save our fish, game and natural scenery.

What will happen when the forests fail? In the first place, the business of lumbering will disappear. It is now the fourth greatest industry in the United States. All forms of building industries will suffer with it, and the occupants of houses, offices, and stores must pay the added cost. Mining will become vastly more expensive; and with the rise in the cost of mining there must follow a corresponding rise in the price of coal, iron and other minerals. The railways, which have as yet failed entirely to develop a satisfactory substitute for the wooden tie (and must, in the opinion of their best engineers, continue to fail), will be profoundly affected, and the cost of transportation will suffer a correspond-increase. Water-power for lighting, manufacturing and transportation and the movement of freight and passengers by inland waterways, will be affected still more directly than the steam railways. The cultivation of the soil, with or without irrigation, will be hampered by the increased cost of agricultural tools, fencing, and the wood needed for other purposes about a farm. Irrigated agriculture will suffer most of all, for the destruction of the forests means the loss of the waters as surely as night follows the day. With the rise in the cost of producing food, the cost of food itself will rise. Commerce in general will necessarily be affected by the difficulties of the primary industries upon which it depends. In a word, when the forests fail, the daily life of the average citizen will inevitably feel the pinch on every side. And the forests have already begun to fail, as the direct result of the suicidal policy of forest destruction which the people of the United States have allowed themselves to pursue.

They stripped the mountain on each side of the river, for miles of its timber. The river, in consequence, was not pouring down its accustomed volume of fresh water regularly. The fish left for new waters; with the fish left the fishermen, and with the fishermen a large revenue. You can't have fish without water; you can't have water, pure, sweet and in full volume, without its natural reservoir—the forest. And it has been conclusively demonstrated that forest-clad slopes do more than most other natural conditions to attract the active as well as the passive moisture of the atmosphere.

Mr. E. W. Stewart, late superintendent of Forestry for Canada, said:

No time should be lost in taking steps to reserve the whole timber area along the east slope of the Rocky Mountains in order to preserve the forest there for the conservation of the water for the great rivers that are supplied from this source. If this area is permitted to be denuded of its timber the North and South Saskatchewan, the Athabasca, the Peace, the Liard and the many smaller streams that receive their supply from this timbered area will be raging torrents for a short period in the spring and almost dry in the hot summer months. The water level in the soil will decrease, and the husbandman of the plains will begin to realize when it is too late why the summer droughts are increasing.

To a greater or lesser degree what is here predicted by Mr. Stewart has happened in the older portions of Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. MacLaren, who was interviewed by the 'Globe,' takes the view that this is a national question, in which the future prosperity and well-being of Canada are bound up. He favours such a measure being taken as would result in preventing the depletion of our raw material for the benefit of foreign industries. He has no doubt that such a measure would quickly result in a great accession of industries to this country, and that with the splendid undeveloped water-powers in Ontario and Quebec there would be no difficulties in the way of establishing such industries.

Mr. MacLaren was equally emphatic in regard to the necessity of a scientific policy of forest preservation. The firm are themselves pursuing such a policy on their own limits. As far as possible they are feeding their mills on the annual growth of the limits. The only remedy is for this government to institute a broad system for the practical training of men whose life duty will be the care of the forests.

The forestation or reforestation of areas unfit for agriculture.

The suppression of that class of 'settler' who is only 'a settler' until he gets all the wood cut off his location, and who then moves on to another well timbered lot.

Obviously the initiative in many of these matters rests with the provinces, and some of them are attempting to deal with them on a broad scale. But the interests of all the provinces, and of the federal government, which likewise controls great stretches of public domain, and of all the forces that work for the country's progress, are so intertwined as to make a united and common basis of action an imperative necessity.

The history of most nations indicates that very little can be expected in a forestry way

from private individuals, even under pretty stringent state control, and it has been found more effective for the state or the community to undertake the work, particularly if it is done on a large scale.

B. E. Fernow, professor of forestry, writes as follows:

To the editor of the 'Globe': In responding to your request for an expression of my opinion as to the forestry situation, I cannot open the discussion better than by the statement that 'the much vaunted virgin timber wealth of Canada would not suffice to supply the annual consumption of the United States for more than twelve years.'

The mills of the gods grind slowly, but still more slowly does a democracy learn the lessons of the world and mend the follies of its happy-go-lucky unconcern of the future.

(Sgd.) B. E. FERNOW.

I wish to read a few more extracts on this subject as quoted in the Toronto 'Globe,' March 7, 1908:

Perhaps in the light of the late utterance of the President of the United States regarding the plight of the American paper manufacturers, Canadians will wake up to the realization that they have something worth keeping not only in their pulp wood, but in other timber supplies. I should not have said 'worth keeping' but worth taking care of and managing for continuity, i.e., applying forestry principles.

Whether this new interest should take shape in the form of tariff legislation or had much better be fostered by regulating the use of Crown timber lands conservatively is a matter for consideration.

The President promised to recommend to Congress the removal of the duty, and 'The Fourth Estate,' a well informed weekly publication of New York, in reporting the interview says:—'He will give as his reasons the necessity for the preservation of the forests rather than the relief of the publishers of cheap newspapers and magazines. . . . One of his arguments will be the recent report of Gifford Pinchot, chief forester for the United States government, who estimates that, at the present rate of consumption, the wood supply of the United States will have disappeared in twelve years.'

According to a special report of the United States Census Bureau the consumption of domestic spruce wood used by the United States pulp mills increased 47 per cent in quantity, and 122 per cent in price in the five years from 1900 to 1905, while the consumption of Canadian spruce wood by United States mills increased 102 per cent in quantity and 150 per cent in price in the same period. The average cost of wood used for mechanical and chemical pulp was more than doubled in the five years named, for every variety of pulp wood except domestic poplar. Canadian poplar had increased 176 per cent. If these percentages could be applied to the conditions in 1907 the increase would be still greater.

To illustrate the nature of the crisis towards which the United States is swiftly tending we may turn to the mills of New York state. This state has 108 mills, largely clustered in the northeastern counties, accessible to the great spruce forests of the Adirondack mountains. Twenty years ago the mills of Watertown, the chief paper making centre, had supplies of pulp wood at their doors, and it was believed the timber would last forever. Now the source of home supply is eighty or a hundred miles away, and an increasing proportion of mills have to get their wood from down the St. Lawrence in Quebec or by rail from that province at a distance of 200 miles or more. The mills of this state have a yearly capacity of 987,000 cords of wood, and on the basis of a growth of ten cords an acre they would strip nearly 100,000 acres a year, and if the lumber cut off this region (estimated in the census at 245,000,000 feet a year) is added, the whole spruce areas of the Adirondacks would be wiped out in seven years were these mills confined to their own state for raw material.

The average man, however, is more accustomed to estimating values in dollars and cents than in acres and cords, so that possibly such a calculation may be found more interesting. Less than twenty years ago the paper on which newspapers are printed cost the publishers eight cents per pound at the mill. That price fell steadily until the bottom was reached about seven years ago, when at least one large contract was made in Canada at 1·87 cents per pound. With that contract the 'dollar daily' had its birth. For about six years the price fluctuated between 1·87 and 2 cents, but about six months ago unmistakeable signs began to appear that even 'two-cent' paper would not likely be secured again for a few years, if ever. The price has gone steadily up in this country to 2·25, and in the United States to 2·60, with a strong possibility that 3 cents will be the prevailing figure there within a year.

It is not pretended that a pulp wood scarcity alone has brought about this sudden and serious increase. Higher wages, low water, increased cost of chemicals and a tendency to concerted action on the part of the manufacturers may each have contributed somewhat; but after making all possible allowance for these contingencies the fact must be admitted that what is almost a pulp famine in the United States and the increasing difficulty with which pulp wood is secured adjacent to railways and good streams in Canada are the principal causes in bringing about this remarkable increase.

Ontario and Quebec are blessed with abundant powers commercially adaptable. No country in the world has such abundance of water-powers capable of development for commercial purposes as Canada. Whether utilized for electrical energy to be transmitted far and wide to the benefit of the industries everywhere springing up or whether used in their respective localities for the manufacture of lumber and pulp wood in the wooded regions where many of them exist, forest conservation is vital to their continuance. The cutting of timber on such a large scale throughout the Ottawa valley has already affected the flow of the magnificent Ottawa river, and more than one project is under consideration with a view to preventing further mischief.

An idea of the vastness of these water-powers in the eastern section of the country may be gathered from the statement that within a radius of 50 miles of the city of Ottawa, according to the statements and calculations of experts, there are water-powers capable of producing over 900,000 horse-power. Some of

these, because of the rivers rising in that province, are under the control of the province of Quebec. It is of interest to note here that the authorities of that province have shown a very commendable desire to take any action needed, such as the creation of forest reserves at the head waters.

The pulp mill has appeared, and by the higher value of its product it makes for the greater prosperity of the province. To quote the estimates of one authority: If 1,000 cubic feet of deals be cut $7 will have been paid in wages, and the product is worth $15. The same amount made into pulp is worth $31.50, and the amount paid in wages is $12. The capital invested in the sawmill is $5, where in the pulp mill it is $41.

In connection with this a strong agitation is now in progress in favour of a prohibitive export duty on pulp wood, for while a cord of pulp wood may be worth $2.50 to $7, made into low grades of paper it is worth $45, and if into the higher grades $50 to $100. It is therefore estimated that if the present export of pulp wood were manufactured into paper at an average value of $50 per cord $30,000,000 would be added to the national wealth of Canada. Considerations such as these are inducing lumbermen, legislators and local boards of trade to favour the imposition of some such duty. The Maritime Board of Trade at its last session in St. John passed a strong resolution in favour of this export duty. The past few years has witnessed the purchase of large tracts of timber lands by syndicates of citizens of the United States. If a federal export duty can be imposed sufficient to compel the paper mills to move into Canada without seriously disturbing any other established industries, immense benefits will acrue to our business interests.

Canada has the largest forest area in the world and has also the greatest amount of water-power in the world. When we consider the relation of forests to water-power and of water-power to electrical energy in a country largely deficient in coal, we can readily see that the conservation of these forests becomes one of the greatest problems of our national life. One phase of our problem is that of the pulp wood industry. At present we export large quantities of pulp wood to the United States, where it is manufactured into paper. At a conservative estimate the same amount of wood would yield from twenty to twenty-five millions of dollars if manufactured into paper on this side.

Thus, if Canada's pulp wood were all manufactured at home, industries would arise whose annual value would be millions of dollars, and at the same time the cutting of our great timber limits would be so regulated as to maintain present rate of reproduction and so conserve the value of our forests forever. Countries like Norway, Germany and France have been able to restore their depleted forests, and thus derive from them a perpetual revenue.

While the creation of a paper and pulp industry in Canada would mean much to Canada, yet it is only part of a greater scheme —that of national self-preservation.

With our forests gone, our water-powers are crippled, our agricultural lands spoiled by flood and drought, and our great national prosperity impaired.

In Ontario's northland the water-power possibilities are almost beyond belief. Some of them are being made use of more or less, many others are as yet not available, others are within easy reach of the Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern Railways, and the extension of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, and the building of the National Transcontinental Railway will hasten for others the time when they will be harnessed for the use of man.

Twelve of the largest rivers in Ontario flow towards James bay, and nearly all of them pass through the great clay belt, where there are approximatetly 300,000,000 cords of pulp wood, from which in the future the province must expect to reap no inconsiderable benefit. Of course this land cannot all be held for ever as pulp wood land; its agricultural values are too great. But there is no doubt that some plan will be devised whereby areas of it will be so held; and that in the not distant future pulp and paper mills will flourish there, and will be fed for many long years from the raw material at hand.

There are millions of horse-power undeveloped in our province, said Mr. Welden, and in almost every instance these water-powers are surrounded with an almost inexhaustible supply of spruce. With judicious cutting and the adoption of reforestation methods, it would be quite possible for any large pulp and paper concern in this way to settle for themselves the perennial worries about wood supply.

Asked as to what he thought of the effect of the proposed prohibitive legislation on the export of pulp wood from Quebec, Mr. Welden stated that he did not think this would prove to be quite so grave a situation as it was thought to be. 'It may,' he said, 'for a while have the effect of increasing the cost of paper to the consumer, but I am thorougly convinced that it will only be a short while when the American mills will adopt the practice of manufacturing their pulp right on the ground and save the heavy transportation and other charges incident to the present method of shipping rossed pulp wood from Quebec.

In 1905 there was invested in Canadian papermaking establishments $21,260,157, with 4,974 employees; a product value at $9,449,842, and wages of $2,208,526. In wood pulp establshments $11,164,768 was invested, 2,456 people employed, $1,023,720 paid in salaries and wages, and material to the value of $3,793,131 was produced.

In Germany a hundred years ago a real timber famine existed, for then wood was the only fuel, rivers the only means of transportation, and the wood along the rivers had been cut away, and the forest devastation, as with us, had wasted much. It was then that the modern forestry systems took their origin, having before that time been only indifferently and locally developed. It was then that the governments instituted such strong organizations to administer the timber lands, and by foregoing present revenue and making present expenditure prepared the results which they are now reaping.

The State forests have now, through a hundred years of patient work, been brought into a condition which compares favourably with the results from agricultural soils; they produce annual revenues of millions of dollars, not by cashing capital, but by using

interest—the amount of annual growth, which the same area can produce forever.

Pulp wood Export Duties.

As the existence of a protective tariff in the Dominion has unquestionably compelled many United States manufactories to erect branch establishments in this country it is a reasonable proposition that similar results would follow the imposition of an export duty on pulp wood. At the present moment the United States paper companies are consuming 4,000,000 cords of pulp wood yearly, about one-fifth being drawn from Canada free of import duty. This is of course due to the care taken to support the home industries and so enable them to compete on the most favourable terms in the paper markets of the world. While little United States paper enters Canada, considerable quantities are exported to Britain, South Africa and Australia.

The northern states that are conveniently situated depend largely on Canadian sprucewood, and any restriction on its export or increase in its cost would certainly entail a reconsideration by the manufacturers of their position at least as regards their foreign trade. Under the present Dingley tariff the import duties into the United States run from 3-10ths of a cent on paper valued at 3 cents a pound to 15 per cent ad valorem on the paper valued at over 5 cents a pound. But the tariff also provides for heavy additional duty in the case of paper coming from a country that imposes export duties on pulp wood. It is doubtful, therefore, whether United States paper companies could supply any part of their home demand from Canada, but it would be even better were the needs of other world markets met by factories established in Canada.

The following article is from the Montreal 'Herald' of August 28, 1907:

Pulp wood and the States.

The Maritime Provinces Board of Trade, in proposing that the export of pulp wood be prohibited, is but voicing a demand that, in one form or another, is yearly being advanced in more insistent terms. Put briefly, the argument is that the consumption of pulp wood is increasing enormously in the States and Canada; that the chief source of supply is Canada; that the States, by keeping a high duty on pulp and paper, and admitting pulp wood free, is draining this country of raw material, while building up its own manufacturing industries; and that an export duty, or the prohibition of export, would force the Americans to come to Canada and make pulp or paper here.

There can be no question that a change is coming over the temper of Canadians in regard to this subject. There has been a widespread disinclination to adopt what might be considered a narrow and liberal policy. There has been a doubt as to whether the destruction of the United States spruce supply was as complete as represented. There has been a fear of the effects of an export duty upon the settler, to whom the market of the States has certainly been a great advantage.

In regard to all three of these matters of contention there has apparently been a steady change in public opinion. For one thing, the experience of Ontario in prohibiting the export of unsawn logs has been so satisfactory that it is not unnaturally taken as an illustration of what may be the results of federal legislation along similar lines.

The result of this legislation is told in the great mills which contribute to the prosperity of almost every port on the Georgian bay.

Evidence has accumulated that the Americans have no great reserves of spruce, and men and papers interested in the paper trade now frankly confess that the States has to look to Canada for the bulk of its supplies of pulp wood. Canadian settlers, with pulp wood to sell, are probably not as numerous as they were. As the lands in the older settlements have now been largely cleared of spruce. But even were this not the case, if it is a fact that the demand from the States would continue, in the shape of imports of the manufactured or partially manufactured product, the Canadian settler's market price would probably be maintained, or suffer only a temporary setback.

The demand for prohibition is based on the argument that an export duty would be met, under the United States law, by the automatic imposition of a countervailing duty on pulp, while there is no such instrument at hand in case the export be prohibited. Of course, it is obvious that if the States must have our spruce, in one form or another, no duty will long be maintained that it will make it impossible or difficult to buy the Canadian product. So an export duty would sooner or later have the same effect as a prohibiting measure.

The subject is a large one, and if it becomes a factor in practical politics, will call for the most exhaustive examination and most careful handling. The outstanding fact that will constitute the chief reason for parliamentary discussion, is that a vast reservoir of natural wealth, peculiar to Canada, is being drained at an ever-increasing rate, into foreign channels, leaving behind it but a fraction of its potentialities for the country's benefit. To this fact is added the other one, that the legislation of the foreign country to which this wealth is flowing, is deliberately devised so as to make it impracticable for Canada to enjoy a greater share of this potential value. In adopting such a policy, the United States has made it impossible for it to consider as unfriendly any Canadian legislation on the subject, however radical. If a foreign country will not, without compulsion, permit us to sell to it our pulp and paper, we are quite justified, in pursuance of a policy of development of our national wealth, in saying to that country, if you will not buy our pulp or paper, we will not sell you our pulpwood.

The Toronto 'Globe' of September 20, 1907:

Newspapers and Pulp wood.

Special despatch to the 'Globe' of yesterday contained the information that the American Newspaper Publishers' Association has requested President Roosevelt and Congress to investigate an alleged combine on

the part of the papermakers to limit the output of paper and to unduly enhance the price of news print. The present import duty on white paper for news print is six dollars a ton, and there is also a duty on wood pulp; the association at its recent New York meeting unanimously requested the repeal of these duties, and appointed a large committee to prosecute the movement as vigorously as possible.

The reason for this action is to be found in a serious scarcity of the paper on which newspapers are printed.

It may be asked why the newspaper publishers do not recoup themselves for the increased cost of white paper by increasing the price of their journals. This is more easily said than done, but some publishers are doing so in the large cities of the United States. In a number of cases the one-cent dailies have been put up to two cents, and many country weeklies have advanced their subscription prices. Some publishers are cutting down the size of their publications, others are reducing the headlines, and still others are using smaller type. All these remedies go but a little way to relieve the present distress, to say nothing of averting the impending danger. It is too late to do much in the way of conserving the supply of pulp wood in the United States, but there is still opportunity to do a great deal in the way of preventing a like situation from arising in Canada. What is urgently needed is a policy of conservation of spruce forests through judicious selection of the trees to be cut, prevention of destruction by fire, and allowing abundant opportunity for reproduction. Whatever the future may have in store in the shape of substitutes for wood pulp, there is nothing yet in sight to displace spruce wood, and in her abundant supply of that timber Canada has a source of wealth that is worthy of the most careful and intelligent treatment.

I have the statement of the manager of the Eddy works in Hull that, in his opinion, nothing will be found to take the place of spruce for making paper. Here is what Professor Fernow says:

In the United States to-day the forestry question is regarded as a critical one, the authoritive assertion having recently been made that the exhaustion of that country's supply of timber is in sight. Is Canada to wait until that can be said of her supply before any adequate action is taken? True, something has been and is being done now, but in the opinion of the men best qualified to speak, these steps are not sufficient to guard Canada against experiencing the conditions that are now causing alarm in the United States. For the most part Canada's timber is being cut with prodigal vigour. A considerable quantity is manufactured in the country, but much more might easily be done here; while, in respect to pulp wood, rapidly increasing quantities are being exported to the United States to build up the pulp and paper making industries of that nation. There is no duty on this raw material; the United States gets it free of duty, handicaps the Canadian pulp and paper industries by putting a duty on their output going into the republic, and tries to under sell them in the British market with pulp and paper made from Canadian wood. The figures cited are, however, sufficiently reliable to make it certain that the United States has already crossed the verge of a timber famine so severe that its blighting effects will be felt in every household in the land. The rise in the price of lumber which marks the opening of the present century is the beginning of a vastly greater and more rapid rise which is to come. We must necessarily begin to suffer from the scarcity of lumber long before our supplies are completely exhausted. It is well to remember that there is no foreign source from which we can draw cheap and abundant supplies of timber to meet a demand per capita so large as to be without parallel in the world, and that the suffering which will result from the progressive failure of our timber was but faintly foreshadowed by the recent temporary scarcity of coal.

The chief wealth of the northern forest region of Quebec is in its spruce, however, where it forms three-fifths of the coniferous forest available for commerce. If, as claimed, it is reasonable to allow two and a half cords of this wood suitable for the making of pulp to the acre these northern forests should furnish no less than 406,874,470 cords of pulp wood. Enormous quantities of white spruce of a very large size are found in the southern Abitibi, capable of supplying large numbers of sawlogs and much pulp wood. Birch and poplar, as well as balsam are also very abundant in many parts of the northern forests of Quebec.

The greatest variety and the richest quality of timber are to be found in the central region of the province, and especially in the new forest reserves of Ottawa and the St. Maurice. This region is situated between the St. Lawrence and the 48th degree of north latitude, and is larger than the combined areas of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, White, red and banksian pine, white and black spruce, cedar and balsam are the chief varieties of timber in Ontario. There are many fine water-powers. On the Missanabie Mettagami and Abitibi rivers, it has been roughly estimated that as much as 150,000 horse-power each could be developed. The Mississiga, the Onaping, the French and the Montreal rivers all have great capabilities in the way of horse-power development. On the Vermillion, Spanish, Sturgeon, Rainy and other rivers while some powers have been developed, there are many others still undisturbed. For the most part these water-powers are still vested in the Crown. The government has therefore a great inducement to offer pulp or paper manufacturers when it decides as occasion arises from time to time to lease pulp wood areas, good water-powers being a most important factor in the economic essentials of the industries mentioned.

Quebec is no less fortunate in its possession of water-powers, though it would appear that a very considerable number of these have passed from the control of the Crown. The tributaries to the St. Lawrence as well as that great river itself, possess water-powers, some of which are already in commercial use and others that will be as the pulp and paper industries particularly call for their being called into use.

It is significant that in the province of Quebec the utmost importance is attached to the bearing of the forestry question upon the water flow. Mention has been made elsewhere of the emphasis laid upon this by the provincial forester, Mr. W. C. J. Hall.

Here is an advertisement in the Toronto 'World' of October 18, 1907, inserted by the provincial government:

Tenders for Pulp wood Concessions.

Tenders will be received by the undersigned up to and including the 15th of December next, for the right to cut pulp wood on certain areas tributary to the Nepigon river, in the District of Thunder bay and Rainy lake, in the District of Rainy river, and make the same into paper. Tenderers should state the amount they are prepared to pay as bonus in addition to such dues as may from time to time be fixed for the right to operate a paper-making industry on the areas referred to. Separate tenders must be made for each area or territory, and the successful tenderers will be required to erect a mill or mills on each of the territories or in such other localities as may be approved by the government of Ontario.

Parties tendering for the pulp wood rights shall accompany their tenders with a marked cheque for 25 per cent of the amount tendered payable to the treasurer of Ontario, and to be forfeited in the event of their failing to enter into agreements to carry out conditions, &c.

With respect to the Rainy lake pulp concession, tenderers will be required to make a tender for the right to cut pine, tamarack and cedar on the territory offered. Parties making tender for these timbers to state the amount they are prepared to pay per thousand feet B. M. as bonus in addition to Crown dues of $2 per thousand feet B.M. A marked cheque for $5,000 payable to the treasurer of Ontario, must accompany the tender for pine timber, and to be forfeited in the event of their failing to enter into agreements to carry out conditions, &c.

No timber shall be cut on either of the concessions of a less diameter than nine inches, two feet from the ground.

The successful tenderers to enter into agreements with the government for the erection of the mills, expenditure of money, &c.

For full particulars as to the conditions, &c., application should be made to the undersigned.

HON. F. COCHRANE,
Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines.

Toronto, October 16, 1907.

This is a very important measure but it can be outwitted by a clever purchaser on the other side. He can send in a lot of stool pigeons to purchase the land. Even where the lumberman has to take off the timber in two years, the stool pigeons and pulp wood settlers will take the land, and pay the price, which will be put up by the corporation on the other side, and deplete that land of all the timber there is on it. By this means the provinces can be outwitted and our forest wealth taken to the other side of the border.

Mr. LEWIS.

With reference to the help we get in this matter, here is an item from the Toronto 'News':

Fighting the Paper Trust—Local Typographical Union enters Resolution of Protest.

At a meeting of the joint conference board of the Allied Printing Trades, composed of delegates representing the International Typographical Union, International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, International Stereotypers' and Electrotypers' Union, International Photo-Engravers' Union and the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, held at Indianapolis, Ind., December 17, 1907, a resolution favouring the abolition of the duty on white paper, wood pulp and the various materials used in the manufacture thereof, was unanimously adopted, and also at a recent meeting of the Detroit Tyographical Union, No. 18, the same measure was presented and adopted by a unanimous vote:

'Whereas, we, the workers, employed in the various departments of newspaper and commercial printing offices throughout the United States, i.e., compositors, pressmen, stereotypers and electrotypers, photo-engravers and bookbinders, to the number of more than 100,000, feel that any combination, which produce an artificial scarcity of news print paper, and which unduly stimulates the price of that product, is an oppression that affects alike the employee as well as the employer; and

'Whereas, the almost prohibitive and ruinous price of such paper has curtailed to an alarming extent the number of workers employed in the printing industry, and has further acted as a preventive to the printing trades artisans from securing higher compensation for their services, to which they are justly entitled; therefore, be it

'Resolved, that this joint conference board, in session at Indianapolis, Ind., December 17, 1907, submit a memorial to the President of the United States and the Congress, and appeal for the abolition of the duty on white paper, wood pulp and the materials which are used in the manufacture thereof, and be it

'Resolved, that all local unions affiliated with our international organizations are requested to endorse these resolutions and forward copies to their representatives and United States senators.

I would ask hon. gentlemen to note the significant bearing of that item, namely, that we have behind us a majority of the unions who are opposed to the corporations that control the paper and pulp mills in the United States.

From the Toronto 'News' of February 15, 1907, I take this paragraph:

Recently reference was made to the economically unwise action of this country in giving away its spruce pulp logs to be manufactured into paper in United States mills. Here is the lesson in a nut shell. Canada has the greatest supply of pulp wood in the world; Great Britain is the greatest consumer of paper, and yet Canada has only a share (how much is not thought worth while giving in these figures) in about twelve or fifteen per cent of Great Britain's importations. On the other hand, the United States, which is an

exporter of paper practically only because Canada supplies it with raw material, is up among the first three or four nations which send paper into Britain. Canada depletes her most valuable forests and sells the product in the shape of pulp wood for $6 or $7 per cord. The United States saves her forests and sells our product in the shape of paper for, say, $30 per cord for good British gold. Are not Canadians what the man in the street would call 'dead easy' to let this go on when we could stop it in six months by prohibiting (as Ontario has done) the export of pulp wood from Crown lands?

In one respect that item is wrong. If properly investigated it will be found there are no pulp wood forests in the United States.

The Laurentide Paper Company have millions invested in their plant and limits, and it is to their own best interests to preserve their limits. Many of the American companies cut off their timber regardless of the future supply, and in this way waste immense quantities.

Over 52,000 tons of roll newspaper is made every year by this company, and as the Canadian consumption is only 27,000 tons yearly, it means that outside markets must be sought for much of the produce. The market of the United States is barred owing to the duty, yet Canada furnishes them with their raw material. When this raw material happens to be manufactured in Canada it is shut out of the United States. As we have to import much of our heavy machinery from the United States and pay duties, the Canadian manufacturer of paper is handicapped when he attempts to compete with American manufacturers in foreign markets. The Americans have also a big advantage in the cost of coal, in the supply of skilled labour, in lower traffic rates, in cost of machinery and mill supplies and many other things. Prohibit the exportation of pulp wood from Canada and the American papermakers would be compelled to buy their ground and sulphite pulp from Canada at from $20 to $38. If not, then the American papermakers would have to move their entire plants over here, and would thus build up large, thriving centres of industry around their plants.

An argument is made by some that the farmer and settler would suffer if the exportation of pulp wood should be prohibited. The Laurentide Paper Company are buying to-day a large portion of their wood from farmers The policy of well-conducted paper mills, they say, is to buy all of the pulp wood they possibly can from farmers in order to save their own limits from the demands made upon them by increasing productions. The paper mills of Canada to-day could use a very large proportion of the wood now being exported to the United States and with new mills building in Canada the market for the pulp wood and the price would be maintained.

From the present policy the company says, Canada is getting practically nothing. The stumps are left as mementoes, a small amount is obtained for transportation, &c. On the other hand, thriving cities are growing up around American mills whose supplies come from Canada. The Americans are quite content to have things remain as they are, for the present arrangements give them the long end of the deal; in fact, the United States Congress dictates to Canada, and not only makes its own laws, but presumes to say what Canada shall or shall not do. Canada gives them all the advantages and gets absolutely nothing in return. Americans own in Quebec province 12,000 square miles of pulp wood areas, and this is being rapidly depleted by the hundreds of mills in the United States which are absolutely dependent on Canada for their supplies. It certainly does not seem the part of wisdom for us to continue a policy which has the effect of building up manufacturing centres in the United States when by changing that policy these centres can be developed in Canada. Our present policy of sending our wood to build up a foreign country was just furnishing it with weapons to fight Canada in the commercial world. How well the United States realize the strength of Canada's position on this question was probably never better shown than in the message of President Roosevelt when he practically said, 'It might be well for us to make some concessions to Canada if they will guarantee us free wood.'

Mr. J. H. Biermans, the managing director, holds strong opinions on the questions connected with the pulp and paper trade that have aroused so much interest in the public mind. On the necessity of this country imposing regulations relative to the cutting of timber he was emphatic. About thirty years ago, he said, the Scandinavians were confronted with the same problem. They, too, had believed that their forests were inexhaustible. It required much persistent and long-continued agitation to awaken them to a realization of the fact that their magnificent forests were being rapidly denuded. To their credit, however, it must be said that when once this fact was borne in upon them they took prompt and effective measures to provide a remedy Now for every tree they cut down two are planted in its place.

Mr. Biermans is also a strong believer in the wisdom of keeping our raw material in Canada. He thinks it is foolish and unbusinesslike that we should allow our logs to go free into the United States, especially when the latter country does her best to shut out our pulp and paper by imposing heavy duties. Personally he thinks that prohibition of the export of logs is the best remedy. He considers that the future for the pulp and paper industries in Canada is a dark one unless such action is taken.

Mr. Riordan is strongly in favour of an unconditional prohibition of the export of pulp wood, whether the United States removes the duty on pulp and paper or not. He believes that our natural resources make it possible for the pulp and paper industry to become Canada's greatest industry and greater than that of any other country. The cultivation of this industry, he believes, means as much to Canada as the cultivation of the steel and wheat industries that the government have done so much to foster. The remedy might bring about for a time some dislocation of the Canadian pulp wood business, but he thinks that the end to be gained would justify the government in taking steps to neutralize that dislocation.

The six daily newspapers of Toronto consumed last year about 9,000 tons of paper, and the consumption has been growing by at least

10 per cent annually. To supply these six newspapers required the product of not less than 3,000 acres of spruce. The Toronto newspapers probably represent one-fourth the home consumption for Canada. This country is even to-day exporting five times as much news paper as is consumed at home, and the industry can scarcely be said to have reached more than the infant stage.

Thus, for the present home consumption alone about 12,000 acres must surrender their product every year, and for the combined domestic and export business 72,000 acres are devasted annually. These figures will, beyond any doubt, increase enormously during the next few years, for more and more Canada is being looked to for the world's supply of pulp and paper.

Two of the Toronto dailies just referred to have only recently raised their price to subscribers outside of Toronto from one dollar per year to one dollar and a half per year. The pinch has been felt more forcibly in the United States, where hundreds of daily papers have raised their prices by from fifty to one hundred per cent since the increase in the cost of white paper mentioned above became effective.

It does not require much argument, therefore, to show that in finding a solution for the pulp wood problem the newspaper publisher and reader are equally interested. For too long the question has suffered through indifference on the part of the public, who apparently regarded it as of interest only to the pulp and paper makers and the paper users of the country.

The opposition to the imposition of an export duty on the raw material as a means of stopping the denundation of our forest lands is unpatriotic in its fullest sense. It apparently wishes not only the destruction of the beautiful and the useful, but also to baulk the immense industries which may develop by keeping the manufacture of pulp in this country. The 'Sportsman' says to the government :—'Stop the export of raw material, force the mill owner to manufacture in Canada, and attend to forest culture as you have to agriculture, and I will be satisfied.' Moreover, an export duty and strict supervision leaves a government in a good defensive position when it is called upon (as it will be) to face an angry electorate and to explain why the country is being robbed of two of its finest assets which explanation will be demanded in the very near future.

Let us examine the work of our cousins over the border. Up to a short time ago they supplied the world with lumber and finished paper from pulp wood. This brought them in millions of dollars. To-day both lumber and pulp wood are about exhausted. To-morrow they will have to spend millions annually for both lumber and pulp wood. Until lately sportsmen and tourists came to the United States from all parts of the world to hunt big game, to admire the scenic beauty found in her forest-clothed mountains, east and west, and to angle in her splendid streams and lakes. Those sportmen brought in millions of dollars; five millions of dollars to one state alone, we are told. That simple tool, the axe, has nearly destroyed these two sources of revenue. In justice to the American people, I must say that this destruction was largely the result of ignorance.

Recently we discussed this question in all its bearings with prominent American sportsmen at the Sportsmen's show held in New York. All were unanimous in condemning the wasteful methods of the lumbermen and the weakness of the government in permitting it until too late. Let the Canadian people take this lesson to heart in time; this lesson that the American people are finding so bitter to learn, and difficult to turn to account. To-day the American lumbermen and pulp mill owners look to Canada as the dying Moslem looks to Mecca for salvation.

Ottawa, Oct. 10.—The petition presented to the government yesterday by a delegation of paper and pulp makers, and which the premier has agreed to take under consideration, is as follows :

Whereas, it has been the policy of the federal government to encourage and promote manufacture within the bounds of the Dominion by duties sufficiently high to protect home manufacture, and by bounties to encourage the use of home raw material; and

Whereas, the federal government has expended large amounts to promote agriculture and to encourage immigration from the mother land and foreign countries; and

Whereas, we have within the bounds of Canada, as a natural product, spruce pulp wood capable of providing employment for a large number of our present people, and for many who may come to find homes here; and

Whereas, this wood is being raised in Canada and shipped as pulp wood to the United States to keep pulp and paper mills in that country running; and

Whereas, our present natural advantages should make pulp and paper our greatest industry; and

Whereas, the exporters are stripping the lands of wood while those with permanent interests in the country are striving to conserve the forests; and

Whereas, the crop of pulp wood is of very slow growth, and the supply is already becoming inaccessible; and

Whereas, the free export of pulp wood to the United States, combined with the tariff against our pulp and paper, favours the development of the paper industry in the United States rather than in Canada;

Therefore, your petitioners humbly pray that the exportation of pulp wood be prohibited by the federal government.

This is how the probable prohibition of pulp wood by the Canadian government appeals to at least one American congressman, T. Littlefield:

'Canada has the largest supply of pulp wood in the world. The country has vast timber resources, and there is already an agitation in the Canadas for an export duty on pulp wood. Why are the Canadians asking for this export duty? It is because they want the mills, the millions of capital that would be invested, and the vast sums that would be expended for labour. They want all the returns their forests will give them, and they are right. It is laudable on their part, and it is just as laudable for us. While we stand on the proposition America for the Americans, they shout for Canada for the Canadians. The Canadians have not the same constitutional limitations as embarrass us in this country. Perhaps I should not say embarrass, for I believe that there is not one limitation in the contitution that is not necessary for our welfare and happiness.

But while we are restricted from putting an export duty on any of our products the Canadians are under no such limitations. They already have export duty on some articles. One can see what an export duty on pulp wood would do to the pulp manufacturers of this country in the experience of lumber operators in the province of Ontario.

I shall explain to the House in two words the difference between our constitution and that of the United States. The federal government of the United States which has to do with the question of export and import duties has only the powers which are expressly given to it by the constitution of the United States, whereas the powers exercised by our provincial governments are only those expressly given to them by the British North America Act. The federal government of the United States has no power to impose an export duty on any article.

I wish now to read an extract from 'Pulp and Paper' magazine of February, 1908, which reads:

Instead of trying to break our business down and force the new mills, which represent an investment of $100,000,000, to move to Canada, why do the newspapers not use their columns to build up the business, advocate preservation of the forests, the building of storage reservoirs, for water-power purposes at the head waters of all streams in the country where practicable, and thus preserve their own existence.

The 31st annual meeting of the American Paper and Pulp Association took place in New York on the 6th instant, the attendance being larger than ever before.

I have here an article relating to the 'Watertown Pulp and Wood Supply Company,' which reads:

The above is the name of a company with head offices in Watertown, N.Y., which was incorporated last year under the laws of the State of New York, for the purpose of buying pulp wood in Canada and shipping it to several paper manufacturing companies in the United States. This object is significant, inasmuch as the paper makers in the Republic recognize they cannot much longer hunt for individual supplies of raw material either in their own country or in Canada, but find it expedient to join together and draw from one independent source of supply in Canada, over which they themselves will have control. The officers of the company are as follows: J. A. Otterson, president; J. M. Gamble, vice-president; C. H. Remington, treasurer; F. M. Hugo, secretary; W. C. Campbell; E. B. Sterling, general manager. They represent the following companies: The St. Regis Paper Company; The Remington-Martin Paper Company; The Norwood Paper Company; The Raymondville Paper Company; The Carthage Sulphite Company; The West End Paper Company; The Champion Paper Company; The Brownsville Paper Company; The Dexter Sulphite Company; The Carthage Tissue Mills; The Brownsville Board Company.

The company has an office in Quebec city, managed by E. B. Sterling, who is authorized to buy pulp wood in Canada and ship it to the above companies.

It was understood that it was the company's intention to build pulp mills in Quebec province, but J. A. Otterson of Carthage, N.Y., who is one of those largely interested, informs the Pulp and Paper Magazine that this is not the case. Evidently, while the Canadian government delays in bringing forward measures for restricting or prohibiting the export of pulp wood, the Americans think they may as well get all the wood they can in Canada and ship it to the United States for manufacture.

I have here an interesting paragraph entitled 'Our Forest Wealth,' taken from an American paper, reading:

Seattle papers predict that the timber resources of the Dominion will soon be severely taxed by increased demands. The rate of consumption shows a constant growth. Concrete, brick, stone and steel are more largely used in all structural work than ever before. But, notwithstanding the demand for all classes of structural timber, lumber and wood materials are increasing too. Other parts of the world have been denuded of trees, and are now restocking their forests. In Canada there is still a large virgin area, an apparently inexhaustible forest supply. But rapid settlement of Canada's prairies, the relatively small pine area left in the United States, and the needs of paper manufacturers are making rapid inroads on Dominion spruce and pine, the country's most valuable timber. Europe is looking to Canada now. The United States is buying there too. The Seattle 'Post-Intelligencer' says that it is the northern wilds that should be Canada's future wood lot. It is there Canada should introduce a practical forestry system that will ensure for all time the perpetuation of those forest areas. Growth and reproduction should be continued there indefinitely by scientific forestry methods. If they are, those uninhabited wilds will long be the source of Canada's greatest wealth.

A significant despatch headed 'Big Timber Land Deal' appears in the 'Globe' under date of St. John, N.B., October 5, 1907. It reads:

For the fifth time during the last two years a lumber deal has been completed on the north shore of New Brunswick whereby American capitalists get possession of property valued at nearly half a million.

To-day the International Paper Company purchased from Ernest Hutchinson of Chatham 45 square miles of granted timber lands and 300 square miles Crown lands held under lease from the government, also a large mill. The price is $500,000.

Mr. W. B. Snowball of the J. B. Snowball Company, has been a consistent advocate of an export duty on pulp wood, and has voiced his opinions and arguments at many of the meetings of the provincial and Dominion forestry associations and elsewhere. He said:

I am opposed to an export duty on pulp wood. My idea is that the exportation of pulp wood from Canada should be absolutely prohibited. If a duty is decided upon it

should be high enough to be prohibitive. That is what we should have in this country. I believe that if the governments of the various provinces would follow the example of Ontario and forbid the exportation of pulp wood cut on the Crown lands it would go a long way toward inducing the establishment here of the pulp and paper manufacturing establishments from the United States.

I now come to two interesting extracts from the Montreal 'Herald,' the government organ in Montreal. They are as follows:

The strong movement to which the 'Herald' directed attention some months ago, as growing in force and intensity, in favour of a change in the fiscal conditions that govern the exportation of pulp wood, has found expression in articles that have appeared in other journals as well as in the representations made this week to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs by an influential delegation representing the industry.

Hon. Mr. Turgeon favours export duty.

'It is,' said the minister, 'a hard question to deal with, and there are many grave difficulties in the way of a settlement.' As Minister of Lands and Forests and speaking solely from the point of view of my interest, because of that position, in the forests of the province, I think it would be a great boon for the public domain if the federal government put an export duty on pulp wood. On several occasions people have come to this government and asked why we should not put a big tax on pulp wood cut for export. We have had to point out to them that in the first place we have no power to enact an export duty, and that in the second place the provincial tax on pulp wood cut for export applies only to Crown lands. A careful calculation made by some experts shows that for every cord of wood exported from the province there is left here a sum averaging $6 per cord. That covers everything, labour, price to the seller, transportation charges and everything else.

Menace to pulp wood areas.

It is admitted by everybody who has gone into the question that the pulp wood resources of Canada are vast but competent authorities declare that it is a mistake to assume that they are inexhaustible. Vast as these areas are in Quebec, Ontario and some of the other provinces of the Dominion they are as vulnerable as the herds of buffalos that once thundered in hundreds of thousands over the prairies, but are to be seen no more. They are as vulnerable as those of the Adirondacks and of Northern New York, which gave way before the portable mills of the lumbermen until the industry disappeared and only charred dry stumps were left to tell the story of vandalism.

An Export Duty on Pulp Wood.

The deputation of manufacturers of paper and pulp which yesterday waited on the Prime Minister, the Finance Minister and the Minister of Customs, evidently presented strong evidence in support of their contention that an export duty should be placed on pulp wood by Canada, or that the exportation of the wood should be prohibited by federal legislation, as it is now in Ontario by provincial legislation. It appears to be clear that the United States paper manufacturers must have our pulp wood, and it is equally clear that they are coming to Canada in large numbers, securing timber limits of great magnitude and stripping them of their pulp wood without doing more for the development of Canada's resources than is implied in the sums they spend for labour and freight. Further, the present condition of affairs encourages jobbers to place 'fake' settlers on Crown lands, get the available pulp wood swept clear and then move the so-called settlers to new fields of labour, leaving behind them lands uncultivated and denuded of timber.

Were the Canadian paper maker finding a ready market in the States, the situation, from a national standpoint, would not be so absurdly one-sided. As it is, he is debarred by a high tariff from selling his finished product in the country which gives free admission to pulp wood, the raw product of the paper maker. The United States tariff being directly designed to encourage the importation of Canadian raw material and discourage that of Canadian manufactured goods, the question arises: How long are we going to rest content with this situation?

Ontario has shown by its action in prohibiting the export of saw logs that the process of manufacture of Ontario timber into the finished product could be transferred to that province. Why should similar action by the Dominion not have a similar result? The two difficulties that appear most prominently in the way are the effect upon the bona fide settler, by diminishing his market, and the possibility of serious reprisals by the States. It is probable that the settler would not find much difference in the value of his timber, owing to the great demand for it, and to the fact that, before long, the States will have to get our paper if they do not get our pulp wood. As to the danger of reprisals, a self-respecting people must do what seems best with their own natural products. If they desire to manufacture them into finished articles within their own borders they cannot hold their hand for fear of some other people objecting. In fact, it is probable that a firm stand by Canada on this very question would be the most certain means of getting from the United States favourable terms on the importation of pulp and paper. If we could send our paper free into the States, we would not have the same objection to our pulp wood being freely utilized by American paper mills. A fair field is all that Canadians desire. They do not possess it under the existing terms of the United States tariff.

Here is an extract from the 'Globe' of August 31:

At Sturgeon Falls is one of the great pulp and paper mills of the province, located on the river that carries down to its doors the spruce which feeds its ponderous grinders, and also supplies the power which makes the wheels revolve. The mill—it is probably no secret among financial men of the province—has had difficulties in the past, partly due to the condition of the pulp and paper market, and doubtless to other drawbacks incidental to putting a large industry on its feet. A substantial town with modern buildings and public conveniences has grown up about the

mill and within ear shot of the cataract which gave the place its name. The whole aspect of the business has changed with the market conditions of the past fifteen months, and the future of the mills at this point is assured. The output is sold before it is manufactured, and an export business has been worked up.

Here is another article from the 'World' dealing with Wisconsin's paper industry and its moral:

Wisconsin's Paper Industry and Its Moral.

How necessary it is to encourage the development of the paper making industry of Canada is brought home to the Dominion and Provincial governments by a recent article in the Milwaukee 'Sentinel.' Quite naturally the leading Wisconsin newspaper cannot restrain its jubilation over the extraordinary progress made by that state in paper production, in which it declares its manufacturers will soon rival the world. Almost all kinds are made. 'Shiploads are sent to Japan and train loads to all parts of the west. Several train loads of paper steam out of the Fox River valley every evening. It is a small mill which does not make a carload in one day. Some of the machines run a sheet of paper 120 inches wide, 500 feet long, every minute, or a mile of paper every ten minutes, which is rolled into great white rolls and shipped in that manner to the newspapers.'

Only a few of the paper mills prepare their own pulp. Most of the pulp plants are separate enterprises, dependent for their lumber largely on Canadian forests. 'Thousands of carloads of wood pulp,' says 'The Sentinel,' are cut in the northern forests each winter and large rafts brought over the lakes from Canada each season and loaded on the cars at Green bay for distribution to the mills.' Papermaking in Wisconsin flourishes chiefly in the valleys of the Fox and Wisconsin rivers but large works have been placed in other water-powers. New plants are being constantly erected and all the mills are running night and day. But why should Ontario and the other forest areas of Canada content themselves with supplying wood for United States paper mills? Every one of the advantages enjoyed by Wisconsin is possessed by Ontario and bettered—clear water, hydraulic power, proximity to the forests. This province ought to reverberate day and night with the hum of paper factories, just as Wisconsin does. The provincial government should lose no further time in checking the export of pulp wood and in adopting a policy which will not only encourage, but compel the utilization of the raw wood in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, in detaining you for so long a time with these cuttings, I feel obliged to say that I have taken every precaution to cut out only those parts that are relevant, and with the object of putting the case in regard to pulp wood as clearly as possible. I wish now to quote from a report of the Industrial and Labour Statistics of the State of Maine for 1906:

The immense increase in the volume of this industry during the past two years is a matter of great surprise to us and no doubt will be to a lot who make the matter a study, but we cannot question the correctness of our schedules.

It is evident to all that this industry is developing the natural resources of Maine as perhaps no other industry has ever done. It is constantly adding wealth to our state, both to the operators and wage-earners, as well as to the merchants and other business men in the communities where the mills are situated. It is adding prosperity to many of our old settled towns and building up new towns in the wilderness. It is giving employment to thousands of our young men who otherwise might be obliged to seek a livelihood in distant parts of the country.

I submit that a great many of these young men mentioned here came from the province of Quebec.

It has no doubt been instrumental, to a large degree, in stemming the tide of emigration from Maine, which, in the past has carried such a large percentage of the brain and brawn of our rural communities to other states, much to the detriment of our own.

The farmer and the gardener, as well as the businessman and the workman feel the influence of the industry in the new demand for produce, which adds much to their income, where formerly the most remunerative products of the soil, without a local market, were rendered almost valueless on account of their perishable nature.

The most serious problem in this industry is the question of a wood supply for the pulp mills.

From the closest estimate the writer can make from a compilation of their returns, it appears that after deducting Canadian spruce and the edgings and other mill waste from the total amount used, the Maine forests will soon be depleted. Now, Sir, here is a statement taken from a book prepared by the Toronto 'Globe':

I do not think there is any doubt but that Canadian mills could and would buy all the wood that the Quebec farmers have for sale at as good a price as they are now getting if the Canadian mills had the protection that the prohibition of export would give them, and the new construction that this protection would bring about would soon make the market larger than ever. Our company are at the present time using from 90,000 to 100,000 cords per year, and we buy a considerable portion of it from farmers.

That is from an interview with the general manager of the Riordan Paper Mills Company. I will now quote from a 'Globe' editorial of September 20, 1907:

In a number of cases the one-cent dailies have been put up to two cents, and many country weeklies have advanced their subscription prices. Some publishers are cutting down the size of their publications, others are reducing their head line and still others are using smaller type. All these remedies go but a little way to relieve the present distress, to say nothing of averting the impending danger. It is too late to do much in the way of conserving the supply of pulp wood in the United States, but there is still opportunity

to do a great deal in the way of preventing a like situation from arising in Canada.

Now, Sir, here is the opinion of Mr. Barber, president of the Wm. Barber & Brothers' paper mill at Georgetown:

I believe in putting an export duty on pulp wood, but it should not be larger than the duty now charged by the United States on our wood pulp. The export duty should be retained until the United States removes the duty on Canadian pulp, and then it should be taken off.

In regard to the retaliation cry, Mr. Barber says:

The retaliatory duty which will go into effect in the United States as soon as action is taken by Canada by the putting on of a duty need not alarm either the pulp wood or wood pulp exporters. I venture to predict that if the Canadian parliament puts on an export duty immediately after the opening of the coming session, the United States Congress would within two months thereafter repeal the retaliatory duty and put Canadian pulp on the free list. A sign of the feeling in the United States was given at the meeting of the publishers of newspapers held last month for the purpose of formulating a demand for the free admission of Canadian paper and pulp. They will be supported in part by quite a large number of American papermakers who want Canadian pulp free of duty, but do not want the paper admitted on the same terms. My opinion is that there will be a compromise of the conflicting interests by admiting pulp wood free without any change in the present duty on paper. If the United States does not want our newspaper other nations do, and with our ample supplies of wood and splendid water-powers we can manufacture so as to undersell them in any foreign market.

I freely believe Mr. Speaker that if the whole matter is properly explained the farmers of Canada who have pulp wood to sell (not the manufacturers of the States) will join in the movement to keep Canadian crude products to be manufactured in Canada. At present they hold the dollar so close to their eye they can't see the many dollars beyond. I am reminded of the time the mechanics broke new inventions because they thought they would stop labour; now they realize better pay and shorter hours through same machines. Now, Sir, in concluding the compilation of facts considering this great question, facts which have been added to and are being added to every day, I wish to say, that my attention was first directed to it specifically by a conversation last fall with a gentleman who had been in the United States, who was fully conversant with the ins and outs of the whole business and who said if the United States were in our position they would not wait a day before putting on an export duty. Politics steps to one side over there when the mighty dollar is in danger. I also want to say that I presented this resolution entirely of my own motion, that I consulted no one, advised with no one, and am fully prepared to plough my lonely furrow if facts, reason or other considerations prevent any one from seeing the case as I see it. I also wish to say I consider it a question so great, so vital to the national and private weal, that it should be absolutely kept out of politics. I therefore ask the government to appoint a committee of the House, three or five, to take evidence in and out of session and investigate the whole matter and report at another session. In the light of the facts to be found by this committee I trust the government will take some action which will bring into force an export duty. not immediately, but within a reasonable time, giving everybody due notice, which will have the effect of bringing the mills to Canada and thus having the product of our own country manufactured in our own country.

Mr. HENRI SEVERIN BELAND (Beauce). My hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Lewis) is an illustration of the difficulties sinners find who enter definitely upon the path of virtue. A few years ago when my hon. friend entered the House he made the reputation of being one of the longest winded speakers amongst us, but if we are to judge by the later speeches he has made during this session he was on a fair way to redeem himself. However, I am sorry to say that to-day he has relapsed worse than ever into the errors of his youthful parliamentary life. Now, Mr. Speaker, coming to the question under discussion, I may say that the subject of imposing an export duty on pulp wood has of late attracted the attention of the people of this country more than at any previous time, and the opinions in regard to it are so varied as to leave one perplexed when he comes to affirm which side of the question meets with the greater favour. I may say at the commencement of the very few remarks which I shall address to the House that there are on in this subject two different opinions which I confess may be shared by men equally animated with a true Canadian spirit. There is in the first place the opinion of the patriotic Canadian who feels that we should impose an export duty on pulpwood because it would conduce to the establishment of a huge industry in this country, the pulp and paper industry. This contention is dependent upon the assumption evidently, that the timber supply of the United States would become exhausted before many years. Then, there is the other contention that the imposition of an export duty on pulp wood would have the effect of preserving and perpetuating our own forest reserves. It is said that at the rate pulp wood is now being cut in this country our supply will soon be destroyed. I might remark here that if this argument is used in favour of an export duty on pulp wood, it scarcely conforms to the law of logic because it is

not to be seen with the naked eye how you are going to consume less pulp wood if all the pulp and paper mills of the United States are removed to Canada. It will be necessary I think to look a little deeper into this contention. Then, on the other hand, there is the contention of the equally patriotic Canadian who believes that no national and public interest can be served by the imposition of this duty, whilst the private interest of a large section of the community in Canada will be prejudicially affected. It has been said in the press, in lectures, in pamphlets, that the people who initiated the movement for an export duty to be imposed by Canada were animated with a narrow and selfish spirit; that the movement must have found its origin in the minds of the pulp and paper manufacturers in Canada with the view of ridding themselves of an active and pressing competitor on the other side of the line. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I want to approach this question in an impartial spirit I must say that I do not believe that this idea, though it may be plausible, is borne out by the facts. We know it is a fact—and every one can discover it for himself—we know it is a fact that the pulp and paper manufacturers of this country have at their disposal large and rich timber limits from which they will be able to feed their own mills. Now, one point about which there is much dispute is as to the timber wealth of the United States, and that question has been recently the subject of heated discussion. It is said that the primeval forests of the United States have long since fallen beneath the axe of the woodsman: it is said that the timber wealth of the United States is practically wiped out. I cannot for my part share that opinion, though I am well disposed to recognize that it is not unlimited and that it is not beyond the possibility of exhaustion. For instance, the state of Maine in the year 1903 had standing spruce timber to the estimated extent of 21,000,000,000 feet, which is considered by Mr. R. S. Hosmer of the United States Forestry Bureau as amply sufficient to meet the requirements of all the mills in that state for an indefinite period. We must not forget that only eleven states have been importing pulp wood from Canada, and we must not overlook the other fact that the United States have a forest reserve of 1,094,000 square miles, which is equivalent to 37 per cent of their total area. The argument is being made by the advocates of an export duty that the American forests are depleted; but I may remark that out of 3,600,000 cords consumed in the United States mills in 1907 they have imported from this country only 628,000 cords. Although I am disposed to recognize that the reserves of the United States are far from being inexhaustible, yet I am of the opinion of those who contend that our neighbours are not at our mercy; and if in America proper and effective regulations regarding the cutting of timber are adopted, as they are adopted, if the rotation system, the system of one section at a time being operated on or exploited in a given district, is enforced, as I understand that it is, and if the policy of reforestation or actual cultivation of trees is resorted to, as it is being resorted to in the United States, it will be found that they have for a much longer period than has been predicted lately sufficient timber to supply their mills.

Coming to what is termed Canada's wealth in timber lands, we may fairly say that we have the richest timber areas in the whole world. According to Dr. Bell of the Geological Survey, our forest areas represent 2,600,000 square miles, which is equivalent to 1,657,000,000 acres. It is idle for me to remind the House that a large proportion of these timber areas are inaccessible at the present time, either by rail or by water. But just for the purpose of demonstrating to the House what an immense asset Canada has in these timber areas, I may be pardoned if I indulge in a little calculation on the subject. According to Dr. Bell, one half of our timber areas is made up of pulp wood; so that we have 828,000,000 acres of pulpwood forests in Canada. If you calculate that each acre supplies five cords of pulp wood, which I believe is quite below the average, you reach the enormous figure of 4,144,000,000 cords; and at the rate at which we are exporting pulp wood to the United States—not 1,000,000 cords a year, but suppose it is—we could continue to ship to the United States at that rate for 4,144 years. If alone we supplied the entire American and Canadian markets at the rate of 4,000,000 cords a year, Canada's pulp forests would exist for 1,000 years.

As I have already said, this is only a speculative calculation, and I do not propose to adhere to it in order to make my point. I would simply come to the forest areas of the province of Quebec, a large proportion of which are within easy reach of lumbermen, and, as you well know, the main source from which American mill owners draw their supply. The forest areas of the province of Quebec amount to 327,000 square miles, equivalent to 209,000,000 acres. I will be content to take as a basis of calculation only 70,000 square miles actually under license in that province; and to make it plain to the House that my argument is not mere fancy, I will take the liberty to quote the testimony of Sir Wm. Van Horne given before the Colonization Commission of the province of Quebec appointed a few years ago. Here is a question that was put to him, and his answer:

Q. At the actual rate of exploitation how long will your spruce limits of the Laurentide Pulp company last?—A. The company has acquired a considerable stretch of tim-

ber lands, some 1,650 square miles. The intention is to purvey for our needs indefinitely by the annual growth of trees; and we believe that with a judicious system of cutting and convenient protection against fire, the Grand-Mere mills will be fed for all time to come.

Now, the reports of the Department of Mines and Forests in the province of Quebec show that the Laurentide Pulp Company cuts 50,000 cords per annum on its limits. This testimony, from the lips of a gentleman who is reputed to strongly favour an export duty on pulp wood, is full of instruction.

We find that 1,650 square miles, divided up into sections and exploited methodically, will supply 50,000 cords annually and indefinitely by the growth of trees simply by natural reforestration. Suppose you apply the same method to the 70,000 square miles under license in the province of Quebec, a yearly supply of 2,120,000 cords of pulp wood will be available for all times to come, or about three times the quantity exported to the United States last year.

I may be told, with much reason, that pulp wood is not the only timber cut on those lands. My answer is that besides the 70,000 square miles under license in the province of Quebec, there is left, making allowance for private and seigneury lands, 200,000 square miles of uncut virgin timber land, the richness of which is unparalleled in the whole world. Apparently therefore the danger is not yet at our doors. Apparently the peril is not approaching and famine is still far away, if only proper methods are adopted.

Much has been said about the progress of the pulp wood and paper industry in Canada. Is it lingering, as is stated by those who advocate an export duty? It will be necessary for me to give some statistics in order to demonstrate what wonderful progress has been achieved in this direction. Take, for instance, the pulp mills. As my hon. friend, who moved the resolution, has quoted, in 1888 we had thirty-four pulp mills in Canada and in 1907 we had fifty-eight. The thirty-four mills in 1888 had a total capacity for 24 hours of 154 tons only, whilst the 58 mills in 1907 have a total capacity for 24 hours of 2,361 tons. Therefore whilst the number of mills has only increased from 34 to 58, the capacity has increased from 154 tons to 2,361 tons daily, or an increase of 1,500 per cent. Take the paper mills. In 1888 we had 40 mills with a capacity of 173 tons in the 24 hours. In 1907 we had 46 mills with a capacity of 966 tons in the 24 hours. Those figures, I submit, show a development in the pulp and paper industry in this country which is most gratifying and encouraging, and that development has taken place without recourse to the extreme measure of an export duty. This industry will keep on increasing and enlarging by great strides owing to our rich timber areas and splendid water-powers.

It is generally claimed, and rightly so, that in legislation as in other matters public interest must take precedence of private interests. But this law scarcely finds an application in the present instance. The private interest, the interest of the individual in this regard, is so large that it comes well nigh being a public interest. It is argued that the national interests of this country would be enhanced by prohibiting the export of pulp wood inasmuch as two things would result. What are these two things? First, that such a course would compel the establishment in this country of huge pulp and paper industries. Second, our immense stretches of timber lands would be preserved and made permanent. Every one will admit that these are the two reasons invoked by the advocates of an export duty. These advocates go even further. They state, as my hon. friend has said this afternoon, that the private interests of those who are engaged in the cutting of pulpwood will in no way be affected because a Canadian market will be substituted for the American market. I shall leave aside the question of the public interest for a moment and deal with the private interests. Assuming that the Americans supply is shortly to be exhausted, as the advocates of an export duty contend, no one will assert that it will not last twenty-five years longer, and it is not to be supposed that the American pulp and paper mills will fall to the ground before our legislation as did the walls of Jericho before the sound of trumpets and drums. It is surely within the bounds of reason to state that fifteen years at least will elapse before any great development of that American industry over here will take place. Now I ask where are the Canadian farmers going to sell their pulp wood in these next fifteen years? It is a fact that the largest proportion of pulp wood exported to the United States is cut in the area comprised between the St. Lawrence and the American boundary line. Assuming that an export duty sufficiently high would have the effect of removing to this country the great American pulp and paper industry, where would that industry seek its field of operation. Certainly not in the area I have described. Why? Because the reserve of spruce and balsam in that area is too limited to warrant the establishment of large pulp and paper mills and because also, although there are a few water-powers still available, they are not very abundant. All lumbermen are unanimous in that opinion. The probabilities are that the new industry would seek its field of operation in the northern region, in the very heart of the richest timber reserves; so that by adopting such a policy as is comprised in the four corners of the resolution of my hon. friend, you would place in a most disadvantageous and

unfair position the farmers situated south of the St. Lawrence and east of the city of Montreal. You would therefore perpetrate a crying injustice upon particularly the population of the counties I am about to name: Rimouski, Temiscouata, Kamouraska, L'Islet, Montmagny, Bellechasse, Lévis, Beauce, Dorchester, Megantic, Lotbinière, Nicolet, Drummond, Arthabaska, Richmond, Wolfe, Shefford, Stanstead, Sherbrooke and Compton.

An hon. MEMBER. And Gaspé.

Mr. BELAND. And Gaspé—and a few other counties also on the north side of the St. Lawrence, aggregating a population of at least 300,000 people actually engaged in the cutting of pulp wood, and entirely cut off from all markets, American and Canadian—for there is no sensible man in this country who would for a moment believe that the owners of pulp and paper mills in the northern region of the province of Quebec would try to feed their mills from the south shore of the St. Lawrence. Furthermore, if, as must appear most probable, ten or fifteen years must elapse before any great migration of the paper industry from the American to the Canadian side takes place, who can say what the conditions of that industry will be at the end of that time? Has science said its last word? Who can assert that in twenty years from now some other device will not be found by which a cheaper material than spruce will be available for the manufacture of paper? Why, twenty years ago the man who would have dared to assert that in twenty years from that time it would be possible to send a despatch 500 miles out to sea without the help of a guiding wire would have been regarded as ripe for a lunatic asylum. I submit that we cannot take any chances in this regard. I submit that if this parliament has the power to prohibit the export of pulp wood it has no right to do so. Our duty, on the contrary, is quite evident; our duty is to open up any new market in order that our exports may balance our imports as far as possible.

Now, one of the arguments brought forward in favour of the imposition of an export duty is the urgent necessity of preserving Canadian timber areas from devastation and utter destruction. The protection and preservation of our forests is a cause that has the sympathy and full support of all men who are concerned in the welfare of this country. It is felt that, holding as we do the richest timber lands of the whole world, the duty is incumbent upon us of preserving our forests in order to make them permanent and perpetuate the large income which we as a Dominion and as provinces derive therefrom annually, and not only for these purposes, but also to maintain the regular flow of our streams and thereby protect our water-powers. But I submit that this noble design does not lie entirely or even principally with this parliament or this government, but, as I shall be able to demonstrate in a little while, with the provincial authorities. Fire regulations and stumpage regulations are about the only means by which to ensure the preservation and perpetuation of timber areas, and an export duty, as my hon. friend will admit, will be of no avail whatever to that end. Much has been made in the press of the opinion of Dr. Fernow concerning the preservation of our timber area. I have and we all have, the greatest respect for Dr. Fernow's opinion. He is a gentleman of the highest culture in these matters, a man whose opinion is prized, and highly prized, in all circles, economic and scientific. I am very glad the opportunity is afforded me to give the opinion of Dr. Fernow. I quote from the 'Globe' of Saturday, February 29 last:

> Personally, I am very doubtful whether tariff regulations can be made effective in securing conservative use of the timber resource. The import tariff imposed by the States has had no effect one way or the other, and I doubt whether export duties would have a very beneficial effect in the long run, so far as conservative forest use is concerned.

Now, it is remarkable that an authority so frequently cited by the advocates, and most sanguine advocates, of an export duty on pulp wood as Dr. Fernow should express such an opinion. The learned gentleman has undoubtedly realized the untenable position in which the promoters of the new policy have placed themselves. In effect, the claim of these gentlemen is that the result of the export duty will be to protect our forests against devastation. But, almost in the same breath, these advocates of the new policy glorify over and call upon all Canadian people to admire the great industry which the new policy will develop on Canadian territory. In fact, it is claimed that before ten years have passed the whole American outfit of pulp and paper manufacturing will be removed to this country. I want to put to the advocates of the export duty this very simple question: If the migration of the American pulp and paper mills takes place, as it is predicted it will, as an inevitable effect of the export duty, how are you going to manage to consume less wood than is being consumed to-day? That is a fair and reasonable question. It needs no argument to show that the same quantity of spruce and balsam will be required, no matter on which side of the line the mills are situated—that proposition is self-evident. And the conclusion is brought home to every keen observer that the protection and preservation of our forests is not dependent in the least degree upon a prohibitive export duty, but upon regulations concerning settlement, concerning dia-

meter of trees to be cut, concerning stumpage duty, and especially concerning fire—for, as has been oftentimes repeated, fire is a worse enemy to the forest than is the axe itself.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Lewis), in finishing his remarks, asked for a commission to be appointed to investigate this whole matter and suggest a remedy for a situation which, he claims is fraught with evil and danger to this country. For my part, I have not the least objection to the course adopted by my hon. friend being adopted by the government, that a commission is required to study the question. But if a remedy is necessary, and I believe a remedy is necessary, a commission will show that it lies with the authorities of the different provinces which have the control and administration of their timber lands. Any action taken by this parliament in the way of tariff legislation of the kind now proposed will constitute in my humble opinion, a serious infringement upon provincial rights, and would no doubt be resented by the provinces. On the other hand, the provinces have in their hands the most effective and ideal remedy. They are in possession of the required jurisdiction to issue, as I have just said, and to enforce fire and cutting regulations as well as to fix stumpage dues. A province may practically prohibit the export of pulp wood by enacting, for instance, that all woods cut within the limits of the province on Crown lands shall be manufactured within those limits. They may also prohibit the export of pulp wood by imposing a prohibitive stumpage duty with the necessary rebate in case the wood is manufactured within the limits of the province.

This remedy is all the more acceptable because it does not interfere with the private land owners, because it allows the bona fide settler who has just patented his land after he has performed his settlement duties to reap a little benefit out of the few cords of pulp wood that he can sell wherever he pleases. Colonization is not hampered thereby. No one has ever contended, I hope, that the salvation of our forests was to be found in the protection of private lands; it lies in the protection and reservation of our Crown lands. Let the Crown lands be preserved and then this forest wealth will be perpetuated. Ontario has set an example in this regard and restrictive legislation has been adopted there which has proved very beneficial to the province. In Quebec, during the last few years, forest reserves have been created to the extent of 168,000 square miles, the object being to insure productive timber lands for centuries to come, and also with a view to the maintenance of our water-powers. This action on the part of the two largest provinces which are as we know more exposed to the exploitation of their pulp wood reserves by the Americans may be accentuated and the desired object attained; the other provinces may follow suit as need arises, and by adopting such a course colonization will not be hampered, our forests will be preserved, and the private owners of land will not see their rights trampled upon and their individual liberty interfered with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Canada, as we know, enjoys friendly relations with our neighbours to the south and any action taken by this parliament towards straining these friendly relations between these two countries would be looked upon with much regret by our people. The export duty policy is an extreme measure. It is very seldom resorted to and the circumstances that would justify its application are very few. It would have its raison d'etre for instance, if a nation holds a practical and complete and undivided monopoly of a certain product. It would also find its application when the price of a given article of daily, common, and indispensible use is forced up to an unreasonable height by an eager foreign demand. But outside of these circumstances I submit that the imposition of an export duty would be looked upon as a provocative measure. Are we in a position to say that we hold a monopoly of pulp wood, or rather of the raw materials that go into the manufacture of paper. I submit not. The United States have still a large supply of pulp wood; they have gone into the cultivation of pulp wood, and we know that half a dozen other materials are used in the manufacture of paper such as cotton stalks and rice straw. It is only last month I read in a magazine article that a German scientist had discovered that paper used for newspaper print could be restored to its original state by a chemical and inexpensive process with a possible waste of only 28 per cent. Should that turn out to be true it will certainly revolutionize the conditions of the pulp and paper industry. Besides, there is no danger of the price of pulp wood in this country being forced so high as to warrant the prohibition of its export. I submit that in the case that is now engaging our attention I would not be far from believing such an extreme measure as calculated to create an ill-feeling in the minds of the American people towards Canada. It might be considered an unfriendly act. Canada does not wish to be entangled in a tariff war with any nation, and certainly still less with the United States. The interests of Canada at large, I have tried to demonstrate, would not be served by the imposition of an export duty, whilst the private interests of a large number of individuals would be seriously injured. But these are insignificant considerations if we compare them to the disastrous results to this country that would follow from measures of retaliation on the part of our neighbours. I quite realize that the American people are precluded by their

constitution from levying an export duty on any article exported from the United States. Were this not so they would hold against us a most dangerous and effective weapon in the matter of raw cotton, as we depend entirely upon them for our supply. That is evidenced by the fact that they hold a practical monopoly of the production of cottton on this continent, and last year we imported from the United States $8,000,000 worth of raw cotton whilst from all other countries we imported only $30,000 worth. My hon. friend (Mr. Lewis) seems to be disposed to take advantage of that position in which the United States are, but there are other ways of retaliating, and as we all know the American people have been ready to take advantage of their customs duties whenever they felt like it. The duties on Canadian pulp could be raised to a level that would mean prohibition for us, and as we know the United States are our natural market for pulp. In 1907, for nine months we exported $3,000,000 worth of pulp and out of that $3,000,000 we sent $2,400,000 worth to the United States, which shows that the United States is our natural market for pulp. Economic wars are as disastrous to industry as ordinary wars are to human life. No two countries can reap any benefit from them, but still they are indulged in sometimes in order to adjust grievances.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say this motion is inopportune. If the American Congress were to resort to raising their duties upon pulp and paper, I would perhaps be tempted to incline to retaliation by prohibiting the export of the raw material, but that is not the condition to-day. On the contrary, the President of the United States in his message to Congress last December recommended the suppression of these duties altogether. Then, let the American Congress take action before we on our part take action. As I understand that a few of my hon. friends want to speak on this subject, I will sum up my remarks by saying: That the American timber areas are not so depleted as is commonly supposed; that the Canadian forest reserves if they are properly guarded will resist for centuries the strain to which they are submitted ; that public interests of an economic as well as of a diplomatic character can scarcely be served by this proposal, while private interests would be seriously injured; that I realize the duty of the hour is to preserve and to perpetuate our wealth in timber lands; that an export duty cannot give the desired protection; that the remedy lies with the provincial governments which are in possession of their lands, by the issuing and enforcing of regulations concerning fires, timber stumpage dues, diameter of cut, and settlement; that such action on our part as is proposed would be a direct infringement upon provincial rights; that in the event of provincial legislation the small owners would be unmolested and colonization would be unhampered, and lastly, we will have remained on friendly terms with our neighbours, and we will have averted possible international complications.

Mr. J. B. MORIN (Dorchester). Mr. Speaker, while this resolution is in many respects well founded, owing to some circumstances connected with it it is hardly practicable to adopt it. I believe that if the government should adopt this resolution it would raise a war against the people living on the south side of the St. Lawrence river, adjoining the United States. These people for a great many years had a hard time to make a living. About ten years ago this industry was first developed in these counties, and since then the people there have been making a good living out of the timber by selling it to the United States and they are to-day making money. At first they sold the timber for $3 a cord, and then the price rose to $3.50, $4, and $5 until now it is $7 a cord. The people are well satisfied and are pleased to let well enough alone. For my part I could not support the resolution, it would be interfering with the public, especially in my county. Then too, if the government should adopt the principle, I do not see how it could be generally applied. Take the case of people who have owned land for the last 50 or 100 years. They should be allowed to do with the timber on that land just as they please, it is their own. For the government to pass a law interfering with these people would not do at all, and to impose an export duty on timber cut on government land would also be an interference. On the whole I think it is best to let well enough alone and I will stop at that.

Mr. A. B. HUNT (Compton). In rising to address this House for the first time, I feel it to be my duty to protest against any such restriction as is suggested by this resolution being imposed. After listening to the able addresses on both sides of the House I take it for granted that this duty would be levied or the prohibition of export imposed for the purpose of either making the United States pulp manufacturers pay more for the wood they consume or compelling them to move their mills to Canada and to manufacture here.

We must first take into consideration the distribution of the spruce areas of the world and the ability of the United States to obtain supplies from other sources than Canada ; in other words, we must ascertain to what extent they are dependent on Canada for their supply of pulp wood. There is, in the first place, the vast territory of Alaska and the fact is demonstrated that there are in that country immense spruce and fir areas yet untouched by the woodman's axe.

How large these areas are, we are only now just beginning to learn. In Norway, Sweden and Russia, as is well known,

gigantic spruce areas are found. The first of these countries has already been invaded by the United States pulp manufacturers and is being to some extent now successfully exploited by them. From all these countries wood and timber can be shipped to the United States cheaply, by boat, and it is only because of the nearer and cheaper supply in Canada that they continue to draw their wood principally from this country. Nor must it be too hastily supposed that the spruce forests of the United States have been depleted. On the contrary, to say nothing of vast areas held by the government and private holders, it is to be noted that out of some 1,100 paper and pulp mills in the United States, 265 mills own their own extensive limits, which they are holding untouched for future emergencies; and in spite of this statistics show that in 1906, the states of Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire and New York alone produced more than two-thirds of all the pulp used by the United States mills in that year. It is also well known that the price of our pulp wood has steadily increased from year to year and that in consequence the price of paper has as steadily advanced in the United States.

The question therefore arises, if an export duty were imposed upon pulp wood by our government, would it not increase the price to United States consumers to a point where it would be cheaper for them to draw their supply from Alaska, Norway, Sweden, Russia or from their own sources, than to pay us the increased price for our product. It will not do for us to assume that the United States paper makers are depending upon the spruce of Canada as their only available source of supply, as the contrary can be easily proved, and if this be shown the loss of this vast and increasing trade to our people would be nothing short of a national calamity.

As to the total prohibition of the export of pulp wood I do not see how the Dominion government could possibly do this as it would seem to constitute an invasion of public and private rights. To say nothing of the vast timber areas of the Quebec Seignories (owned to a large extent in fee simple, by private parties) as of the forest owned by individuals, who also own the soil, and who are now selling their spruce to the United States. What shall we say of the right of the provincial government to exploit their own timber limits as they please? Would it not be considered an invasion of their rights and priviliges to enact a law that would prevent the natural products of their possession being exploited and thus deprive them of the large revenue obtained from their forests? The wealth of the province of Quebec consists principally in its forests and water-powers, and if the interference of the Dominion government in the sale of some water-powers in that province last year was resented, what would be the effect of interfering with the sale of timber from provincial Crown lands? Under the wise regulations now in force in Quebec limiting the sizes of trees that can be cut, thereby affording the timber time to replenish itself, spruce areas are practically inexhaustible and are, under present conditions, an immense source of revenue to all our people.

It is, I think, the greatest mistake to suppose we could, by legislature enactment force the United States paper and pulp makers to abandon their mills in their own country, in which hundreds of millions are invested, and come into Canada and spend other hundreds of millions to build mills here. Rather than face this contingency they would turn to other sources of supply, some of which have been already mentioned, and thus practically paralyze our pulp wood industry and inflict the greatest financial loss upon this country that we have ever sustained. There is no other industry in Canada the crippling of which would inflict such disastrous results upon our people. Speaking from the standpoint of the individual, it would hit the man who owns the spruce. The man who swings the axe, the jobber who hires him, the man who furnishes the supplies, the farmer who raises them, the merchant who sells them, the man who buys and sells pulpwood, the river driver, the canal boat man, the railroad man—all in fact now depending upon this industry.

If it be said that the prohibition of the exportation of pulp wood cannot be justly claimed to be aimed especially against the United States, it would be answered that this would be its effect as Canada cannot successfully compete with Norway and Sweden in the markets of Europe and the pulp of our product goes to the United States.

It may be said in this country that the President of the United States has just recommended to Congress now sitting, the removal of the existing duties on pulp and fibre products coming into the United States principally on account of the rise in the price of paper and paper products, owing to the increased cost of the pulp wood. Now, in the face of this, to clap on an export duty or to go to the extent of prohibiting its export, might well be looked upon by this great and friendly nation as a slap in the face that would certainly be returned in kind with disastrous results to us. No country on the face of the globe is entirely independent in every respect of every other country. While it is not necessary to go into details, it may yet be said that it is a fairly recognized principle of all governments to leave unhampered by fiscal restrictions all natural products of the soil, or of interfering with the free and untramelled exercise of the rights of private

ownership, and allow the proprietors of the products of their land to send the same to the best market, or of the right of the province to do as they please with their own natural resources. The last analysis of the question after all is one of practical politics of legislatures to give effect to laws that will operate for the greatest good of the greatest number of our people and give at the same time no neighbouring nation cause for offence or retalliation. It is therefore in this light that I consider this question should be viewed, and this parliament, in my opinion, would make a very grave mistake in hampering the export of so great a natural product as pulp wood, by the imposition of an export duty, and a much graver error in prohibiting its export.

Mr. E. W. TOBIN (Richmond and Wolfe). I have listened attentively to hon. members on both sides of the House in discussing the important question whether it would be advisable to prohibit the export of pulp wood. I may mention that some eleven years ago when this government came into power, I formed part of a delegation that came to Ottawa to oppose putting an extra export duty on pulp wood, and since then I have not changed my mind. That is some eleven years ago, and although at that time I was not interested in the manufacture of pulp and paper as I am to-day, I opposed any interference which would take away from the farmers a trade which is a great source of revenue to them, and aids in the settlement of the country, especially in the province of Quebec. There has been a good deal said for and against an export duty on pulp wood. For myself, Mr. Speaker, I do not know and cannot understand why the Canadian pulp and paper mills persist in bringing up this question and keeping it before the public, unless it is that an export duty on pulp wood would cheapen the raw material to their mills.

What was the situation some fifteen years ago? The farmer was receiving for a cord of pulp wood, what we would call peeled pulp wood, sawed in four foot lengths, $2.75 per cord of 128 cubic feet. The Canadian manufacturers would buy nothing else but the body of the tree, and would not take anything less in size than six inches. The farmer had to leave the balance of the tree there to rot, or pick it up and burn it. As you are aware, the pulp wood lands of the province of Quebec average from 30 to 40 per cent of balsam, and the pulp mills would not buy that kind of timber, and the stumpage was not worth anything to the farmers. So after taking the best of his spruce, he had to cut down the balance of his forest and burn it up in clearing his land. What is the state of things to-day in consequence of the farmer having the market of the United States to ship his wood to? We are now shipping wood to the United States which really the manufacturers of this country would not buy ten or fifteen years ago. What was formerly used for firewood is now used for making pulp wood; this has reference to spruce, balsam, hemlock, poplar and basswood. But I will deal generally with spruce and balsam. Pulp wood is divided into rough wood, wood with bark on, peel wood, hand-shaved wood and rossed wood. For rough wood we are getting from $6 to $7 per cord, for peeled and hand-shaved wood, we are getting from $8 to $10, and for rossed wood, from $10 to $11 per cord f.o.b. In the wood we ship to the United States they do not make any difference between spruce and balsam. Instead of only using the body of the tree, we now use for pulp wood as far up the tree as four inches in diameter, after cutting the limbs close.

The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Lewis), in his remarks, said that pulp wood was selling at $6 a cord, pulp at $20 per ton, fibre at $32, and paper at $50. Now I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is aware that it takes close on to two cords of pulp wood to make a ton of fibre? A cord of pulp wood will make about 1,150 pounds of fibre, or it will make about one ton of ground wood pulp. If you take two cords of wood and estimate the price at $8 per cord, which makes $16, you can sell the pulp made from that wood at $32. I would suggest to that hon. gentleman that when he ventures to address the House again on this question, he should give the number of cords it takes to make a ton of fibre pulp.

From the experience I have had in the pulp wood and lumber business, I am of opinion that it would be a hardship to impose upon the farmers of this country and the people who hold lands in fee simple, having purchased them, to say to them: You have no right to ship your wood out of this country without being taxed two or three dollars per cord. I think such a course would retard colonization in the province of Quebec, which I am pleased to state has been growing by leaps and bounds these last ten years. Within the last few years quite a number of our pulp and paper manufacturers have seen fit to go into the pulp wood business themselves and have shipped thousands of cords of pulp wood to the United States. They think it pays better to ship pulp wood than to make it into pulp. Within the last three years pulp has been sold in the province of Quebec, and I may say in the province of Ontario also, for less than $12 per ton, and the wood was selling for $7 and $8 per cord f.o.b. on the cars. You can easily see that a great many mills were not manufacturing pulp at a profit. Now, we have in the province of Quebec over 100,000 miles of limits which are held by the provincial government, and 70,000 are under license. There are about 25,000,000 acres of seigniory land, 15,000,000 acres of lands ceded by the Crown and 6,500,000

acres are surveyed and ready for colonization. Now, what are these farmers going to do who have settled on these lands, if this government puts an export duty on pulp wood, or prohibits the exportation of pulp wood? Of course there is a certain percentage of wood that is made into pulp which is not fit for anything else; you cannot saw it into lumber because it is to knotty or too crooked. Therefore I say it would be a hardship to these farmers if they were prohibited from exporting this wood as pulp wood. They have had the courage to go into the bush, build a small house, cut down the first tree and open up those lands for cultivation. As you are aware, there cannot be pulp and paper mills in every city, town and village of this Dominion. When the farmer clears up his land he gets five cords, six cords and sometimes eight or ten cords of pulp wood to the acre. He goes to the pulp wood dealer and makes a contract for 40 or 50 cords to go out in the following winter. If he needs money so that he may be able to stay at home during the summer months and work on his farm, he can get an advance of $1.50 a cord as soon as the trees are cut down and peeled, and he can get another advance of $1.50 when it is sawed and piled. Therefore I say that the farmers are reaping great benefit from their pulp wood to-day. In clearing up his land the farmer gets $6 or $7 a cord for the pulp wood he sells. This enables him to stay at home to cultivate and improve his farm and to live with his family during the summer months. In this way he will make during twelve months $400 or $500 from a few acres of land. I remember the time, not many years ago, when the farmers in clearing their land used to burn up all the small timber. In that respect things have changed, and I for one would oppose any interference with their vested rights in this matter. In the province of Quebec there is no great outcry for an export duty on pulp wood. Twenty or twenty-five years ago, I well remember, when we were shipping hemlock bark to the United States, there was a great demand for the imposition of an export duty on it. To-day hemlock bark is not worth within $2 a cord what it was 20 years ago. Chemicals have been found to replace hemlock bark for tanning purposes, and we cannot be sure that in the next twenty years something will not be found to replace spruce and balsam for the manufacture of pulp. Some time ago I read the following in a newspaper:—

New Orleans, La., May 20.—It is announced that a large paper mill will be established at an early day in the rice district of Louisiana at Crowley or Jennings, to manufacture paper from rice straw. The enterprise will be backed by northern capital, and the mill it is estimated, will cost $150,000.

Every new factory is welcomed in the south but this paper mill means more than a single new industrial enterprise. If it proves the success hoped for it will revolutionize the paper world and give new wealth and prosperity to a section that has been wonderfully favoured of late years in the development of its resources.—Southwest Louisiana.

Paper manufacturers of the country have been looking for years for a new material convertible into wood pulp, the chief stock of the paper manufactured to-day. The supply of spruce, which has been found the best material, is nearly exhausted, and it is hoped to obtain something nearly as good. The country has been searched far and wide for material, and half a dozen substitutes have been discovered that will do fairly well. The hope still exists that something better may be found, and the manufacturers have turned their eyes toward the south as a section rich in timber and other possible paper stock which has not yet been sufficiently examined.

There have been a dozen different experiments more or less successful. Two have received great consideration, because their success means much to the south's leading agricultural industries—the manufacture of paper from the crushed stalk of the sugar cane, and from rice straw.

There are two bagasse paper mills, one in Texas and one in Louisiana, and they are doing well. That rice straw will make good paper has been well established. The experiment now proposed will show how good and what profit it will yield. There is enough bagasse and rice straw produced in Louisiana and thrown away as a waste product to supply the paper demands of the entire country. The next few years will settle the question whether these materials are destined to play a leading part in the paper industry. If they prove satisfactory it will transfer to the south a new and profitable industry and materially increase the profit of the cane and rice growers.

A gentleman who is a high authority on pulp, who is interested in one of the largest pulp mills in the Dominion of Canada, the Hon. N. Garneau, president of the Chicoutimi Pulp and Paper Company, in a lecture delivered in Quebec on the 3rd of February last, said that there were three remedies: first, the prohibition of the pulp wood; second, to put on an export duty of a few dollars a cord: third, that the provincial government could pass legislation requiring all wood cut on Crown lands belonging to the province of Quebec to be manufactured in the province. This last he said would be the most feasible remedy. This is my opinion also, Mr. Speaker, and when we have to protect our forests, the press and Canadian paper manufacturers, instead of addressing themselves to the Dominion government for relief, should address themselves to the local government.

Regarding the bringing of American capital to this country, I think we have made considerable progress in building up pulp and paper mills. In 1888 we had only twenty-four pulp mills while in 1907 we had fifty-eight. In 1888 the pulp mills turned out 154 tons of pulp in twenty-four hours; in 1907 they turned out 2,361 tons. Our paper mills have made as much pro-

gress or more, and but for the American market I am sure that we would not be able to run our pulp mills, because it is a well known fact that although there is a duty of $1.66 a ton on ground wood pulp going to the United States, 75 per cent of our pulp is shipped to the United States. We cannot depend on shipping pulp to Great Britain or the continent of Europe, because we are met there by Norway and Sweden which can ship their pulp to those countries at less cost than we can. It would be just as reasonable to advocate an export duty on ties and sawn lumber as on pulp wood. I believe there is as much money made by our people in the making of pulp wood as there is in the manufacture of sawn lumber and railway ties. Whether you cut up our forests into pulp wood or sawn lumber, you are shipping the lumber away from the country, and it is not reasonable to say to the farmer and the land owner: You shall not sell your pulp wood in the open market but must sell it to the Canadian manufacturer. Besides there may be in some years a complete change in the industry of papermaking. Some years ago we used to employ basswood and poplar in the manufacture of pulp wood, but to-day spruce is given the preference because it has a better fibre and you cannot get within $2 or $3 a cord for poplar and basswood what you would get for spruce. It is therefore quite possible that our paper manufacturers will discover some other substances to replace the spruce.

In the province of Quebec we have a forest reserve of 108,000,000 acres and besides the government has thousands and thousands of acres for sale, so that I do not see that you need ever expect a shortage. With the laws we now have in the province of Quebec for the preservation of our forests there is not likely to be any shortage of pulp wood. In fact more damage is done by fire than by the axe of the lumberman.

Mr TAYLOR. What business to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A resolution of the Minister of Railways with regard to the Exchequer Court, the Bill to amend the Railway Act, the Bill to amend the land titles, then Supply for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries Department.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 12, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF COMMANDER SPAIN.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I was asked the other day by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) to lay on the table the correspondence exchanged between the Auditor General and the department. In order to put these papers before the House in a proper way, I move than an order of the House be issued for copies of all correspondence between the Auditor General and the Department of Marine and Fisheries concerning the travelling expenses of Commander Spain in 1905-6.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BRODEUR. In obedience to the order which has just been granted by the House, I have the honour to lay on the table the correspondence referred to therein.

### SUPREME COURT ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. AYLESWORTH moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 121) to amend the Supreme Court Act. He said: The whole purpose of this proposed legislation is to enable the court to change the composition of the list of cases for hearing at any sitting of the court. Under the present statute the list of cases for hearing at any sitting of the court is divided into three parts: No. 1, cases coming from the maritime provinces; No. 2, cases from the province of Quebec; No. 3, cases from the rest of Canada; and these appeals are heard ordinarily in that order. The chief justice of the court has informed me that the present system is inconvenient for the lawyers of the province of Quebec especially, and especially at the October sittings of the court, as the order in which the cases are then set for hearing in the Supreme Court conflicts with the sittings of the courts in the province of Quebec, at which frequently some of these gentlemen have business. What is now proposed is that this list should be divided into five parts as follows: No. 1, election cases; No. 2, cases from the provinces west of Ontario; No. 3, maritime province cases; No. 4, Quebec province cases; and No. 5, cases from the province of Ontario. What is for the convenience in that respect of the legal gentlemen concerned in the argument of these appeals will no doubt prove to be for the pecuniary advantage of their clients, and the change is one which is asked for by members of the bar of the province of Quebec and concurred in by the chief justice.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### WEIGHING OF MAILS FOR TRANSPORTATION.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. Is the government aware of statements being made in the House of Representatives

of the United States to the effect that the Post Office Department of that country had lost seventy millions of dollars through the fraudulent weighing of mails by the railroads of that country?

2. What means has this government employed to prevent a similar loss in weighing of mails?

3. Has the government any inspectors whose duty it is to investigate the weighing of mails for railway transportation?

4. How much money was paid by the government each year for the past five years for carrying of mails by the railways in Canada?

5. How much money was paid out of Post Office estimates towards carrying mail on steamships in the form of subsidies and rates?

6. Is any money taken from the estimates of the Postmaster General for the erection of post offices, or repairs to post offices, or for the furnishing or equipment of post offices? If so, what amount was so used in 1906?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. No. The government has no special knowledge of the matter beyond the statements which have recently appeared in the public press.

2. Railways in Canada are not paid for carrying mail by weight.

3. Answered by No. 2.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4. | 1903 | $1,413,835 28 |
| | 1904 | 1,457,622 55 |
| | 1905 | 1,505,589 26 |
| | 1906 | 1,545,685 27 |
| | *1907 | 1,195,210 72 |
| | (*9 months.) | |
| 5. | 1903 | $ 87,688 79 |
| | 1904 | 89,723 48 |
| | 1905 | 94,644 37 |
| | 1906 | 97,773 26 |
| | *1907 | 84,054 36 |
| | (*9 months.) | |

6. No.

## PURCHASE OF STEAMER BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. Did the government purchase a steamer for the use of the Post Office Department? If so, between what points does it carry mail?

2. What was the price paid for the steamer, where was it purchased, who purchased it, and when was said steamer purchased?

3. What was the cost of bringing the steamer to Canada?

4. Was the boat new, or, if in use previous to purchase, for what length of time, and in what trade was it used, and between what points?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEXIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Yes. Between the Atlantic mail steamers and the wharf at Rimouski, Que.

2. £12,500. At Penzance, England. The assistant Deputy Postmaster General. In April, 1907.

3. £760.

4. Not new. Built in 1901. Was used chiefly for the conveyance of mails and passengers between Penzance and the Scilly Isles.



## POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK AT ST. GABRIEL DE BRANDON, QUEBEC.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the government opened a post office savings bank in the post office of St. Gabriel de Brandon, province of Quebec?

2. Who asked for the opening of the said post office savings bank?

3. Did some person recommend the opening of the said post office savings bank, and by whom was such recommendation made?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Yes.

2 and 3. The postmaster of St. Gabriel de Brandon made application for the establishment of savings bank business at his office, and his application having been favourably reported upon by the post office inspector at Montreal, the office in question was in ordinary official course constituted a savings bank office on the 1st March, 1908.

## MAIL CONTRACT BETWEEN DARNLEY AND KENSINGTON, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. A. A. McLean—asked :

1. Who has the contract for the carrying of the mails to and from Kensington, Malpeque and Domley, Prince Edward Island, and when is the contract up?

2. Was contract let by tender, who were the tenderers, and the amount of each tender?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

There is no mail service so designated, nor are there any post offices called Malpeque and Domley, but if question refers to Darnley and Kensington mail service the answers are as follows :—

1. (a) Wm. R. Mann ; (b) 30th June, 1911.

2. (a) Yes.

(b) Wm. R. Mann ..... $465
Arch. Howard ..... 469
Robert T. Moase ..... 490
James F. Semple ..... 673

## DREDGING AT PORT DUFFERIN.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. What is the total cost to date of the work done in dredging the harbour of Port Dufferin?

2. What was the remuneration of the government checker per day?

3. Is it the intention of the government to complete the work as shown on the official plan?

4. Have any representations been made to the government for the enlargement of the works as first planned?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $21,114.58.

2. $2 per working day.
3. Matter under consideration.
4. No.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAIWAY—EXTENSION TO STANLEY BRIDGE.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. Did the government receive petitions from inhabitants of Clifton, Stanley and Hope River, Prince Edward Island, praying for extension of railway from the main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway to Stanley Bridge or vicinity, and for the placing of a sum sufficient for the purpose in this year's estimates?
2. Is it the intention of the government to grant the prayer of the petitions?
3. Is it the intention of the government to make surveys this year with a view to extend the railway system along the north shore of Prince Edward Island?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes.
2. The government has not so decided.
3. No decision has been reached.

POST OFFICE AT SOUTHVALE, COLCHESTER COUNTY, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. When was the Southvale, Colchester county, post office, removed to its present location?
2. Did the Post Office Department receive a petition from the inhabitants of Southvale asking that the post office be placed at a convenient position?
3. Why was the prayer of the petition not answered?
4. Has the post office known as Southvale office been removed beyond the bounds of Southvale district?
5. Does the government intend to restore Southvale post office to a location where it will be convenient for the people it is intended to serve?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. On the 9th December, 1907.
2. A petition has been received at the department, recommending the removal of the Southvale post office to its former location.
3. Representations had been made to the department that the present location of the office was a convenient one for the residents.
4. The post office has been removed about a mile from its former site.
5. The question of again changing the location of the office is being considered.

SUB-LAND AGENCY AT RANCHVALE, MANITOBA.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

1. Has the sub-land agency at Ranchvale, Manitoba, been closed? If so, why?
2. Has Mr. Wakefield, sub-land agent, been discharged? If so, why?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes. Not considered necessary to keep it open for the present.
2. Yes. Not needed when the office was closed.

LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER ON BELLECHASSE ISLETS.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked: (Translation.)

1. What is the salary paid to the lighthouse keeper on the islets of Bellechasse?
2. Has such salary been increased, how often and to what extent?

The Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation).

1. $350 per annum.
2. Yes. May 1st, 1904, increased from $320 to $350.

PURCHASE OF HOSPITAL LOT, BELLEVILLE.

Mr. PORTER asked :

1. What amount was paid for the property known as the hospital lot, Belleville, Ontario, the first site selected for drill hall in Belleville?
2. What amount was received for the same property on its re-sale by the government?
3. What was paid for passing the title and making the transfer to the government and from the government, to whom, and when?
4. When was the purchase made, and when was the property re-sold?
5. Upon whose recommendation was the property purchased, and upon whose was it re-sold?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

All the papers connected with the subject matter of this question are before the Committee on Public Accounts. If my hon. friend desires further information I would ask that he move for a return.

Mr. PORTER. I have examined these papers and the information that is asked for in this question, is not in them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would move for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

PROSECUTIONS UNDER FRUIT MARKS ACT.

Mr. PORTER asked :

1. Does the department or government employ counsel to prosecute cases of infringement of the Fruit Marks Act in the packing and marking of apples?
2. What prosecutions have been taken place, and what number of convictions made for one year prior to this date in the counties of Hastings, Lennox, Prince Edward, Northumberland East and West, and Peterborough?

3. What are the names of the persons so convicted, and have the fines imposed been paid?

4. If counsel has been employed in such prosecutions, how is he paid (a) for each conviction, or (b) for each case whether conviction follows or not, and how much for each case?

5. What counsel has been employed, if any, to prosecute such cases in the counties above named?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (for Minister of Agriculture):

1. Counsel has been employed in 22 cases out of 48 in prosecutions under the Fruit Marks Act for the year ended March 11, 1908.

2. There have been 48 prosecutions and 48 convictions in the counties of Hastings, Lennox, Prince Edward, Northumberland, East and West, and Petreborough, during the year ended March 11, 1908.

3. James Coyle, Colborne, (convicted twice); J. and R. Coyle, Colborne; Robert Coyle, Colborne, (convicted six times); M. B. Nichols, Brighton; W. M. Ives, Brighton; H. A. Beech, Brighton; T. H. Cheer, Brighton; Allen Lovett, Brighton; Sam Dudley, Colborne, (convicted three times); Robert Wade, Brighton, (convicted twice); John Royal, Belleville; Blake Cheer Brighton; A. H. Clapp, Brighton; Cormon Baker, Brighton; J. E. McDonald, Colborne; F. C. Morrow, Colborne, (convicted twice); G. W. Davis, Colborne; James Marchen, Belleville; L. Emmerson, Belleville; F. J. Thompson, Belleville; R. J. Graham, Belleville, (convicted three times); F. H. Lazier, Brighton, (convicted twice); Henry Herrington, Brighton, (convicted twice); S. P. Herrington, Brighton, (convicted twice); Harlow Fulford, Brighton; A. D. Fulford, Brighton, (convicted twice); G. W. French, Colborne, (convicted twice); Groff and Onderdonk, Trenton; A. E. Brown, Ameliasburg; W. Miron, Wooler; Geo. E. Alger, Frankford; Alger and Ferguson, Frankford.

The fines imposed have been paid except in the case of Geo. E. Alger, Frankford, who is said to have left the country, and in the case of Alger and Ferguson as Ferguson decided to go to jail instead.

4. Counsel has not yet rendered his bill for his services, when received it will be submitted to the Department of Justice for taxation and will be paid in accordance therewith.

5. Mr. F. E. O'Flynn, barrister, &c., of Belleville was employed in the 22 cases mentioned in No. 1.

## REPAIRING CLIFTON WHARF.

Mr. LEFURGY asked:

1. Was there a contract extended last year for repairing or rebuilding Clifton wharf, in New London, Prince Edward Island?

2. Who was the contractor, and what was he paid?

Mr. PORTER.

3. How much did the work cost, and what was the amount paid to each labourer?

4. Is the work completed?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1 and 2. No; certain repairs were done there by day's labour.

3. (a) Total cost $991.06.

| | |
|---|---|
| (b) Peter McGuigan | $152 00 |
| Joseph McAleen | 98 00 |
| Harry Coles | 37 50 |
| Ezra Power | 65 00 |
| James Graham | 9 50 |
| Clement Trainor | 102 50 |
| Peter McElmeel | 15 00 |

4. Yes.

## INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

On the order of the day being called:

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I wish to inquire about certain returns for which orders have been passed but which have not been brought down. These are as follows:

| Passed. | Subject. |
|---|---|
| December 18 | Marconi stations and bookkeeping, Marine and Fisheries. |
| January 8 | Newspaper printing. |
| January 18 | Government steamers. |
| January 15 | Services of Mr. Shepley. |
| January 13 | Quantity of supplies, materials and mails. |

The minister spoke about one of these returns and I understand it is under way. I would ask the Minister of Finance if there is any word yet of when we may expect the report of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. FIELDING. I have heard nothing since my last remark on the subject in the House.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When may I expect a return passed on December 11 referring to all complaints respecting defects and deficiencies in the postal service?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). My attention was drawn to this once since my return from Japan. We have now a whole staff working on this return which is quite voluminous. The department is quite willing to do the work but it requires a large staff. I will ask the officers to hasten its preparation.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a return moved for by my self on January 22, 1908, showing how many fire extinguishers were purchased by the government in the different departments of the public service, since June 30, 1906, to January 1st, 1908, from whom, at what price and the total amount paid. The return brought down reads:

The following is the information desired by order of the House on inquiry of Mr. Taylor, re fire extinguishers:

(a) Total number of fire extinguishers purchased between date named was 195.

(b) Number purchased from Patton & Crowe, Ottawa, was 95, and number purchased from Chas. Patton, Montreal, was 100.

(c) Price paid was $15 each.

(d) Total amount paid was $2,925.

Nothing could better show how little faith the opposition can place in returns brought down than this return. If the hon. minister has the Auditor General's Report for 1907-1908 he will find in volume 2 :—

Mr. SPEAKER. This is out of order ; if the hon. gentleman wishes to ask a question—

Mr. TAYLOR. I am asking how this comes to be left out of the return.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would not be proper to make remarks on the subject.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not.

Mr. SPEAKER. Whether the hon. gentleman's making comments now or not, he was a moment ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not mean to violate any rule. If the minister will turn to volume 2 of the Auditor Geenral's Report at P—19 he will find that 8 of the articles were purchased from P. E. Perrault, Quebec, at $14 ; at page P—23 another 8, at page P—36 another 8 ; at page P—56, 16 ; at page P—100, 8 ; and page P—102, 4, making a total of 52 purchased from Parent at $14 apiece a total of $728. This is not in the return at all and I find that a number of others were purchased in other departments. What I wanted was the total number purchased in all the departments, and here I find that one department that I have under my special observation purchased $728 worth that do not appear in the return.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). It will of course be necessary for me to look into the items mentioned by my hon. friend. When the order for the return reached my department it went in the ordinary course to the proper official who is charged with making returns and if he has omitted any thing it will, of course, be corrected.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). When may we expect the returns dealing with timber berths 413, 414 and 415 ? These were ordered on the 3rd of February last and we would be glad to have them as soon as possible. I would also ask as to an order made for a return concerning grazing leases and the acquisition of property for irrigation purposes in ranges 15 and 21 west of the 4th meridian, townships 12 and 14.



Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I will be able to tell the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

Mr. A. N. WORTHINGTON (Sherbrooke). I beg to direct the attention of the Minister of Public Works to some returns asked for on December 11, 1907, regarding drill sheds. I would like also to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to returns asked for his department on the same day, December 11, 1907.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Instructions have been given to prepare the returns as speedily as possible. There is no unnecessary delay and I trust that the return will be presented very soon.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. One of the returns, I think, is ready and I hope to lay it on the table of the House to-morrow.

## ALLEGED IMMIGRATION FRAUDS.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask a question of the Minister of the Interior in connection with a matter of some urgency. This arises out of a dispatch which appeared in most of last evening's papers, dated London. I quote from the 'Evening Journal' of yesterday—

Collusion in fraud.

Halifax man works with old country emigrant agent.

London, March 11.—The trial of Mikael Sarkis, Charles Hanson, Arshag Attamian, charged with conspiring to defraud emigrants, began yesterday at Liverpool. N. Cockshutt watched the case on behalf of the Canadian government. When Attamian was arrested a large number of letters were found in his possession. Counsel said the letter showed Attamian to be on terms of very intimate relationship with the authorities who had to pass immigrants on the other side. One letter was from a man from Halifax, describing himself as Hugh L. Dickey, M.D.

Another letter was from W. Dodds, Halifax, in which he said : 'Your eleven people were all passed. Be a little particular next time with Montreal cases. Do not let them make any signs whatever. If you describe something they will wear, that will be enough. I felt nervous when they all made the same signs with hands on tie. In another letter Dodds warns Attamian: 'please be careful, as the other doctor is often with me.'

I would like to ask my hon. friend the minister what steps the government is taking to unearth what appears to be a fraud or blackmailing practice on desirable immigrants, or else money charged to undesirable immigrants for admission to this country ? Who is the Dr. Dickey referred to in this transaction ? Who is W. Dodds ? Has he any position under the government? Has the government taken any steps in regard to this matter ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to give an answer at the moment. I shall be able to do so to-morrow.

## ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION.

House went into committee to consider the following resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to make better provision for the exercise of Admiralty jurisdiction within Canada in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890; and also to provide that, by way of compensation for loss of salary or emoluments of office, there may be granted to each of the present judges in Admiralty of the Exchequer court who held office on the first day of September, 1907, and to the Marshal of the Quebec Admiralty district, an annuity equal to two-thirds of his salary, to the registrar of the Toronto Admiralty district, the sum of $750, to the registrar of the Nova Scotia Admiralty district, the sum of $1,000, to the registrar of the New Brunswick Admiralty district, the sum of $1,500.—Mr. Aylesworth.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The object of this resolution is not only to declare the expediency of making better provision for the exercise of admiralty jurisdiction in Canada, but to found upon it a measure which I hope may bring about a better condition of things than that which now exists. The present condition of things is, I think, not satisfactory. At any rate, from almost the first day on which I took charge of the Department of Justice, complaints have been continuous from one part of the Dominion and another with reference to the existing state of things in regard to admiralty jurisdiction, and it has been a subject of much and of anxious thought on my part to endeavour to find some improvement. Let me remind the committee of what the existing condition is. We have now the jurisdiction in admiralty conferred upon the Exchequer Court of Canada, with local judges of that court in some, not in all, of the provinces of the Dominion, and with surrogate judges, or practically referees, in several of the provinces, who are, as it were, deputies of the local, or deputy, judges of the court. We have one judge in the Exchequer Court; we have local judges in admiralty in some of the provinces; and again we have the deputies of those local judges in the position of surrogate judges of the court in some localities. This system is the substitute for the ancient Vice-Admiralty Court established in different British possessions. That condition of things, which was endured in this country until 1891, was found to be eminently unsatisfactory. The Vice-Admiralty Court in each British possession was an admiralty court, the judge of which might be appointed by the admiralty of Great Britain. In nearly every instance the judge of that court was in reality a colonial judge, who was vested with authority over admiralty matters in his capacity of judge of the Imperial Vice-Admiralty Court. There was an appeal from the judge in vice-admirality, not to the local or colonial courts, but only to the Privy Council direct. The position of matters therefore was that side by side with colonial courts there existed a court of local jurisdiction territorially, but an Imperial court presided over by either a brother judge of the colonial judges, or possibly by the only colonial judge who in one capacity was an Imperial judge and in the other capacity exercised merely the ordinary jurisdiction of the colonial courts. That condition of things was found to be exceedingly unsatisfactory, and during the latter years of the decade of 1880, correspondence was had by the Colonial Secretary with each of the British possessions, resulting in the Imperial Act of 1890 amending the law respecting the exercise of admiralty jurisdiction throughout the empire. That statute is the foundation of the right of this parliament to legislate upon this subject. That statute abolishes the old Vice-Admiralty Courts throughout the British empire, and substitutes for the jurisdiction which they possessed the right in the parliaments of the British possessions to confer that jurisdiction upon some local or colonial court. Pursuant to the authority conferred on this parliament by this Imperial legislation of 1890, this parliament in the following year passed the statute which I am now proposing to amend.

By that statute of 1891, this parliament conferred jurisdiction in admiralty upon the Canadian Court of Exchequer, which was then recently established, and provided the system which has existed from 1891 to the present and which, it seems to me, has certainly proved in many parts of Canada very far from satisfactory. Whether I have found a remedy or not, what I am proposing is to take away from the Exchequer Court of Canada, this anomalous jurisdiction in admiralty and confer it upon the various courts of civil jurisdiction in the different provinces. I think it will be recognized as desirable that there should be as much uniformity as possible in the administration of justice in the different courts. Certainly the whole trend of legislation in modern times, not only in Great Britain but in this and other English speaking countries, has been towards a simplification of the legal procedure. We have seen within our own time the ancient courts of Chancery, Queen's Bench, and Common Pleas —differing radically, not only in their methods of practice but in the principles of law applied in them to the determination of what apparently might be a similar if not the same case—abolished and the jurisdiction they exercised vested in one tribunal, not only in the old country but in several of the provinces of Canada. That has been a distinct step forward. It has tended to the simplification and cheapening of the ad-

ministration of justice and has been legislation, which—however much it was resisted at the time and however much it was regarded by lawyers, and no doubt by clients, as a radical step subverting the very foundation of things—has turned out to be successful and which therefore we may very well attempt to follow in connection with our admiralty procedure. I need scarcely say to any one who has any acquaintance whatever, even the slight acquaintance I happen to have had, with procedure of this character, that it stands as a thing apart. To the average lawyer—nay to almost all lawyers—the practice of the admiralty court is a hidden mystery. There is not, and there never has been, enough of it to enable a man to devote himself entirely to that branch; and the result has been that but few practitioners make any special study of it, and throughout all the years it has been maintained as a thing separate and apart. I cannot myself see any reason or advantage in that. On the contrary, it seems to me a distinct disadvantage, though I can appreciate to the fullest extent how any lawyer, who has himself become versed in the mysteries of its practice, should feel an inclination to keep those mysteries untouched and the circle of those acquainted with them as narrow as possible. That was the way in which the Judicature Act, with the changes it made in the common law practice, was viewed by practitioners twenty-five years ago in this country. The years. however, have demonstrated that that was a beneficial measure, and, speaking by analogy, any provision which tends to simplify and make more clear the practice of the admiralty court, should be an advantage, not merely to the suitors, but to the lawyers in that court. This measure I hope may be a step in that direction. However I am not proposing any radical change in the practice of that court or the principles which govern its decision. The whole purpose of the legislation I am proposing is to vest in the superior courts of the different provinces the jurisdiction to try a case arising out of the collision of two ships, just as to-day they can try a similar case in respect of the collision between two railway trains or between carriages on the street. To bring that about I am proposing to change the clause of the present Act which gives this jurisdiction to the Exchequer Court and to substitute a clause which will give it to the ordinary civil tribunals. At the outset I should point out this circumstance. It was very plainly contemplated by the British statute in 1890 that this change should take place, because it is there providded, in the second section, that every court of law in a British possession which is, for the time being, declared to be a court of admiralty, shall have the jurisdiction of the ancient vice-admiralty court, and it further provides that if no such declaration be in force in a British possession, then this admiralty jurisdiction shall go automatically to the ordinary civil tribunals of the country. It was plainly, therefore the expectation of the framers of the imperial statute that there would either be, in ordinary circumstances, a declaration of the parliament of a British possession that this jurisdiction should go to the ordinary courts or that it would go there by force of the imperial statute, in default of any legislation whatever taking place on the subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there anything in the language which points more to the courts of the various provinces than to the Exchequer Court of Canada ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I do not know if I apprehend the meaning of the hon. gentleman's question. It would seem to me that certainly the courts which are aimed at by the Imperial Act are the ordinary provincial courts of ordinary civil jurisdiction rather that any court of special statutory jurisdiction, such as our Exchequer Court.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the hon. gentleman referring to section 2 ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Yes. The second section of the Imperial Act will show what I mean. It says :

> Every court of law, which may be declared to be a court of admiralty, shall possess this jurisdiction, or, failing any such declaration, every court of law, which has in a British possession original, unlimited civil jurisdiction, shall be a court of admiralty.

So that the imperial legislation provides that failing any special declaration on the subject in a British possession this admiralty jurisdiction shall go automatically, by force of the Imperial Act, to a court of original unlimited civil jurisdiction in that British possession. The only courts which answer that description are the Supreme Courts of the provinces—the High Court, as it is now called, the ancient court of King's Bench, or of Common Pleas, or of Chancery, which, possessing unlimited civil jurisdiction, answer the description of the imperial statute. Upon that legislation being passed in Great Britain in 1890, the matter was taken up in this parliament in the following year, resulting in the passing of our present Act. And I commend to the consideration of hon. gentlemen interested in the subject 'Hansard,' 1891, and especially the remarks of Sir John Thompson in introducing the measure which is now law and which has had sixteen years of trial. It is chapter 29 of the statutes of 1891. After reciting the imperial Act to which I have referred, it declares that the Exchequer Court of Canada is and shall be within Canada a court of admiralty. It is by that form of language that this admiralty juris-

diction is conferred upon the Exchequer Court. Now, an examination of the remarks made by Sir John Thompson in moving the second reading of this measure convinces one that his mind had weighed this very question and that, if one may not say that he hesitated between the advisability of conferring this jurisdiction upon the newly-constituted Exchequer Court and conferring it upon the provincial court, it is correct to say that he certainly had considered that question. Sir John Thompson states two objections to the proposition to confer the jurisdiction upon the provincial courts, objections which seem to have turned the scale in his own mind and to have led him to make the proposition which has since then been law. I find no difficulty in appreciating what seems to me must have been the considerations in his own mind causing him to prefer at that time the Exchequer Court. One consideration which he points out is one that, certainly, does not appeal to my mind. He thought it was better in the interests of this country that power should be centralized in this parliament than in the provincial legislatures, that this parliament should keep on in control of everything that was in its control, and having this view that the interests of the country called for centralization of parliamentary and governmental power rather than distribution of it to the provincial authorities, he acted upon it in the proposition which became law and which since has governed in this matter. I am free to say that I look at that question from a diametrically opposite standpoint. It seems to me that it is to the interest of the body politic in this country that greater power, in every place where it can be given, should be given to the provincial authorities, and that especially in the matter of the constitution and maintenance of the courts of the land which, of course, already by the British North America Act, is vested in the provincial authorities, we are carrying out the principle of the framers of our constitution if we, so far as possible, divest ourselves and the central authority of the control over a matter of this character. Sir John Thompson was also influenced, he argues, very substantially in the conclusion to which he came by the fact that if he had not proposed to vest this jurisdiction in the Court of Exchequer and the various local judges of that court in the different provinces it would have been necessary to establish a heavy pension list in the persons of the numerous vice-admiralty judges who then existed. However much that may have been a deterrent influence at that time, it does not at the present time continue to have so much importance, as I venture to submit to the committee. This resolution proposes to make what it seems to me, will be all the provision necessary in regard to the pensioning or payment of judges or officers. At the present time we have in the province of Nova Scotia and in the province of Prince Edward Island the jurisdiction in admiralty exercised by gentlemen who either are or were at the time this statute of 1891 became law, chief justices of the court, and had been, in virtue of their position as chief justices, judges in vice-admiralty, the judges of the Imperial Courts which the statutes of 1890 and 1991 were abolishing. The chief justice of Nova Scotia has since retired from his position of chief justice of the civil court, but has retained his position as local judge in admiralty. Under the provision which I am proposing he would receive an annuity equal to two-thirds of the salary which he receives at the present time as judge in admiralty. That salary is but $1,000 per annum. In a similar way, the present chief justice of Prince Edward Island, receiving now $800 per annum in addition to his salary as chief justice of the court, for his work in admiralty, would be entitled to his annuity of two-thirds of that amount. In the province of New Brunswick the jurisdiction in admiralty was conferred some years ago upon one of the puisne judges of the court who has since exercised it. He remains in precisely the same position, notwithstanding the passing of this statute. He will still be, as much as before, a judge with jurisdiction in admiralty. Under the arrangement I am proposing he will not be the only judge in New Brunswick possessing that authority, but he will none the less be clothed, under the statute I am proposing, with exactly the same jurisdiction which he now possesses, and no doubt, if he is willing to continue doing all the work in admiralty, his learned brethren will be quite content that he should so continue. There will, in that way, be no practical change in the administration of admiralty business in such provinces as Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and British Columbia, in which latter province one of the puisne judges of the Supreme Court is the judge in admiralty. The practical change is, as I have said, in the province of Nova Scotia, where the jurisdiction would be conferred on each one of the judges of the Supreme Court of that province, instead of being vested, as it is now, in the former chief justice of the court, who is not otherwise engaged in judicial work. In the province of Quebec there would be a like change. In that province, at the present time, there exists one of the anomalies of the present system. The local judge for the province is a former chief justice of the province who has retired from his position as chief justice and is receiving his annuity under the statute in virtue of his long service as chief justice, but who has not resigned his position as judge in admiralty and continues, in the city of Quebec, to exercise that jurisdiction.

In the city of Montreal there is no local judge. Now, the admiralty business that is transacted in Montreal far exceeds, as I am told, the amount of business of the same character transacted at the city of Quebec. At the city of Quebec there is a local judge of the court, while at the city of Montreal there is a deputy of a deputy, a judge who is in the position of a referee, who receives no salary, but whose remuneration, under the present system, is simply by fees upon each of the admiralty causes he hears and tries, as though he were simply a referee or an official of the court instead of being one of the puisné judges of the Superior Court of the province. That is an anomalous position of affairs. Nobody is satisfied with it, everybody thinks it ought to be changed. My hon. friend from St. James, Montreal (Mr. Gervais), I think, has upon the paper a notice of motion that the present condition of things in that regard is not satisfactory. I am bound to say that I have not yet found one single individual, acquainted with the situation in that respect which exists in Montreal at the present time, who is content with it, and who does not think that some change ought to be made.

It is stated in the words of the present resolution that it is expedient to make better provision for the exercise of this jurisdiction, and the only question is as to what means are the most expedient whereby if possible, to bring that about. Now, the suggestion that has been made from those interested in this matter in Montreal is that a separate court should be created, that a separate judge should be appointed for the discharge of this particular work, and that he should—of course, that would be necessary—receive a proper remuneration for his services. I can only answer that it seems to me that would not be a desirable condition of things. That proposition would involve exactly the maintenance and perpetuation of this separation between the court of admiralty jurisdiction and all other courts, which, to my mind, is an unmixed evil, and which we ought to try and put an end to. But apart from that consideration altogther, the fact remains—and it is this circumstance which I press most strongly upon hon. gentlemen from the Montreal district and the members of this House from the province of Nova Scotia—that in each of the localities there has been the same pressure to establish a separate admiralty court for that locality, or for that city and the surrounding territory. There is not enough business in either place at the present time to keep any reasonably active judge busy one day in the week throughout the year. We pay in one place $1,000 at the present time. That is considered to be, and is accepted as being, an adequate remuneration for the amount of work that is to be done; and I have no hesitation in saying that the whole of the admiralty work of the province of Nova Scotia at the present time could be satisfactorily attended to by one judge sitting one day in the week, or working one day in the week, throughout the fifty-two weeks of the year. The same condition of things we have at Montreal. There is on an average about one case per week during the twelve months, of this special admiralty jurisdiction; and I certainly would not feel myself justified in proposing that a separate judge, with what would have to be a judge's living pay of $6,000, $7,000 or $8,000 per annum, should be appointed for doing that work.

Since this resolution has been put upon the notice paper, now a period of a month, there has been, not unnaturally, a good deal of attention attracted to it by those who are interested in the matter, and representations have been made to me, coming in the first instance, I think, from the local practitioners to whom I previously alluded, who are versed in the special mysteries of this subject, and who naturally deplore the suggestion that there should be any inroad made upon that particular branch of the practice in which they possess special skill, and in which their fellows are not as well qualified to practise or to compete with them. That opposition on the part, as it seems to me, in the first instance, of local practitioners, has been followed up by the passing of resolutions in which I think I can trace the fine Italian hand of these same gentlemen. Local practitioners have clients, clients in these matters may be easily alarmed, and have become, some of them, impressed with the idea that I was so radical in my proposals as to intend to sweep away absolutely all admiralty courts and all admiralty jurisdiction in this country, and to put an end, finally and for ever, without, I presume, substituting anything in place of it, to all power of our courts to deal with admiralty matters. Certain resolutions have been forwarded to me from various bodies, more or less public, in which that idea is very strongly put, and an earnest hope is expressed that in no event will such a thing be thought of as the abolition altogether of the jurisdiction in admiralty of the courts of this country and putting nothing whatever in its place.

Now, I have pointed out that the change I am making in this matter can have no such effect. Take exactly the condition of things which exists to-day in the city of Montreal. The admiralty work, whatever there is in that city, is now done by one of the puisné judges of the Superior Court of the province. He sits, as I have said, as deputy of the deputy, as practically a referee of the Exchequer Court, and receives his pay by fees instead of by salary. That is not a desirable condition of things. If, for the jurisdiction of the admiralty court in this matter, there is substituted the jurisdiction of the ordinary civil courts, it is a practical certainty that, by common consent

of all the judges of the Superior Court, in whom this jurisdiction will be vested, the work in admiralty of the district of Montreal will be assigned to the same gentleman, and his ordinary civil work will be correspondingly lessened. That would be the natural condition of things to expect, and that I venture to say will be the result of this measure if adopted.

Now, as I have indicated already, it is not proposed at all by the legislation which, if this resolution is adopted, I shall ask leave at once to introduce, to interfere in the slightest degree with the present practice of the courts or with their method of doing things. That is now governed by the judges of the court. They prescribe the methods of practice which lawyers practising before them have to learn. I propose that the jurisdiction shall remain with the judges of the courts to lay down their own rules of practice. I propose that jurisdiction be given to the various provincial courts which will be clothed with this admiralty jurisdiction to prescribe their own rules of practice, and I hope that the result will be in time the assimilation of the admiralty practice to the ordinary practice of the courts, so that there may be no longer any mystery about it. I am proposing to leave the jurisdiction, the control of the methods of practice, with the judges of the court, exactly as it now exists. I am not proposing to touch in any degree, by statutory declaration or otherwise, the principles which now prevail in regard to admiralty matters. Those are established by law, and usage, and decisions of the courts, and I am not proposing in the slightest degree to interfere with or to legislate in any degree with respect to them. I have pointed out that in Prince Edward Island, in New Brunswick, in Montreal, as I think likely, and in British Columbia, there would be no change whatever in the personnel of the judges who will continue to administer the admiralty jurisdiction. In Nova Scotia, in Ontario and at the city of Quebec, there will necessarily be a change, because at no one of these three points is the present local judge in admiralty a member of the Superior Court of his province. That is the extent of the change, and with the exception of these three judicial changes which will be worked by this measure, if it becomes law, there is no other change that suggests itself to my mind. I have gone at this length into the subject because it is certainly one of importance, and it was one which I was anxious to present as fully as it was possible to the consideration of the committee. I am proposing, if this resolution is adopted, to introduce at once the Bill which has been prepared. I shall allow it then, if it is the will of the House, to stand for further consideration, or until I have had the advantage of being able to follow in 'Hansard' the observations that may be made on the subject by hon. members.

Mr. AYLESWORTH.

I have to explain this one further detail. It is provided, under the imperial statute which confers this jurisdiction upon us, that we cannot bring into force any legislation of this character until it has first been submitted to the consideration of His Majesty in Council at home. That has been, in this case, done. This measure, having been drafted in the summer months, was sent to England and has received the assent of His Majesty in Council; so that it stands now for the consideration of this parliament. Before sitting down, Mr. Chairman, let me move that, in two respects, the figures mentioned in this resolution be changed. You will see, Sir, that it is proposed, by way of compensation for loss of salary, to grant to each of the present local judges in admiralty, who receive an additional salary and who are six in number, and to the marshal at the court of Quebec, an annuity equal to two-thirds of his salary. The reason for especially mentioning the marshal at the city of Quebec is simply that he is the only marshal of the court who is paid by salary instead of by fees. He was the marshal of the ancient vice-admiralty court prior to 1890. He was receiving his salary as an imperial officer and his position was preserved by the imperial statute and by the Canadian statute. He has continued in office ever since receiving a salary of $333.34 annually. I am proposing accordingly that as to him the same provision shall be made as to the six judges who receive, four of them, $1,000 each, one $800, and one $600, namely an annuity of two-thirds of his salary. Then, in regard to the registrars and clerks of the court; we have one at Toronto, and, in a word, one in each of the provinces in which there is a local judge. With respect to all of them, except the three who are especially mentioned in the proposed resolution, there will be no change in their offices by the proposed change in legislation. They occupy the similar positions in the provincial courts, so that the change will be simply in the position of the registrars at Toronto, Halifax and St. John. With some hesitation, I admit, I have come to the conclusion that we could properly propose the payment to each of these gentlemen of a lump sum by way of compensation for the loss of fees which will result to him if the measure I am proposing becomes law. At the present time these gentlemen are paid by fees according to the amount of work they do. The more work the more pay and they are, in short, in exactly the position in that respect of an ordinary practising lawyer in any province. It seemed to me, I must admit, on considering their position, that they were not, in principle, occupying any different position from the lawyer who may have some excellent client, perhaps a company which gives him all its legal work, not paying him any salary, but paying him just according to the amount of work he does, the proper legal prices

therefor. Such a company, of course, is at perfect liberty to change its mind at any time and appoint a new solicitor and no solicitor would dream of saying that he had a claim against his client for compensation because that client chose to take away from him that particular line of business. It seemed to me that these registrars were exactly in that position. They are gentlemen who are not precluded from engaging in other work. Their fees have not amounted in a year to anything like a living allowance, but after considering the situation as fully as I was able, it seemed to me that if we were erring in proposing compensation to these gentlemen, we were, at all events, erring on the right side and I have therefore framed the resolution as the committee will see. But, I have possibly drawn the line a little closely in regard to the registrar at Toronto, and the registrar at Halifax.

Mr. GERVAIS. I would like to know from the minister if any provision is made for compensation to Mr. Justice Dunlop. I heard him say that compensation is to be granted to the local judges, but the surrogate judge of Montreal, Mr. Justice Dunlop, has been omitted from the list.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There was no intention on my part to suggest compensation for Mr. Justice Dunlop. He is in the position of being not a local judge of the court but a comparatively recently appointed surrogate or deputy to the local judge, receiving pay for judicial work just as an arbitrator or referee might receive it in proportion to the amount of such work which he performs. I am proposing to take from him with one hand that very work and take, with the other, it is true, the fees that previously he received for doing that work, but it has seemed to me that his judicial position was not changed and that no encroachment was made upon his salary as a judge. Then I should again point out and perhaps a little more distinctly than I have done that in regard to the registrars in the other provinces they are in the corresponding offices of the provincial courts. They are now the registrars, or clerks, of their respective courts. They will continue in the same positions and although this measure may increase the work of the provincial courts or of their officials there will not be a cessation of the work as at present existing, and if the judges of the various provincial courts, chose, by their regulations, to require the payment of similar fees to these gentlemen I assume that it is entirely in the power of the judges of the provincial courts to do so. But, in regard to the registrar at Toronto, the registrar at Halifax and the registrar at St. John, N.B., each one will have no further work of this character to do. None of these three gentlemen are clerks or registrars of provincial courts, and accordingly I have asked each one of them to let me have a memorandum showing the amount he has earned in the way of fees for this work during a period of some years. Averaging the amount per annum of these fees, and taking three years as the basis of calculation, I reached, in round figures, the amounts mentioned in the resolution. Approximately the average income per annum from fees received by the registrar at Toronto was some $250; by the registrar at Halifax, about $325 or $330; and by the registrar of the court in New Brunswick, about $500. In that way the figures in the resolution were reached, but further information which has been sent me during the past few weeks by these gentlemen leads me to think I have been cutting down perhaps rather too closely the amount of their annual earnings; and while the $500 per year or the $1,500 for the three years in the New Brunswick district would, I think, be entirely adequate, the registrar of the Halifax court is probably entitled, upon the footing of three years, more nearly to $1,250 than to $1,000, and the registrar at Toronto to $1,000 instead of $750. I beg, therefore, to move that the sum of $750 in respect to the registrar at Toronto be changed to $1,000 and the sum of $1,000 in respect to the registrar of the Nova Scotia district to $1,250.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth). He proposes to abolish a system which has been in force in this country for nearly eighteen years and which, so far as I am aware, has worked very well, at least in the province of Nova Scotia; I do not profess to speak for its operation in any other province of the Dominion. The minister has referred to the fusion of law and equity which was constituted in Great Britain and also in nearly every province in Canada by the Judicature Acts. The Judicature Acts constituted a great reform. They made it possible to apply the rules of equity in all cases without having to resort to the special procedure in the Court of Chancery. Undoubtedly they have created a great reform. The minister did not mention that in Great Britain at least, and I think in some of the Dominions of the empire, the judges assigned to hear chancery cases are men who have been familiar with that particular branch of the law. In Great Britain, and I think in some provinces in Canada, there is a well marked distinction between the chancery bar and the bar of the common law courts.

It is absolutely impossible to fuse admiralty law and the general law of the country. The Minister of Justice has referred to the procedure in admiralty. It is perfectly evident that he has never had much experience in the court of admiralty or he would have known that the practice in admiralty to-day is simpler than any other form of

procedure. At least it is simpler than any form that I know of. The simplest form of procedure of which I am aware in the British dominions to-day is the procedure which prevails in the courts of admiralty in Great Britain, and that is substantially the same as the procedure in the courts of admiralty in this country. So when the minister proposes to create greater simplicity by applying the ordinary procedure of the courts to procedure in admiralty, I beg to assure my hon. friend that so far as my information goes, he will be absolutely mistaken if he anticipates such a result. This is so for many reasons. In the first place you have to provide in admiralty procedure for a great many things not required in common law courts. You have to provide for means of bailing vessels, for fixing the valuation of vessels and for half a dozen things absolutely unknown in common law courts. They are dealt with in a very simple and summary way in the courts of admiralty and the procedure is, in my opinion, as good as it can be. Then there is the action in rem, utterly unknown to the common law. The authorities to which we mostly look in this country not only as to procedure in admiralty but upon the law of admiralty are those in Great Britain itself, in addition, of course, to our own precedents; and if you adopt a different procedure in admiralty to that which prevails in Great Britain it seems to me that instead of rendering the matter more simple you will render it more complicated.

I have spoken of what has taken place in Great Britain under the Judicature Act, namely, that men who are familiar with chancery procedure and chancery law, are appointed to the chancery bench and it is most unusual—I do not know of any such case—that a man who has attached himself exclusively to the chancery bar, should be appointed to the probate, divorce and admiralty division. Every one who recollects the witticisms of Lord Justice Bowen, one of the greatest lawyers who ever adorned the English bench, will recall that having been compelled by the very necessity of one case to sit in the court of admiralty, he murmured as he took his seat upon the bench:

> And may there be no moaning of the bar
> When I put out to sea.

That illustrates exactly what I was about to say, that the rules of admiralty, the law which prevails in respect of admiralty cases, is in very many special respects a law which is constituted by different authorities and in some respects upon different principles to that which prevails in the common law courts. You never can bring about any assimilation between them. My hon. friend does not propose to bring about such an assimilation. The rules of the road which prevail upon the high seas of the world, and which are recognized by the nations of the world will never be brought into line with any rule which governs the operation of railway trains in this country. They are a different set of rules which have been formulated by consent of the nations of the world and which operate as substantive law to control in case of collision or other damage to one vessel or another upon the high seas. That illustrates exactly what has already been brought to the attention of the Minister of Justice. If you select one man, the chief justice or any other judge of a provincial court in Canada appointed as the deputy judge of the Exchequer Court in Canada, you select, in the first place, a man who has had some experience in this particular branch of law and by selecting him give him an opportunity to acquire additional experience and knowledge and skill; whereas if you disperse this jurisdiction between 6, 8, 10 or 12 judges of any particular court, you will not permit any one judge of that court to acquire the knowledge and experience and skill which are absolutely necessary to any man who undertakes to deal with the very difficult problems which sometimes arise in admiralty cases. I am not speaking of the procedure, because the procedure of the admiralty court is the simplest in the world, but of the necessity that a judge of any admiralty court should be a man who has devoted an enormous amount of study to the particular branch of law which he is called upon to deal with in that court.

What have been the difficulties in the past? Are they difficulties which will be remedied by this measure? What does my hon. friend propose, what is his main argument? His main argument, as I understood it, was that this Bill would bring about exactly the condition that prevails to-day. He said that because this Bill would lead to the exercise of admiralty jurisdiction by one judge out of eight or ten or twelve, therefore it was to be commended. Is that not an answer to the whole argument of the hon. gentleman? That ideal condition which he says will be brought about in some indirect way by the measure he proposes, is exactly the condition which we have in Canada to-day, because the local judge of each province deals exclusively with those cases which arise in the province, subject to an appeal to the judge of the Exchequer Court or to the Supreme Court of Canada, as the litigant may prefer. In these circumstances I fail to see any ground whatever for the proposal the hon. gentleman submits to the House.

He seems to think that some question of provincial rights is involved in this matter. I see no question of provincial rights. It is simply a question of what will be the best tribunal—the provincial court, with its eight or ten or twelve judges, none of whom will be able to acquire any special skill or expert

knowledge of this subject, or the single judge, the delegate of the judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada, who will be able to devote his attention to this subject and to acquire a knowledge and a skill in regard to it which will be extremely useful. In what way does the question of provincial rights come in ? As a matter of fact, we find reserved to this parliament the power of legislation with respect to shipping. Does that not seem to be a fairly good argument why the Exchequer Court of Canada should be selected as the tribunal for dealing with questions concerning shipping rather than any provincial court ? The distribution of power between the parliament of Canada and the provincial legislatures with respect to the appointment of judges and the constitution of courts is not in a very satisfactory condition to-day ; at any rate, that was the opinion of the predecessor of the hon. Minister of Justice. The provincial legislatures have the power to constitute civil courts, to say how many judges shall be appointed to those courts, and it remains only for the executive of Canada, without any power to inquire into the necessity of those appointments, to make the appointments and for parliament to provide the salaries. I do not think any argument derived from that source is of very much avail in this discussion.

The hon. gentleman also took the ground that there was some argument in the language of the imperial statute of 1890 to lead us to depart from the system which has prevailed in this country during the past 17 or 18 years. In the first place, if there were any suggestion in that Act, I do not know that we would be bound to pay very earnest regard to it. We are better judges of what is the best for our country in that regard than the men who sit at Westminster. But when you look at the statute, you see no such suggestion there. Section 2 of chapter 27 of the imperial statutes of 1890 is as follows :

> Every court of law in a British possession, which is for the time being declared in pur suance of this Act to be a court of admiralty, or which, if no such declaration is in force in the possession, has therein original unlimited civil jurisdiction, shall be a court of admiralty, with the jurisdiction in this Act mentioned, and may for the purpose of that jurisdiction exercise all the powers which it possesses for the purpose of its other civil jurisdiction, and such court in reference to the jurisdiction conferred by this Act is in this Act referred to as a colonial court of admiralty.

The first portion of that section confers on this parliament the right to declare the Exchequer Court of Canada to be a colonial court of admiralty. The clause which follows was inserted for the purpose of preventing any failure of justice in case the legislature of any British possession did not see fit to make that declaration, in which case the ordinary courts of the country are invested with the jurisdiction of colonial courts of admiralty.

My hon. friend, in what I presume was merely an extravagance of language, referred to the practice in the Court of Admiralty as being a mystery, and he went on to deduce the conclusion that the gentlemen practising in that court were desirous of maintaining themselves as masters of that mystery and utilizing it to their own personal advantage. I have too high an opinion of the members of the bar of this country to attribute to them any such motive. The practice in admiralty is not a mystery ; it is the simplest practice in the country to-day. The men who have devoted their study to admiralty law understand that that law is different from the common law of the country—that it is a special department by itself. But it seems to me that it would not make the slightest difference to any one of these gentlemen, so far as their future prospects in the practice of their profession are concerned, whether the court remains as it is now or becomes what the Minister of Justice proposes, except that in one case litigation could be carried on more in the interest of the whole people than it could be by the proposed change. The men who practise at any bar, whether admiralty, chancery or common law, know perfectly well that it is to their advantage that litigation should be disposed of by thoroughly capable judges, who will give prompt judgments, intelligible judgments, judgments that will commend themselves to the members of the bar. I would be inclined to think that it is solely for that reason, and for no malign or sinister motive, that these gentlemen have interested themselves in opposing the proposal of the Minister of Justice. I have not heard of any difficulties in the province of Nova Scotia, except that I understand that there have been now and again complaints of delay in the delivery of judgments, and I am of course ready to concede the extreme advantage, not only to litigants, but to members of the bar themselves, of having a prompt delivery of judgments on all occasions.

I do not see how the proposal of my hon. friend will affect the question in that regard, one way or the other. For these reasons I regret very much that the government have found it necessary to change a system which has worked well in this country during the past seventeen or eighteen years. This system was established by so eminent a lawyer as the late Sir John Thompson, and established, as my hon. friend has himself observed, after very careful consideration as to whether or not it would be better to impose this jurisdiction upon the Exchequer Court or the ordinary courts of the country. A system which has worked well for seventeen years should not be lightly departed from. And when we have had the

consideration put forward seriously by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) that the new system he proposes will work out exactly in the same way, it seems to me there is absolutely no ground for the change proposed. I have letters from different members of the bar—men whose character and position at the bar are beyond question—declaring that this proposal will be disliked by litigants as well as by the profession, that it will operate injuriously to both for the reasons I have already given; and I can assure my hon. friend that if I gave him the names of the gentlemen to whom I allude, he would agree that they are animated by motives entirely worthy in the public interest.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). I have listened with a good deal of attention to the explanations given by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), and I fail to see in them any sufficient reason for the change he proposes. I am not sufficiently versed perhaps in the practice of the courts of admiralty to speak with authority, but it does appear to me that to throw this additional burden upon the ordinary courts of the land, which are already overworked, will tend to the disadvantage rather than to the advantage of litigants. There are other considerations to be borne in mind besides those referred to by the hon. minister. Before determining on changing the jurisdiction and practice of any court, we should consider what effect that will have on the question of expense and delay. I quite agree with my honoured leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) that one of the purposes to be served by a court of admiralty is the obtaining of speedy decisions, because the cases which come before such a court are of a character that require speedy hearing and determination. But if such cases are relegated to courts presided over by judges who are now complaining of overwork, and who are unable to give judgments for months after they have heard the cases, and in some instances for years, how does the minister expect that greater expedition will be obtained? It seems to me that the result will be greater delays. Another point on which I would like the opinion of the hon. minister is this. Has he considered whether the jurisdiction he proposes to give to the ordinary courts will have the effect of increasing or decreasing the cost of litigation? It seems to me that if any change be proposed, it should be along the lines of improving the position of the litigant and enabling him to get a decision as speedily and with as little expense as possible. I did not hear the minister make any reference to that point. If the change is going to increase the delays and also the expense, the measure is not one which ought to receive our support.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). It appears to me that the changes proposed by the Minister of Justice should have been made many years ago, in so far as the practice in the admiralty court in Ontario is concerned. I cannot pretend to speak with regard to the practice in any other province. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) says that the practice in the admiralty courts is exceedingly simple—the most simple of any court in the land. Well, I venture to say that it is not more simple than the practice and procedure in the High Court of Justice in Ontario, than which there can be no more simple procedure and practice. I might go further and say that the practice of the admiralty court in Ontario is practically the same as that in the High Court of Justice. A writ is issued, or a warrant if you desire to arrest the ship, an appearance is entered, a statement of claim is delivered, and a statement of defence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not aware that you had pleadings except by order of the judge.

Mr. GERMAN. There is always an order or the judge for the pleadings.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not in my experience.

Mr. GERMAN. Mine is different. There has always been an order in any case I have been engaged in, and I have been engaged in as many admiralty courts cases as perhaps any legal gentleman in this House. There is always a request for an order of the judge for pleadings on one side or the other; the pleadings are delivered, the parties are at issue and the case goes to trial; and that is exactly the practice and procedure in our High Court of Justice. Now, it seems to me there is one reason, so far as Ontario is concerned, why this change should be made, and that is that all admiralty writs have to be issued in the city of Toronto and delivered to the marshal of the court in Toronto. The marshal of the court in Toronto can exercise wide jurisdiction, but he does not travel over the Welland canal or up the St. Clair river or elsewhere to arrest a boat, but sends the writ to the sheriff in the district. And I know from my own experience that it has reached the sheriff in the locality where the boat was at the time the writ was issued, the boat was gone from that section into American territory—being an American bottom—and the claim was lost. Only to-day, without knowing the gist of this resolution, I wrote a letter to the Minister of Justice suggesting that at least there should be a local registrar of the admiralty division of some place on the Welland canal where writs could be issued in admiralty and the

sheriff there be seized at once of jurisdiction to arrest the boat——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would remedy the difficulty, would it not?

Mr. GERMAN. That would, in a measure, remedy the difficulty. But why not give the right to the local registrar in each judicial district to issue the writ? It might just as well be issued there as in Toronto. It is an absolute absurdity that these writs should all be issued in Toronto, but that has been the law. The hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter) has said that this would overburden the judges of the high court with extra work. I do not think so at all. There are not many cases in admiralty to be tried at any rate. A great many are settled and but a few of them tried. I venture to say there is not a judge in the high court of the province of Ontario who does not understand the admiralty law as well as any special judge who might be appointed for that particular purpose. It is usually a question of fact. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) says it depends upon the rule of the road. It probably does in some cases, as, for instance, in cases of collision. But the others are questions of fact, and the evidence is heard by the trial judge, whoever he may be. He applies the law as it exists in regard to the matter, and he finds the facts one way or the other. But, even as it was, there was always an appeal to the Supreme Court and then the whole matter went to a tribunal that was not particularly seized of expert knowledge in admiralty matters more than the judges of our High Court of Justice might be. So, for the convenience and interest of litigants, it is far better that the procedure as it has existed since 1891 should be changed. Whether this is the best change that could be made or not is another thing, but that some change should be made from what we have had in the past is to my mind most absolutely certain. The admiralty court, as constituted at present, is not constituted in the best interest of litigants. Only a short time ago a vessel on the Welland canal collided with a contractor's plant. The vessel was outside the jurisdiction of the court of that judicial district before we got the writ from Toronto executed, and, before we could get word to Montreal and have a writ issued there, she was on the Atlantic ocean. The consequence was that the party lost his claim of several hundred dollars, for the boat was gone and the owners lived outside the jurisdiction. If the writ could have been issued in the county of Lincoln, the county of Welland, or the office of any local registrar bordering on Lake Ontario, the boat could have been seized and the person injured could have got his claim out of the boat or compelled her to remain tied up. This kind of thing happens frequently. Great injustice has been done to persons injured by collisions with steamers by reason of the slow procedure under the present practice. I am confident that the change proposed will benefit litigants and claimants as well as the owners of vessels themselves.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (Montreal, St. James). I would like to express my views as concisely and accurately as possible against this measure. I may say at the very outset, and before dealing with the merits of this resolution, that I am a little surprised to hear that no provision is made for compensation for the surrogate judge at Montreal. That gentleman is one of the very few admiralty judges who have done much work, and as a matter of fact he has done more work than any other admiralty judge in Canada. He tried 42 cases last year and rendered over 100 judgments. In the district of Quebec only two cases were tried by the admiralty judge in that district, who is the ex-chief justice. I am much surprised to find that a man like Mr. Justice Dunlop, who has done such a large amount of work during the last year and the year previous, is not to be allowed any compensation. I know that Mr. Justice Dunlop could not expect to have any salary paid from the consolidated fund of Canada, for the reason that under the Act of 1891 he is appointed merely a surrogate judge, that is, a judge who should not but is just the same to be paid by fees. But I may say that Mr. Justice Dunlop has refused continually to accept any fee paid by law. He did not feel disposed to accept a fee like an ordinary marshal or bailif or other public officer authorized to receive fees. In November, 1907 for the purpose, I suppose, of pleasing the local surrogate judge in admiralty in Montreal, the judge of the Exchequer Court, the late Mr. Justice Burbidge, made the following order, which was published in the Canada 'Gazette' of November 30, 1907:

In pursuance of the provisions of The Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890, and of The Admiralty Act, 1891, Canada, it is ordered that the following additional rules of court for regulating the practice and procedure (including fees and costs) of the Exchequer Court of Canada, in the exercise of its jurisdiction, powers and authority as a court of admiralty, shall be in force in the said court:

1. Part 2 of the appendix to the general rules and orders relating to the practice and procedure in admiralty cases in the Exchequer Court of Canada is hereby amended by adding thereto the following paragraphs:

13. By a judge or deputy judge in admiralty, to whom no salary is paid as such judge or deputy, to be taken for his own use:

| | |
|---|---|
| On administering any oath or declaration in court or in chambers.. .. .. .. | $ 1 00 |
| On examination before him of any witness before trial.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 5 00 |
| On any application in chambers.. .. .. | 4 00 |
| On any motion in court.. .. .. .. .. .. | 5 00 |

| | |
|---|---|
| On a final decree in an uncontested action... .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 5 00 |
| On a final decree in a contested action.. | 25 00 |
| Where the trial or hearing of the action occupies more than one day, for each additional day.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 15 00 |
| On the assessment of damages, or taking of any account if assessed or taken by the judge according to the case, from $5 to.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 25 00 |
| On signing or certifying any document | 2 00 |

Well, the bar of Montreal thought that such a decree was entirely unworthy, and that it would be undignified in a British judge to observe it, and Mr. Justice Dunlop has been refusing, since the passage of this decree, to accept any fee from any lawyer, or asking any lawyer for a cheque, before hearing a case, although it has been the practice in England for centuries to observe the old Latin maxim: Non deliberetur, donec solvantur species. Fortunately, that practice was abolished in the year 1825. Now Mr. Justice Dunlop, who is a good British judge, declared that he did not feel free to ask for $5 or $25 before he went on with the trial of a case. The result is that Mr. Justice Dunlop has been presiding over the admiralty court in Montreal for the last three years without receiving a farthing, although he has tried more cases than any other admiralty judge in all Canada, yes, I may say, although he has tried more cases than all the other admiralty judges put together. Therefore I think the Bill is defective in that it has no provision for making compensation to Mr. Justice Dunlop, the surrogate judge in admiralty at Montreal.

But I am opposed to the Bill for several reasons, I am opposed to it in toto. In the first place, permit me to give a brief history of the admiralty courts in New France and in Canada so far as the province of Quebec is concerned. As far back as 1717 there was an admiralty court established under the French regime in New France, of which the intendant was the presiding judge. Soon after the colony passed under British authority, an imperial vice-admiralty court was established in 1764, and that court tried cases in admiralty as late as the year 1891. In 1890 was passed the Imperial Colonial Admiralty Act, and I venture to call attention to two sections of that Act. Section 3 reads as follows:

The legislature of a British possession may by any colonial law, (a) declare any court of unlimited civil jurisdiction, whether original or appellate, in that possession to be a colonial court of admiralty, and provide for the exercise by such court of its jurisdiction under this Act, and limit territorially, or otherwise, the extent of such jurisdiction; and (b) confer upon any inferior or subordinate court in that possession such partial or limited admiralty jurisdiction under such regulations and with such appeal (if any) as may seem fit.

Mr. GERVAIS.

I quote this article for the purpose of showing that this Bill is unconstitutional and that this parliament has no power to amend the Act of 1891 which was and which is still unconstitutional; at any rate to show that this parliament has no authority to organize a court to try maritime cases within any province of the Dominion. This section 3 does not give power to the parliament of Canada to establish a new admiralty court, a new judicial authority, but that power is given to the legislature. Every one knows that under the British North America Act of 1867 the word 'legislature' has a well defined meaning; it means the legislative power which legislates for any British province, while on the other hand, the parliament of Canada is only authorized to deal with matters of a federal character. Well, under the circumstances, every one can draw the conclusion that under the Act of 1890, according to the construction put upon it by the imperial parliament, it is only a provincial legislature that has authority to legislate upon this subject. Next I will quote article 15 of the Imperial Act of 1890. This is the interpretation clause, and reads as follows:

In the construction of this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the expression 'representative legislature' means, in relation to a British possession, a legislature comprising a legislative body of which at least one half are elected by inhabitants of the British possession.

So I say the clear import of the Act of 1890 was that the power to create a new admiralty court within a British possession, is confined exclusively to the provincial legislature, not to a British parliament or a colonial parliament. Now if we look up the constitutional Act creating the commonwealth of Australia, or creating the confederation of British colonies in the West Indies, if we look up the constitutional Acts relating to the South African colonies, we discover that a distinction is always made between what is styled a colonial British parliament and a British legislature. If that is the case, we must conclude that by the Act of 1890 it is only a provincial legislature of any one of the provinces of Canada that has power to organize and establish a court; while on the other hand, to the parliament of the Dominion is assigned the duty of appointing the judge. The office is to be created by the provincial authority, and the federal authority has only the power to appoint the official to fill that office. Then the well known clause 14 of section 92 of the British North America Act, is very clear upon that subject. With the permission of the committee I will quote that well known section:

14. The administration of justice in the province, including the constitution maintenance and organization of provincial courts, both of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and

including procedure in civil matters in these courts.

As a matter of fact it cannot be said for a moment that it is within the power of the Canadian parliament to deal with the question of procedure before the admiralty court. The organization of the maritime courts cannot be dealt with by the parliament of Canada. But to-day for the time being, still adhering to my contention that this Bill is unconstitutional I will give other reasons why the present conditions should not be made worse. Then, I say that under the Act of 1867, under the Imperial Act of 1890, and under the Canadian Act of 1891, this parliament cannot organize or reorganize what is called the admiralty court for Canada. But nevertheless in 1891 the court of admiralty was established for Canada. It was made more especially a court of appeal. Then six local courts were established. The whole of the Dominion of Canada was divided up into six districts, namely, Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. At the head of each local district in admiralty a judge was appointed and a salary was provided for each one of those judges. That salary has ranged from $600 to $1,000 a year. Clever and painstaking men, and men of large experience in maritime matters have been appointed as local judges in admiralty. There is an appeal from the judgment given by each of these judges of the Exchequer Court from the Exchequer Court to the Supreme Court of Canada and from the Supreme Court to the Privy Council in England. For the last fifteen years in the district of Montreal, on account of the large number of maritime cases arising in and about that port, the board of trade, the chambre de commerce and many of the most important corporations and citizens have been asking this government to appoint a local judge in admiralty for the district of Montreal. To give a certain amount of satisfaction to our citizens a deputy admiralty judge has been appointed for the district of Montreal. There were many reasons for the appointment of a deputy admiralty judge. For many years past, on account of there not being an admiralty judge in Montreal, the shipping men of that port, when they had cases to defend, or were obliged to institute actions to enforce maritime contracts, had most of these cases tried before the high court of admiralty in England. I could mention many of these cases. It was a detriment to the traders, merchants and shipping men of Montreal, it was a detriment to my fellow members of the bar and it was a prejudice to everybody. After years of fighting this government appointed a deputy judge in admiralty for the district of Montreal. This judge has been trying cases for three years. Indeed, during the first year over fifteen cases were tried ; last year, forty-two, and some one hundred and twenty decisions were given by him during the year 1907. But, apparently because this admiralty court in Montreal has been serving a good purpose, somebody sees fit now to abolish it. I will declare to this committee that the mere fact of merging the jurisdiction of the admiralty court with that of the superior court means the absolute abolition of all admiralty authority in Montreal. It means that within a few years from now all the admiralty cases arising at Montreal will be tried at Quebec or in England. Some hon. members of the committee may ask me my reason for that. It is very simple. We have in Montreal seventeen judges of the Superior Court, all of whom I must say, are very clever men. But they have been trained to try cases under the civil law, they know the commercial law and they are familiar with a great many of the maritime laws. But as everybody knows the maritime terminology is quite extensive. It includes more than eight hundred special words having a special meaning which no one could hope to familiarize himself with in three months nor yet in six months. Sea-faring men, shipping men and ship owners have a special terminology of their own. Moreover they have habits, customs and usages which are sometimes considered ridiculous by land lubbers but ship owners would not be any more ready to submit their cases to the decision of the land lubbers than land lubbers would be to accept the arbitrament of the sea-faring men. It will be asking a good deal to expect any of the seventeen judges that we now have, to try maritime cases. If this parliament does not provide any additional salary for the judges who will hear these maritime cases I say, Sir, that that means that no civil court judge will be very anxious to try maritime cases or to undertake the extra work which this increased jurisdiction involves. Such is human nature. If you transfer the jurisdiction of the admiralty court to the Superior Court of Quebec which is the equivalent of the high court of Ontario, of the high court of New Brunswick, or the high court of England, and which may be called the common law court dealing with all cases except otherwise provided, the result will be that very few admiralty cases will be tried there. If you abolish the salary which is paid to the admiralty judges and if you force the civil court judges to hear and try maritime cases without any additional compensation you will do something which is to the utter detriment of the port, the citizens and the bar of Montreal. I say that it is unfair. Moreover, this resolution is uncalled for and it is inexpedient. Who has asked for this change ? Perhaps there are some poor officers or poor judges. Are we to abolish our admiralty courts because there are one or two undeserving or inefficient admiralty

judges? Are we to abolish this parliament of Canada because there may be one, two three or five bad members? Should we abolish a public office because there is one poor officer? Should we abolish the Senate because there are a few senators who are more or less deserving? No, we cannot for a moment think that we will abolish a court because sometimes for a few days in the year that court is presided over by a poor judge. I think that under the circumstances, that is a poor argument.

Then I said that this Bill is inexpedient because it is interfering with the terminology, the language, the usages, the habits, the customs of sea-faring men without sufficient reason being assigned for so doing. It has been said also that there has been opposition to this Bill. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of this committee to pay attention to a few paragraphs from certain resolutions which were sent to the Minister of Justice and to some members of this House at the request, not of lawyers alone, but of all those who know of things maritime. I quote first an extract from the minutes of the council of the bar of Montreal passed on January 10, 1908.

The attention of the Council of the Bar of the District of Montreal having been called to the general order made by his Lordship, Mr. Justice Burbidge, as published in the 'Canada Gazette' of November 16, 1907, in relation to certain fees to be paid to a judge or deputy judge in admiralty, to whom no salary is paid as such judge or deputy, it was unanimously resolved:—

Whereas the port of Montreal is the principal port in Canada; and

Whereas by reason thereof there is more admiralty business done in the district of Montreal than in any other Admiralty district or division in Canada; and

Whereas the judges in admiralty sitting in Halifax, St. John, Charlottetown, Toronto, Vancouver and Victoria receive a fixed salary varying from $1,000 to $800, which salary is payable out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada; and

Whereas the judge sitting in admiralty in Montreal receives no salary as such judge; and

Whereas the said judge, therefore, is paid by the fees fixed by the general order above mentioned being a certain sum for each proceeding taken before him in the case, thus imposing a direct tax upon the litigants, who appear and plead before the admiralty court established for the district of Montreal; and

Whereas the paying of such tax is an unfair discrimination against said litigants and that the said system can be justified by no consideration of the importance of the port of Montreal, the dignity of the judge, the large number of cases which come up for trial before the said judge in admiralty or of the general method in vogue in modern times of remuneration judges of the superior courts of Canada;

That the matter be immediately and respectfully brought to the attention of the government of Canada and of the Honourable Mr. Justice Burbidge with a view of obtaining during the present session of parliament, for the judge in admiralty appointed and sitting in the district of Montreal a salary commensurate with the duties performed by him and of having the said general order repealed as soon as the said salary is voted and that a copy of the present resolution be addressed to the Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Prime Minister of Canada, to the Honourable A. B. Aylesworth, Minister of Justice, to his Lordship, Mr. Justice Burbidge and to the members representing the city of Montreal in the House of Commons.

Certified a true copy.

Montreal, January 16, 1908.

JAN. PRIMEAU,
Secretary, Bar of Montreal.

I have here a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Dominion Marine Association at their annual general meeting at Ottawa, on Wednesday, February 15, 1908:

Copy of a resolution adopted unanimously by the Dominion Marine Association in annual meeting, at Ottawa, on Wednesday, February 12, 1908.

Be it resolved that the Dominion Marine Association, having considered the resolution submitted to parliament by the Honourable, the Minister of Justice, in relation to admiralty jurisdiction within Canada, strongly disapproves of any change in the jurisdiction, procedure or administration of any Canadian admiralty court, which may in any way, or to any extent, impair the rights, remedies or facilities for relief enjoyed under the present law.

That having regard to the nature of the property in dispute and of the questions placed in issue in admiralty cases, and having regard also to the real necessity for the preservation intact of such peculiar rights and requirements as the action in rem, the right to arrest under warrant by telegram, the release under bond, the preliminary acts in collision cases, and the various other special items of admiralty practice, it is essential for the protection and convenience of litigants that a separate procedure be preserved; while the same special attributes and requirements and the special laws, regulations and maritime customs governing the decision of these cases render specialization urgently desirable on the part of the judges and administrative officers of these courts as well as in the practice and procedure.

That the continuance of a separate judiciary and staff for these courts is requisite for the above reasons and for another important reason also, namely, that only thereby can the speedy and convenient trial of actions at suitable places be provided for, the continuance of these special facilities being in a large majority of cases essential to the collection and preservation of the evidence of crews of vessels.

That this association believes that the rapidly increasing growth of the Canadian merchant marine entitles the above considerations to special attention, and that any steps taken in the matter should be in the way of extension rather than curtailment of the rights now enjoyed.

The Dominion Marine Association.
FRANCIS KING,
Secretary.

One word about procedure in maritime law. One hon. member spoke of the similarity between the common law and the maritime law. There is all the difference in the world between the English common law procedure and the admiralty procedure. For example, under the common law procedure you have no such useful remedy as the 'actio in rem.' Where is your actio in rem in the common law such as you have under the admiralty practice? Then, under the admiralty procedure you have the arrest by wire, by telegraph, of a ship, which is not given under the common law procedure. Then, under the common law, you have nothing like the giving of a bond for obtaining the release of a ship. This remedy is quite useful both to the ship owner and to the claimant. Here are three admirable modes of procedure which cannot be replaced under the common law and I could quote many other useful remedies to which recourse can be had under the admiralty practice, but which cannot be employed under the common law. For these reasons the shipping men of Canada are in a body protesting against the proposed change of the jurisdiction of our admiralty court.

Let us hear another protest. I have here a resolution of the Montreal Board of Trade reading as follows:

Resolved, that in 1897 and again in 1898 the council of the Montreal Board of Trade urged upon the government by resolution the establishment of a maritime court in Montreal such as was provided in Quebec, Toronto and other places, and that the government thereafter acceded to this request,

That the council now learns with alarm and regret that the government contemplates the abolition of the admiralty courts throughout the country,

That the council hereby prays the government not to disturb an arrangement which has given such satisfaction to shipowners and marine underwriters but rather to perfect it by ordering that the Montreal admiralty judge shall be paid a fixed remuneration out of the consolidated fund of Canada, instead of the fees fixed by the general order of the Exchequer court of Canada.

I am, dear Sir,

Yours truly,

GEORGE HADRILL,

Secretary.

Then there is a letter from a maritime law expert, Mr. King, of Kingston, which reads:

I am sending you inclosed herewith a copy of the resolution of the Dominion Marine Association on the subject of the proposals introduced by the Hon. the Minister of Justice on Tuesday last in regard to admiralty jurisdiction in Canada.

The resolution presented to the House by the minister is so delightfully vague and ambiguous that it may mean a great deal or it may mean nothing, while in fact it does not say that any part of the troubles we fear are contemplated, but rather that it is expedient to make better provision for admiralty jurisdiction within Canada. It does say that the judiciary and staff are likely to be superannuated or pensioned off, and the other matters only loom up as a possible or probable consequence.

I note that the Montreal bar 'views with alarm' any changes in The Exchequer Court Act, whereby jurisdiction would be transferred to the Superior Court. I think their resolution reads too much into the minister's resolution. Changes, too, would not be in the Act referred to but rather in the Admiralty Act (chapter 141, Revised Statutes of Canada) which confers certain powers on the Exchequer Court under the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890.

In view of the haze which obscures everything and the praise-worthy object aimed at in the opening lines of the minister's resolution, I have been rather explicit in our resolution in order to avoid condemnation of any good thing.

I am interesting members of our local bar, and have also taken the matter up directly with a member of the Toronto bar, who is a bencher of the Law Society of Upper Canada, and interested considerably in admiralty matters, namely, Mr. W. D. McPherson, K.C.

I will be very pleased to try to be of further service to you in any way, for mutual benefit.

Faithfully yours,

FRANCIS KING.

I have here a resolution of the Shipping Federation of Canada which, as every one knows, is composed of the ocean shipping men, who know the ins and outs of the admiralty practice in England as well as in Canada. Their resolution is as follows:

Extract of minutes of a general meeting of the members of the Shipping Federation of Canada held in their board room, Board of Trade building, in the city of Montreal, on Wednesday, the 12th day of February, 1908.

Whereas, it has come to the knowledge of this federation that it is the intention of the government to change the Exchequer Court Act, in such a way as to give jurisdiction in admiralty matters to the Superior Court instead of maintaining the present system.

And whereas, our Canadian admiralty courts, as they are at present constituted, have the confidence of shipowners and underwriters.

Therefore it was unanimously resolved, that the federation respectfully urge the government to maintain the present system in connection with the Montreal admiralty court with the exception that the said admiralty judge be paid out of the Consolidated Fund of Canada, instead of fees fixed by the general order of the Exchequer Court of Canada.

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution bearing the seal of the corporation be forwarded to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G., P.C., Premier of Canada; to the Hon. A. B. Aylesworth, K.C., Minister of Justice; Hon. L. P. Brodeur, K.C., L.L.D., and the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, K.C., L.L.D., and also to the respective members represent-

ing the city of Montreal in the House of Commons.

Certified a true copy.

THOMAS ROBB,
Secretary.

Montreal, February 12, 1908.

The Shipping Federation do not like to have the Montreal admiralty judge paid by fees and they have reason for not wishing that. As you remember during the sixteenth century the court house of Paris was burned down and some malicious litigants of the time published these four verses about it:

Certes, ce fut un triste jeu,
Quand à Paris, Dame Justice
Pour avoir mangé trop d'épices
Mit son palais en feu.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I understood the hon. member in drawing a distinction between the remedies that are available at common law and those which have always been available in the admiralty court, to argue that, as a result of the change proposed by this Bill, it will be impossible for the common law courts to grant these remedies.

Mr. GERVAIS. No. theoretically; but practically, yes. After the passing of that Bill, you say, the same remedies will still continue to exist. If I may be allowed to use an expression well known in the courts, I join issue with that statement; my plea is a general denial. There are several reasons why that change cannot maintain those special remedies. But let me quote, first of all, the English Judicature Act of 1873. For the last four or five centuries the good people of the British Isles had been confronted with about half a dozen of inferior jurdisdictions and an equal number of higher jurisdictions. Many proposed judicial reforms had been before the British parliament during the nineteenth century. At last, in 1873, the great Judicature Act was passed, by which all the inferior courts and all the superior courts of England were abolished and were replaced by one single court—the High Court of Justice of England—having the right to sit in two divisions, one as the trial court and the other as a court of appeal, with the right of ultimate appeal to the House of Lords. By section 16 of the Judicature Act of 1873 the fifteen or sixteen courts of England were abolished, or rather were merged into one court—the High Court of Justice of England. That section 16 provides:

The High Court shall be a Superior Court of Record, and, subject as in this Act mentioned, there shall be transferred to and vested in the High Court the jurisdiction which, at the commencement of this Act, was vested in, or capable of being exercised by, all or any of the courts following.

Then follows the list: The High Court of Chancery, the Master of the Rolls, the Court of King's Bench, the Court of Common Pleas at Westminster, the Court of Exchequer, the High Court of Admiralty, the Prize Court, the Court of Probate, the Court for Divorce and Matrimonial Causes, the London Court of Bankruptcy, the Court of Common Pleas at Lancaster, the Court of Pleas at Durham, the courts created by commissioners of assize, of oyer and terminer and of jail delivery, and so on. All the courts which had been in existence in England for over three centuries were abolished and were replaced by that single court, the High Court of Justice of England; so says section 16 of the Judicature Act of 1873. But there is a rider to it; there is a limitation to that complete and absolute merging of courts. Let me quote another section, section 31. The divisions were still maintained; and so, though the High Court of Admiralty was abolished, and its jurisdiction transferred to the High Court of Justice, still there is the High Court of Admiralty, under the assumed name of the Probate, Divorce and Admiralty division. Let me quote section 31:

For the more convenient despatch of business——

We have no such language in our Acts of parliament. The civil law and civil procedure in each province is governed by the provincial authority. The government of Canada has merely the power of appointing judges; and because it has that power, it now unconstitutionally claims the right of amending, modifying and altering the civil procedure of the province; and it is this tendency which I oppose. But I will quote section 31:

For the more convenient despatch of business in the High Court (but not so as to prevent any judge from sitting whenever required in any Divisional Court, or for any judge of a different division from his own) there shall be in the High Court five divisions consisting of such number of judges respectively as hereinafter mentioned. Such five divisions shall respectively include the several judges following, that is to say——

The section then provides for the division of the High Court into five divisions, called, respectively, the Chancery division, the King's Bench division, the Common Pleas division, the Exchequer division and the Probate, Divorce and Admiralty division. That means that in England, though the High Court of Admiralty has been abolished by the Judicature Act of 1873, still the shipowners, the sea-faring men and the merchants can avail themselves of the ability and capacity of their admiralty judges by means of this admiralty division.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Will my hon. friend tell me whether there is anything in the English Judicature Act that differs in any particular from that proposed by the Minister of Justice? Does not the English

Act assign to one of the divisions of the High Court of Justice the same jurisdiction that the Minister of Justice proposes to assign to the admiralty court?

Mr. GERVAIS. There is a wide difference.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. In what way?

Mr. GERVAIS. Because that Act was being passed by a sovereign power—by a power which at the same time can create the law, regulate the procedure, and can provide for the appointment of the judges and the assignment of their work. In Canada the provincial legislatures are sovereign and supreme in the way of amending, modifying, altering or repealing what is styled the civil law. I speak of civil law, not in the narrow sense taken by many lawyers, but in the large sense of private law as contrasted with public law. All that is not public law is private law, and consequently, under the working of the Act of 1867, all that is styled by the jurists private law—that is, civil law, commercial law and maritime law—is under the jurisdiction of the provincial parliament. According to the most modern definition of rights, what we style civil law must include private law, and private law is composed of three elements—civil law, properly speaking, commercial law and criminal law. And therefore it comes within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures to deal with commercial and maritime law.

Under the Act of 1873, passed in England, it was thought that English lawyers and ship owners would be deprived of the admiralty procedure hitherto in force. That expectation was very natural. If the admiralty courts were to be abolished, the procedure in those courts would follow suit. If the admiralty courts were too ancient and were to be abolished, although they embodied the common sense and logic of ages, it was only natural to presume that the procedure followed in those courts would be abolished. But, curious as it may seem, nothing of the kind was done. I might quote you a few articles of the great Judicature Act of 1873 to prove what I say. For example, after the passing of that Act of 1873, one might wonder why the procedure relating to arrests under the old admiralty practice was not abolished. But it was not. In section 35 of the Judicature Act of 1873 you will find that the division of actions of the old admiralty court are incorporated in that Act. They may be found under articles 498, 538, 539 and 167 of the Judicature Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. The old practice observed.

Mr. GERVAIS. Let us follow therefore the English example; let us maintain admiralty practice separate from the common law courts jurisdiction. Yes. If you will look at the procedure you will find that discovery, transfers, appearance, preliminary objections—in fact all the rules of admiralty practice—instead of having being repealed, are purely and simply incorporated into the general Judicature Act of 1873. And they were properly retained and incorporated in that Act, because these rules of admiralty practice were an admirable set of rules of procedure, devised for the best advantage of the shipping interest and of the bar. There is no court in the world which has better rules of practice than those of our court of admiralty. It is idle to think that one may devise some rules of procedure which could replace for a moment the old admiralty rules. In a word, there is more reason in Canada than in England to keep the admiralty jurisdiction separate from the civil law courts jurisdiction.

What has been the result of this merging in England in 1873 of the admiralty practice with the common law practice? The result has been that instead of having the rules of practice before the admiralty Court compiled together in one book, you have now to look through two bulky volumes in order to discover what they are. So that instead of having a clear and concise code of maritime law as well as admiralty procedure you have to look up any number of authorities and begin anew your maritime law education and training.

Mr. LANCASTER. And there are different rules in each province.

Mr. GERVAIS. Not now. I would like to know who are asking for this legislation? All the legal men, all the shipping men, all the ship owners, all those who are interested in maritime matters are, in my province at least, arrayed against the Bill. Who then are asking for the change? We must presume that parliament strives to follow public opinion and that before important measures of this kind are introduced there must be some evidence of their necessity. What are the great interests at the back of this proposed legislation? Who are clamouring for a change? I have been trying to find that out for three weeks, but without success. I have made inquiries of shipping men, judges, lawyers and others in my province, and the only answer I have had is that nobody is asking for the change. Most of the leading newspapers in Canada have written articles against it. The bar of Montreal and the bar of Quebec have put themselves on record in public meetings against it. I cannot, therefore, see why the government should press this measure. Speaking for myself I consider it not only inexpedient and uncalled for, but entirely unconstitutional. Should this Bill become law, that might induce the provinces to accept illegal delegation of constitutional power from this parliament. That accepta-

ance might cause some people to argue that the unconstitutional Act of 1891 has been at any rate approved of by the people of the provinces. They may have before long to organize proper and constitutional courts of admiralty, by virtue of the Colonial Admiralty Courts Act, 1890. This House should not make worse in the meantime the present de facto condition of affairs. Mr. Speaker, I might be allowed to sum up those remarks I had to make to-day within a couple of hours of notice. I beg leave to request this House to remember that the monks of Cambridge and Oxford, while dreaming of universal union, unity and domination, met universal disruption and subserviency.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

## After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. Mr. AYLESWORTH. At the beginning of the sitting this afternoon, I stated my proposal to increase the amounts that this resolution proposes to award to the registrar at Toronto and the registrar at Halifax. Of course, I should have spoken of that before the Speaker left the chair. With your permission, I ask to withdraw the motion that I made in committee with the intention of resuming it in another form at a later stage.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. AYLESWORTH moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 122) to make better provision for the exercise of admiralty jurisdiction within Canada in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## SUPPLY—INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go in Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) to a motion moved by myself on January 13 last, calling for a return of the revenues from certain wharfs and the expenditures on those wharfs. Or, it may be, that this return relates to the Marine and Fisheries Department.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Yes, I think that relates to the Marine and Fisheries Department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know that the department have many returns in hand, but I should be glad if the earliest possible attention were given to this.

Mr. BRODEUR. This has to do with the expenditure on construction of wharfs, and I think it is under the Department of Public Works.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It calls for a return of the revenues from these wharfs also. It may be that it relates partly to one department and partly to the other.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I think the hon. gentleman is right.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) will see that it covers a very wide range. Another hon. member has moved for a return covering somewhat similar works.

Mr R. L. BORDEN. That is a motion relating to public buildings. This includes nothing but wharfs.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am under the impression that we brought down last year a return showing these revenues.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, I do not ask to have brought down again anything that is already before the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will look into it.

## EXPENDITURE OF PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. GEO. H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks regarding certain matters connected with the Public Works Department. We know that Canada has been very prosperous during the last few years, and we all rejoice in that fact. But I find that the Public Works Department has been even more prosperous than Canada. Within the last twelve years the population of Canada has increased from 25 to 50 per cent—we do not know exactly how much. But, during the same period, the Department of Public Works increased nearly seven times. I find that the expenditure of the Department of Public Works has increased according to the following figures:

| | |
|---|---|
| Expenditure, Public Works Department for the year 1895-6: | |
| Consolidated Fund.. .. .. .. | $ 1,299,768 |
| Other items.. .. .. .. .. .. | 114,825 |
| Total.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,414,593 |
| Expenditure of the Public Works Department for the year 1905-6: | |
| Consolidated Fund.. .. .. .. | $ 7,484,715 |
| Other items.. .. .. .. .. .. | 2,359,528 |
| Total.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 9,844,243 |
| Expenditure of the Public Works Department for the year 1906-7: | |
| Expenditure for nine months— | |
| Consolidated Fund.. .. .. .. | $ 5,977,385 |
| Other items.. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,178,011 |
| | 7,155,396 |
| Add one-third for remainder of the year.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 2,385,132 |
| Total.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $ 9,540,528 |

For the year 1907-8, the estimates of the Public Works Department were nearly $15,000,000. The estimates for the year 1908-9 now before the House are for a total of nearly $13,000,000. This will be added to by large supplementary estimates as usual.

Now, Liberals seem to consider this vast expenditure of the Public Works Department something to be proud of, something for which they should get great credit. The present government seems to think this money its own, just as though it had made it and not taken it from the pockets of the people. In election campaigns they speak of this continually, and claim support for the government because they have spent so much in public works without giving consideration to what it is spent for, and whether the works are really needed or not. I find in the report of the Public Works Department for the year ending June 30, 1906, the following statement:

The statement prepared by the accountant shows the great expansion of our branch of the administration inasmuch as the expenditure made by this department during the fiscal year under review has reached the total of nearly $10,000,000, while ten years ago the expenditure was barely $2,000,000.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, the boastful tone of this statement. It sounds like a pæan of joy. Look at us, they say; we are a great department; ten years ago our expenditure was barely $2,000,000 whereas now we spend $10,000,000. It seems to me that the question whether this expenditure is a subject for congratulation or not depends upon how this money has been spent, depends upon whether the works on which it was spent were needed or not. What has caused this tremendous increase of expenditure? It has not been caused in the main by any large works which were needed; it has been caused chiefly by the frittering away of the money of this country on many unnecessary works, most of them small, perhaps, but representing in the aggregate vast sums. When we point to such a case, the Liberals answer: Oh, well, what does it matter? that is a small thing. We all know that a great deal of the money is spent on necessary works, but the Liberals forget, and I think purposely forget, that these sums which are frittered away are very many in number, that the total amounts to a very large sum of money, and in this case to many millions. Now we say plainly on this side of the House that we want to see all necessary public works constructed. We have always said, when in opposition and in power, that this country was bound to go ahead and become one of the great countries of the world, and we wished to see the expenditure keep progress with the development of the country. When we criticise certain expenditures of the Public Works Department, our friends opposite try to make out that we are opposed to public works. Sir, I want to deny emphatically, not only on my own account, but on account of all my friends on this side of the House, that we are in any wise opposed to a proper expenditure of public money in constructing necessary public works. There is and there must be a reasonable increase in such expenditure. No one would expect that the expenditure of to-day would not be greater than it was twelve years ago. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that all these works are necessary, whereas we know that a great many are built in a wasteful manner, and a great many are built that are not needed, built for the benefit of private corporations and individuals. But we do not believe in wasting the people's money in that way. To treat this subject properly, we ought to get down to concrete cases and mention items that we object to. I propose to mention a few that have already been exposed, and by these we may judge of the balance which have not been investigated. Besides public works which are necessary, there are a certain number of others which may be of some public service, but upon which the money has been largely wasted. We need not go far from our doors to find one glaring case of this kind. I refer to the wharf at Hull across the river. Questions have been asked in this House about this wharf. In 1905 on 'Hansard' page 2,064, I asked this question:

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

Hon. Charles Hyman, acting Minister of Public Works, answered:

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

Again on January 28, 1907, another question was asked:

Mr. PERLEY asked:

1. How many steamers used the wharf at Hull, Quebec, during 1906?
2. What was the revenue for 1906?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works):

1. Steamers carrying freight called 83 times, and the 'Victoria,' a passenger boat, called twice daily from the 30th July to the close of navigation.
2. Nil.

Now I submit that the expenditure of $54,000 on that wharf was absolutely un-

necessary, that a large portion of that sum was an utter waste, and that for the small traffic which is carried on there a much less expensive wharf would answer the purpose just as well. You will notice that although there was no revenue from it during 1906, yet Mr. J. P. Labelle made a revenue out of it at the rate of fifty cents per day. Why should that wharf have been built? I presume it was not built for political purposes, because the county has been strongly Liberal for a long time. It seems to me this government must have thought that it had more money to spend than it knew what to do with when it spent $54,000 on that wharf. During the summer I have crossed the bridge several times every week, and I took notice of this wharf. For months and months I never saw a single steamer there, but at last after about a year I did see one steamer. I submit that the few steamers which called there would have been just as well off with an expenditure of one-fifth that sum of money.

In the same category come wharfs built in the back country. Now the Ottawa river is between two provinces, it is an interprovincial water. Yet this government has undertaken, during the last few years, in sporadic cases, to build wharfs in the back country. I have here a memorandum of certain wharfs built on Lake Nomininingue. Lake Nomininingue is in the county of Labelle, seventy-five miles north of the Ottawa river. It is an inland lake, one of ten thousand such lakes dotted all over the north country. On the 28th of January, 1907, I asked this question:

1. How many wharfs has the government built on the Nomininingue lakes in Labelle county?
2. What was the cost of each?
3. What was the revenue of each in 1906?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works).

1. Five wharfs have been constructed: Two on the Grand Nomininingue, two on the Petit Nomininingue, and one on Lake Bourget.
2. Cost of these five wharfs: $4,154.42.
3. None.

Now, Sir, the waters of Lake Nomininingue are entirely in the province of Quebec, and as such I do not consider that this government is at all called upon to spend money for wharfs in such localities. As I say, there are ten thousand such lakes in the northern parts of Quebec and Ontario; and if this government is going to spend money on one lake, why not spend it on all these lakes? Wherever there is a small village on these lakes, wharfs are just as necessary as they are on Lake Nomininingue. Is this government going to carry out this system everywhere throughout the back country? It is impossible. How does the government decide where they shall build such wharfs, and on what lakes? The conclusion is inevitable that wharfs at places like these are granted by favouritism or for political purposes.

In the same category comes a public work which has been frequently referred to in this House, I refer to the bridge at D'Israeli. As all the members of this House know, this government went there and built a so-called wharf, which was practically the one-half of a bridge across a stream and then the municipality set to work and bulit the other half themselves.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend tell me where D'Israeli is?

Mr. PERLEY. In the county of Richmond and Wolfe.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the eastern townships?

Mr. PERLEY. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. In Mr. Tobin's constituency.

Mr. PERLEY. The only difference between the half that was built by this government and the half that was built by the municipality is that the municipality built theirs for a great deal less money.

Mr. LENNOX. For less than one-third.

Mr. PERLEY. For less than a third of the cost of the government half. This government cannot say that it had no warning regarding this work. I find in 'Hansard' of 1905, page 9593, that this matter was discussed and that the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) made the following remarks relating to this wharf:

Mr. MORIN. Will the minister tell me if this wharf is ever frequented by a boat of any kind, how long will the boat be?

Mr. HYMAN. O am afraid I cannot answer that.

Mr. MORIN. I will bet you cannot. The hon. minister does not know anything about it. Of course, that is admitted. The engineer is the man who recommends that a wharf be built there or that the proposal to erect a wharf be rejected, and he is the one I am aiming at, not the minister. At that place there is a little creek called Black creek, and the member from the county has asked the government for money to build a bridge there. It is not a wharf he wants at all, it is a bridge, and they try to make this House believe it is a wharf. We all know that for a boat 400 or 500 feet long a wharf 300 feet long is not long enough.

Further on he says:

When the water is high in the spring it is all right for floating logs, but at other seasons of the year there is no water to float even a small boat. The people of that place deserve some encouragement. It is a new country; the settlers went there about 30 years ago, and they had a good deal of trouble on account of that bridge. They endeavoured to procure facilities for themselves, but without success, and so I am glad this money is being voted. Now they want the government

to help them to build a pier or a wharf, but it is neither a pier nor a wharf, it is a bridge. Why does not the minister come down straight, and tell us he wants to help the people and he is going to build a bridge for them. That is what he is doing, and I am glad he is doing it, but I do not want the minister to try and make us believe things that are impossible of belief.

That bridge was built there in the face of that protest and this government surely has no justification for spending the money of this country in building bridges within the provinces. If it were on the Ottawa river, or on any other water between provinces it would be a different matter, but to start and build wharfs and bridges in parts of Canada which are entirely within one of the provinces I claim is wrong. What did the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) say about this when it was brought up at the time the debate regarding this matter took place? He said:

Let me tell my hon. friend that the member for Richmond and Wolfe who at the last election had a majority of nearly 1,300 does not require the building of a small bridge in his county to obtain for him the votes of the electors.

Well, Sir, if it were not needed for political purposes, what in the world was it needed for in so far as this government is concerned, and what possible excuse can this government offer for putting it there?

Then, there is another class of public works which this government has under taken to build in many cases and the worst of it is that these works are built for political purposes or to favour a few individuals or corporations. I know that it is supposed to be unpopular to criticise public works, to say that certain public works should not be built, but, Sir, I claim and I know that when people understand it you can speak against a useless public work right where it is being built and be applauded to the echo. People of any county like to have public works built in their midst if they are wanted and if the money is not wasted, but if they are not wanted, or they are built to benefit certain individuals, then the people of the locality do not object to criticism. There is in my county a wharf at Greece's Point which I have spoken of before and I merely mention it again to show that I am content and ready to criticise similar works no matter where they may be. This wharf was built in my county some years ago, it was built near a bad eddy where it is of no use whatever, hardly any one uses it at all and I believe it was put there simply for the purpose of helping certain Liberals who live in that locality. I asked about it in 1905, 'Hansard,' page 2063:

Mr. PERLEY. 1. What was the total cost of the public wharf at Greece's point, on the Carillon canal?

2. How many boats used this wharf, and what was the revenue received from it during the last year?

3. Who is in charge of this wharf, and how much did he receive for his services during last year?

4. Was he paid by fees or by salary?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (acting Minister of Public Works). 1. $5,452.19.

2. The Marine Department have no record of the exact number of boats which used that wharf. The gross revenue last year (1903-4) was $60.93.

3. Telesphore Ranger.

4. Fees, being a commission 25 per cent of the amount collected.

In February 6, 1907 I asked also:

Mr. PERLEY. 1. How many steamers used the wharf at Greece's point during 1906?

2. What was the revenue for 1906?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). 1. The wharfinger's returns for 1906 are all marked 'Nil'.

2. None.

Now, Sir, I have been told myself by people living near there that they prefer to take their freight off at another place several miles away rather than attempt to get it there, and the steamboats themselves refuse to go there except under extreme pressure on account of the position in which the wharf is built. The expenditure upon this wharf, to my mind, has been absolutely lost to the country.

Another wharf of the same kind is one that has been referred to in this House and which is called the St. Joseph wharf on Lake Huron. This wharf was built in an impossible place on the open shore of Lake Huron where it is not at all likely that it can be kept and it was put there to benefit certain speculators. Five thousand dollars was voted for it in 1902, but $15,000 was spent on it altogether, and I notice that in 1905 the gross post office revenue of that place was the large sum of $91.14 and that the net post office revenue was $16.14. This government undertook to build a $15,000 wharf where hardly anybody lives. The building of this wharf was objected to in the strongest possible terms by the gentleman who was the Liberal member for that county before any work was done on it. In 'Hansard' page 3385 Mr. McEwen, the then Liberal member for that constituency, when this matter was up in the House, spoke as follows:

I would have raised my voice against this vote last year. I never dreamt, and no one in that part of the country ever dreamt, that when the Hon. Mr. Tarte went up there and saw the place he would spend the money. The hon. gentleman promised to come my way and we would go out together and see it, but instead of that he went by way of Parkhill and he was there only two hours, and we never saw a sight of him. The great majority of even the French people who were there never asked for this money. It is true that the people who put money into that scheme

have lost their money and will never see a cent of it again. Mr. Cantin has a peculiar way with him and he seems to succeed in making people give their money to put into enterprises that could never produce a cent. What surprises me is that a man of his kind should be able to mislead this government into spending money where there is no need for it at the present time, or for years to come, any more than there is any need of building a wharf on the top of a mountain. If this wharf is built it will be built at the foot of a hill where there is no way to get at it unless you buy land from some one, unless there will be a road built through a gulch that is a very hard place to get at. In the meantime they make the road through somebody's land and they get around to it in that way, but where this dock is being built there is a hill about fifty feet high. It is not quite straight up, but nearly so, and it will be very hard to get at it suppose the dock is built. With all due regard to the engineers, $5,000 is not worth anything to build a wharf there.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. So far as the hill is concerned, my hon. friend (Mr. McEwen) knows that it is an easy thing to have a slanting road there. My hon. friend has reproached me for not having called on him when I went there.

So they went on and built this wharf. Mr. Tarte, the minister at that time, thought it would be an easy thing to have a road down hill so they proceeded promptly to go down hill and to spend $15,000 where it was not wanted. This Mr. Cantin was talking about building a summer hotel at that place. The summer hotel never materialized and this government spent a large amount of money endeavouring to put a wharf there which the people in that vicinity all stated would not stand on account of its being so exposed to Lake Huron.

At page 372 of the 'Hansard' of 1906, Hon. Mr. Hyman, at that time minister, in answer to a question said :

It is true that the results hoped for never materialized.

I should think not. What did the Public Works report say regarding it ? I quote from page 178 of the report of the department for 1906 :

St. Joseph is situated on the east shore of Lake Huron, about 14 miles south of Goderich. The population is about 100.

A very fine place to put a $15,000 wharf.

During the session of parliament, 1902, the sum of $5,000 was appropriated towards building a wharf at this place. The wharf was partly constructed by day labour, when a contract was let in 1903, for the completion of same, to Mr. J. A. Cory, of Ottawa, for the price of $3,950,50.

I think we have heard of this same gentleman in connection with certain elections in London.

At the beginning of the last fiscal year only a portion of the work was built, and on October 16, 1905, a large crib was placed and almost immediately destroyed by a heavy storm, when other damage was also done. Work was then practically suspended until last spring.

Very bad luck has been experienced in the placing of the outer cribs of the work, which partly accounts for the fact that the work is not yet finished.

Considerable difficulty is found in building stone approach, owing to the heavy force of the waves at this point washing off any but stone of very large size.

It is estimated that about one month further will complete this work.

Expenditure during the fiscal year 1905-6, $569.75.

There was a case where the government was warned, where it had full knowledge that the wharf was not required and would not stay and would be of no use but in the face of that the minister had $5,000 voted to build the wharf and it ultimately cost $15,000.

This is by no means an isolated case in that regard because as far as I can see in going through the papers and blue books it is practically never the case that any public work in this country is built for the amount it was originally estimated to cost.

Another piece of work of the same class is the building of certain piers and booms by this government on the Saguenay river above Chicoutimi. It has of course for some years been the well known habit of this government to spend money freely for all kinds of purposes when its friends asked it to do so. This led certain owners of logs and timber limits on the Saguenay to make an extraordinary request to the Minister of Public Works and this request seems to have been promptly granted. I asked for a return regarding this matter two or three years ago and I shall quote some of the letters from that return :

Ottawa, March 18, 1904.

The Hon. James Sutherland,
Minister of Public Works, Ottawa.

Hon. Sir,—I have the honour to include a petition from Mr. Dubuc on behalf of Chicoutimi Pulp Company, and other lumber firms interested on Saguenay river, praying that the government should take up the booming system on this river.

There are six companies interested in the floating of logs on the Saguenay, and the current is so strong, as you know yourself, that the booming is very expensive.

The mixture of the lumber of the different companies causes to each of them heavy troubles to divide their own from others, and it is practically impossible that it shall work well unless the government takes the whole system under its control, as it does on St. Maurice and Ottawa river.

I understand that a sum of $25,000 will cover the expense of building, and that such a small amount will not delay your department from helping on a business foot the important industries growing over on the Saguenay. The capital invested already on those industries deserves consideration of public men.

I believe it my duty to join the requisition and pray that the supplementary budget will include the necessary amount.

Hoping that you will be pleased to do so,

I have the honour to be,

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) JOS. GIRARD, M.P.

Then I find this letter:

Department of Railways and Canals, Canada,
Resident Engineer's Office, Roberval,
April 19, 1904.

E. D. Lafleur, Esq.,
Chief Engineer, Department of Public Works, Ottawa.

Sir,—According to your verbal instructions at Ottawa, I have made an examination for the erection and maintenance of booms in the Saguenay river. The site of the boom is about 4½ miles above Chicoutimi at its starting point, and running about a mile and a half.

The starting point on north shore is located on the property of William Price & Brothers, on the south shore on the property of Messrs. Charles Dallaire, M. Dallaire, Larouche, and Gilbert. Messrs. Price & Brothers have an option of renting the property at any time they want.

The present booms which are kept by the Chicoutimi Pulp Company at their own expense, are used by different companies of pulp wood and sawmills, and all the logs coming into Saguenay river from Lake St. John, or from the two discharges of the lake are passing through that boom.

The present organization is not sufficient for the traffic and does not give the satisfaction it should, and the different companies, the proprietors of sawmills and the Chicoutimi Pulp Company, ask for an establishment of government booms, with collectors on the same principle as those established on the Ottawa river and St. Maurice.

To have a good service, five piers ought to be built. At present they keep their booms with anchors, which is very inconvenient and causes a good deal of maintenance. The length of the boom, as indicated on plan, will have a length of about 7,000 feet.

The construction of the five piers will cost about $10,000. The construction of 7,000 feet of booms will cost $15,000.

The maintenance of the boom, say a foreman and three men, with boats, &c., will cost about $1,500 annually.

The Chicoutimi Pulp Company are willing to let the Department of Public Works have the use of their boom for the first year.

I have not yet had the opportunity to ascertain the present condition of the booms of the company, but at any rate they were sufficient last year for the traffic.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) J. C. TACHE,
Resident Engineer.

You will notice how promptly the department took action on this extraordinary request. The letter was received on March 18, and the other letter was written on April 19, showing that for some reason the government was in a great hurry to grant this request. Thereupon the government went on and undertook to build these booms and piers under an agreement between the Crown and the Chicoutimi Pulp Company, of which I shall read the essential clauses:

Whereas it is the intention of the government, in the public interest, to construct and establish on the Saguenay river, in the district of Saguenay and province of Quebec, piers and booms on a stretch of about one and a half (1½) miles, the starting point of which is about four and a half miles (4½) above Chicoutimi, district and province aforesaid.

Whereas amongst others, the said company will derive a special benefit from the establishment of said bonus.

And whereas it is considered proper to arrange matters so that the government should not be exposed to disburse for the maintenance of said proposed booms a sum larger than the revenues to be derived from the use of said booms, thereby entailing a loss to the government.

Now this indenture witnesseth as follows, that is to say:

1. Should the revenues accruing from the use of the booms above referred to, after they have been constructed, established and maintained by the government, fall short of the amount of expenses chargeable to and paid by the said government, for the management and operation only of said booms then the said company are hereby bound and they hereby bind themselves to recoup to the government immediately after each and every year the excess of such expenses of management and operation only over and above the receipt on revenues derived from the use of said booms by lumber merchants and pulp manufacturers.

2. It is understood and agreed that the rates to be charged for the use of said booms and the rules and regulations to be observed by the said company, as well as other parties interested, shall be the same as are ordinarily paid to, established and determined by the government for and in connection with their booms in other rivers of the Dominion of Canada, or such as shall have been submitted to and approved of by the Governor in Council.

3. It is understood and agreed that the duration of the present agreement and the effect thereof shall be a period of five years to be computed from the date at which the said booms shall have been completed and be ready to be used.

This government entered into this agreement with the Chicoutimi Pulp Company to build these piers and booms, the company undertaking to hold the government harmless and to recoup them for the annual expenditure in keeping up the booms or for whatever the revenue might be short of that sum. The resident engineer estimated that this work would cost $25,000. As a matter of fact, it has cost more than twice that sum, and in the very following year, on April 24, 1905, the deputy minister, Mr. Gobeil, in a memorandum to the minister, stated as follows:

I beg to submit herewith a detailed estimate of the cost of providing the materials necessary for the construction of booms and piers on the Saguenay river for which parliament granted last year an appropiation of $25,000.

By this statement you will kindly see that an additional amount of $18,000 is required.

They found that they had not enough money, and it afterwards turned out, according to the statement of the government, that these piers and booms had cost $50,000. On page 993 of 'Hansard' of 1906, in answer to a question of mine, the Hon. Mr. Aylesworth stated as follows:

1. What is the estimate of the total cost of the piers and booms being built above Chicoutimi, on the Saguenay river?

Answer, $50,000.

2. What is the estimated annual revenue from these works?

Answer, $2,625; however, if the revenue falls short of the maintenance and operation, the Chicoutimi Pulp Company is bound by a written agreement to make good such deficit.

3. Will these works be of service to any one except those engaged in the log and pulp wood business? If so, to what class of persons?

Answer. Though built to retain logs, these works will prevent timber from getting into the river below, where they would be a danger to navigation.

I call the attention of the House to the flimsy excuse given in the third answer. The same thing can be stated with regard to any boom and any river in Canada; and if that were to be a reason, this government ought to build piers and booms for logs on every river in Canada. However, the Hon. Mr. Hyman, when his estimates were up, did not give the same reason. He stated, as will be found on page 7210 of 'Hansard' for 1906:

In this particular instance the situation is complicated, and the government thought that in the interest of the general public it would be better they should operate these booms. The companies could not agree; one company controlled and the others were hampered in their operations to such an extent that there was not that development there should have been when we consider the wealth of the timber resources. These companies came to the government and made out a very strong case. The substance of their complaint was that they could not agree on the formation of a company, and at their request the government undertook these works in the interest of the development of the trade, feeling they were safeguarded.

With reference to the revenue, on page 1379 of 'Hansard' for 1906, in answer to a question of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), Hon. Mr. Hyman stated:

1. What is the estimated annual cost for maintenance and operation of the piers and booms being built above Chicoutimi, on the Saguenay river?

Answer—$2,420.

2. Is the Chicoutimi Pulp Company bound to pay interest on the amount expended in building these works, in addition to the cost of their maintenance and operation?

Answer—No.

3. Is $2.625 the estimated annual net or gross revenue from these works?

Answer—The gross revenue.

Mr PERLEY.

Neither this company nor any one else had to pay any interest whatever on the cost of these works. In the report of the Public Works Department for 1907, with reference to these works, it is stated as follows:

On the Saguenay river the increase which has taken place in the lumbering industry, following especially the establishment of large pulp mills at the town of Chicoutimi, has induced the department to construct works to facilitate the passage of timber. An agreement has been made with the Chicoutimi Pulp Company, which was the prime mover in the agitation for the construction of those works, to the effect that should the revenue during the next five years fall short of the maintenance account, the difference will be paid to the government by the company. It is expected, however, that the works in question will ultimately return a good profit on the primary expenditure.

This last sentence is a most extraordinary one. It reads to me as though the department were endeavouring to assure themselves, and when they thought they could make themselves believe that this was a good expenditure, they could perhaps get other people to believe it; because there was not the slightest possible chance of these works returning a good profit on the primary expenditure. The agreement made with the Chicoutimi Pulp Company would absolutely preclude anything of the kind. Under that agreement this government was bound to make the ordinary charges for such work, and the Chicoutimi Pulp Company only agreed to make up to this government any shortage which there might be in the annual maintenance charges. Under no circumstances was anybody to pay any interest whatever, or any money as a sinking fund. The total expenditure for three years from 1904 to 1907 on these works was $47,309.39, according to the Public Accounts, and in answer to my question the Minister of Public Works stated that the total cost would be $50,000. This $50,000 has now been spent, and I am informed by a man who has been there during the past year that these works are not yet by any means completed, and that a further sum of money will be required to complete them. I am informed that one or two of the piers were found to be improperly built, and that it will take a lot more money to put these works into proper shape. It is well known that public works cost this government to build a great deal more than they would private individuals. I think we may take that for granted; and I may say that the pulp and log owners on the Saguenay river would never have wanted this government to build these works if they had expected to pay a proper amount for interest and sinking fund. Instead of doing that they would have preferred to build the works themselves. I will not say whether they should have cost less money or not; but I will

cite one instance, which I find in the Auditor General's Report for 1904-5, on page V—308, where it is shown that this government bought ten-inch round spruce for ten cents per lineal foot, equal to $27.25 per thousand feet board measure; nine-inch round spruce for nine cents per lineal foot, equal to $31.75 per thousand feet board measure, and seven-inch round spruce for seven cents per lineal foot, equal to $46.67 per thousand feet board measure. Even those who are not lumbermen will know that these prices are perfectly absurd for small spruce logs, and if the other parts of these works were paid for on the same basis they must have cost a great deal more than they are worth. I merely mention this to show with what a light heart the Minister of Public Works at that time hurried into this contract. To-day those spruce logs would be worth about $14 a thousand feet.

Mr. BUREAU. What size logs ?

Mr. PERLEY. 7 to 10 inches.

Mr. TOBIN. What length ?

Mr. PERLEY. I cannot give the length, but they were not long ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. How do you know they were not long?

Mr. PERLEY. I speak from recollection. I think the lengths were given in the Auditor General's Report, but we all know you cannot get very long stuff of that size.

Under the present system in vogue in Ontario and Quebec regarding such works, it is usual for them to be built by a company, and there are statutes in both Ontario and Quebec governing them. These statutes are practically the same in both provinces. Let me read section 4975 of the Revised Statutes of Quebec :

> The tolls are so calculated that, after defraying the necessary cost of maintaining and superintending the works and collecting the tolls, the balance of the receipts may as nearly as possible be equal and in no case exceed ten dollars for every hundred expended and invested in the said works.
>
> If in any year the receipts from tolls be such that, after defraying all the current expenses, there remains a clear profit of more than ten dollars upon every hundred of the capital expended, there shall nevertheless be divided amongst the shareholders no greater dividend than at the rate of ten dollars for every hundred, and the remainder shall be carried over to the receipts of the following year.

In other words, the custom of the trade is for the people who build these works to form a company, and the company to cover interest and sinking fund, pays to its shareholders 10 per cent dividend on the amount expended and invested in the works, after defraying expenses of administration and maintenance. But these people evidently wished to get the government to build these works for them. I do not blame them for that, and there does not seem to have been anything wrong or underhand as far as the company is concerned. If they could persuade the government to give them these works without the ordinary charges, so much the better for them, but they evidently wanted to get the work done by the government because they were going to get it done at much less cost than in the ordinary way. But if the government is going to adopt any such policy, it will have to adopt it everywhere. All the lumbermen have to put up such works, and the government should not make an exception and put them up for one and not for another. And when they make an exception, as they did in this case, it must be of course because they want to show favouritism to some one for some purpose or another. Hon. gentlemen opposite will no doubt refer to the works on the St. Maurice and the Ottawa. But these should not establish a precedent, because the circumstances are altogether different. Before confederation the united provinces built works of this kind on both the St. Maurice and the Ottawa, and these works were taken over by the Dominion at confederation, but the instance I am mentioning is the first case, I believe, in which the Dominion government has built such works. In the old days the conditions of the lumber trade were entirely different. At that time timber limits were obtained simply by applying for them. The object of the provincial government was to get men to embark in the lumber trade so as to give work to the people. There was no money in the lumber business at that time, and the government was consequently wise in building some of these works for the benefit of the trade. But things have changed entirely, and there is no reason why all the lumbermen should not now build these works and pay for them themselves. What is the net result of this contract with the Chicoutimi Pulp Company? Instead of building the dams and piers themselves, as other lumber companies have to do, it got the government to do that work, so that this government practically made those interested a free gift of $50,000. These lumbermen are in exactly the same position as if the government had sent them a cheque for $50,000 and told them to build the works themselves. It was in fact equivalent to a bonus of $50,000. The lumbermen have no interest to pay on it. All the government got in return was an agreement for five years with the company by which the company bound itself to recoup to the government any shortage there might be in the annual maintenance. I do not believe that the people of this country will approve of the expenditure of their money on works of this descrip-

tion, which are purely and simply for the benefit of certain individuals and corporations and can by no means be considered as a public benefit.

Further, I wish to say that the Chicoutimi Pulp Company has not even paid the amount which it agreed to pay by its contract. On December 4 last in 'Hansard,' page 195, I asked the question :

1. What companies or individuals made use of the government boom on the Saguenay river above Chicoutimi during the year 1906?
2. What amount did they each pay for the use of the boom?
3. Did the Chicoutimi Pulp Company in accordance with its agreement, recoup to the government the excess of expenses over receipts in connection with this boom for the year 1906?
4. If not, why not?
5. What companies or individuals made use of this boom during the season 1907?
6. Did the Chicoutimi Pulp Company use it in 1907 for all its logs on the Saguenay river?
7. If not, what use did that company make of it ?

In these questions the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) replied as follows :—

1. La Compagnie de Pulpe de Chicoutimi and Jos. Vachon.
2. No payment made.
3. No.
4. The company claim that, as the boom was not fully completed till the month of September, they should not be held liable for the dues and the matter is still under discussion.
5. La Compagnie de Pulpe de Chicoutimi only.
6. and 7. Yes, for all logs coming by and below the Grande Décharge.

In other words, this Company has refused to pay even the small sum it agreed to, and I am informed the reason of its refusal is that the work was so badly built and so large a quantity of the company's logs consequently lost that it refused to pay these charges.

Referring to another matter of a similar character I noticed that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who is supposed to be the guardian of the public funds, said on February 28, 1907, 'Hansard,' page 3951 :

Mr. FIELDING. That view is too rigid. I am responsible in the first instance for getting the vote and then for not spending the money. The Minister of Finance is supposed to set a good example in the way of economy, and after the vote was taken, when I saw the expenditure was running up into large figures and money not too plentiful, I was anxious to put on the brakes and so let this item stand over. But the work is really needed. All the departments need extra accommodation.

The Minister of Finance is supposed to set a good example in the way of economy. In other words, in his own county, I suppose, the Minister of Finance does a great deal better than others in regard to these useless public works. But I find, on looking into the record in the minister's (Mr. Fielding's) county that there was a lake at Red Head into which a channel was cut at a cost of $2,000. And when the channel was finished, it drained the lake, the bottom of which is on a level with low tide. Also, at another place in the hon. gentleman's county, Clam Point on Cape Sable Island, I am informed, there is a lake there which is above the sea except at flood tide. A canal was cut into that lake which drained it. There is no approach to it except through private property, and when the canal was constructed the lake went dry. The boats of the fishermen could not enter except at flood tide. Now, I find that in the same constituency, there was a very extraordinary thing done at Gunning Cove. There is a post office there, the postmaster being one John Doane. The government set to work and built a wharf in Mr. Doane's back yard. This wharf was inaccessible from the shore except by trespassing upon the private property of Mr. John Doane, postmaster. There was no approach to this wharf from the shore. At low water it was reached by scrambling over the rocks and at high water a boat was necessary in order to get to it. When he was asked if the wharf had ever been used, Mr. Doane said that Mackenzie and Mann had used it to land supplies for a railway. When asked if they had free access to this wharf, his answer was that they had not free access, but had to pay him for the privilege of crossing his land and any damage caused thereby. A petition was circulated asking the council to open up a road to the wharf. Mr. Doane wanted $500 for the right of way, but the council hesitated. I am not informed whether, up to this time, the council has succeeded in putting the road through to Mr. Doane's wharf—I mean the government wharf built on Mr. Doane's property.

Mr. FIELDING. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perley) permit a question ?

Mr. PERLEY. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has stated, with regard to certain matters, 'I am informed' so and so. These are engineering questions. Will he say who 'informs' him about these things ? A statement with no authority given is hardly good against the reports of engineers.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why, this is in the public press.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not in the public press, except a thousand miles away from the place.

Mr. PERLEY. I am informed of this by a gentleman who says he saw it.

Mr. FIELDING. Will the hon. gentleman give the name ? I would like to know if his informant is equal to an engineer.

Mr LENNOX. It does not take an engineer to know whether the water runs out or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Better not take hearsay statements.

Mr. PERLEY. With regard to Gunning Cove, I find that on February 14, 1907, the government practically acknowledged the statement I made with regard to this. I asked this question:

1. Is there a public road or approach leading to Gunning cove wharf, in Shelburne county, Nova Scotia?
2. If so, when was it provided, and from whom was the land purchased?
3. Could the public use this wharf last summer without trespassing on private property?

This was replied to by Hon. Sydney Fisher (Acting Minister of Public Works) as follows:

There is no public road leading to the wharf at Gunning Cove. It was expected that arrangements would be made for securing a road through the municipal authorities but this has not yet been accomplished.

I only mention this because I feel sure that the minister takes better care of his county in regard to these works than almost any other member; and when even one thing of that kind can happen in the county of the Minister of Finance, we naturally wonder what could have happened in the counties represented by ordinary members on the other side.

Mr. TAYLOR. Ask Mr. Nickerson.

Mr. J. D. REID. There's a nigger in the fence.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) makes an allusion which he must see is offensive. I hope he will withdraw it.

Mr. J. D. REID. Oh, no, I don't withdraw it. There must have been a nigger in the fence there.

Mr. PERLEY. In the Liberal platform of 1903, I find the following:—

We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. Where is that from?

Mr. PERLEY. That is from an ancient document, now out of print, I believe, and long ago forgotten by those who prepared it. Now, legitimate expenditure of the public money is very essential. That is what the Conservatives carried on, I believe, when they were in power. But when the Conservatives were in power the Liberals found fault with an expenditure in the Public Works Department of less than $2,000,000, but now they boast that they have increased that expenditure to $10,000,000. I do not see how this vast expenditure can be said to agree with their former professions, especially as the money has been mainly frittered away in these small works which are really useless.

Before I close, I wish to read a short summary of a speech by Mr. J. M. Courtney, C.M.G., who until recently held the position of deputy Minister of Finance. We all know the distinguished services that this gentleman has rendered to Canada during the many years he occupied his high position, and how, above all others, he should be fitted to comment on the course of the expenditure of this government. He is thus quoted:

Mr. Courtney expressed the opinion that Canada was spending too much. At the present time every effort should be made to save. It was true the debt had not been materially increased of late, but he repeated that every effort should be made to save. 'The Canadian credit ranks high,' remarked the speaker, 'very nearly equal to that of England. There are large maturing liabilities to be met of loans made some twenty-five or thirty years back, and it will require all the wisdom of government to meet the future and preserve our high credit. For these reasons, I think that expenditures should be critically scanned and that a halt should be called in many instances.'

Now, I have tried to bring before this House a few of the cases in which this government has been spending money recklessly on public works, many of which are useless, and with many others of which this government should have nothing to do, as they are built for the benefit of certain corporations or private individuals. This is supposed to be a democratic country. This expenditure may be an example of government of the people. Possibly, it may be an example of government by the people. But I defy any one to say it is government for the people. The government have practically given away large sums of money to companies and individuals. I question very much whether, when this matter is brought before the people at the next election, even in the localities where this money is spent, they will uphold the government in their policy of useless, of wasteful expenditure. I therefore move:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the said motion be left out and the following substituted therefor:

The revenues of Canada belong to the people of this country and should be expended in the public interest; and this House condemns the action of the present government in expending public money on works which are really for the benefit of favoured corporations and private individuals and not for the public benefit.

Mr. GIRARD. In replying to the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) I would like very much to speak English, but as my English is so poor I will not venture to weary hon. members by speaking that language.

Mr. J. GERARD (Chicoutimi).—(Translation). Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will allow me a few remarks after the speech that has just been delivered by my hon. friend for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley). I will not discuss every point he has brought out, but will only deal with the one relating to the works being carried on in the constituency I have the honour to represent. As to the other issues of the question which brought forth such criticism on his part, I am not personally acquainted with, but judging of the government's caution in what it has done in the past and is actually doing in my district, I believe it is easier to criticise without having been on the spot at all than to ascertain the accuracy of one's criticism. A while ago the hon. member read a letter signed by me purporting to show that I had endorsed the request made upon the government by the Chicoutimi Pulp Company ta have booms erected on the Saguenay river. In fact I took the whole responsibility of the matter before the government. I am not at all sorry for what I have done, because, while the issue was still pending before the minister and even before I had time to take upon myself the responsibility of advocating the request, I thought I had better discuss the matter, outside altogether of the pulp company, with the leading lumber operators of the Saguenay river, and every one of them told me that there was no actual need for these booms at that time, but that if the government saw fit to erect them, they would not object, and consequently they advised me to endorse the application. Under the circumstances I thought I would ask the Minister of Public Works and even the Premier to favourably dispose of the application. An appropriation of $25,000 was put in the Supply estimates as the probable cost of establishing that boom system.

My hon. friend contended that the action of the government had for direct object to help political friends. I know the directors and many of the shareholders of the pulp company; I know friends of the government are to be found among them, but I know also that many of them are its opponents, while I am equally aware that the greater number of them are opposed to me. Therefore, the contention that the government was actuated by political motives does not hold, and still less is it the case as far as your humble servant is concerned. My hon. friend alleged, and justly so, that the cost of the work was largely in excess of the original estimates. I believe I can state a very practical and specious reason for that. Those booms are stretched at a point of the Saguenay river where the tides reach a height of 10 or 12 feet, thus affecting the regular currents, which become particularly strong at ebbing tide. That spot is also very much exposed to the winds. When about to start building operations, the engineers had to revise their original plans which had been prepared somewhat hurriedly, owing to the fact that the request of the pulp company was altogether unexpected, and that no one of them had had sufficient time to provide for such a fortuitous case. Thus in order to ensure better protection to the lumber people concerned, in view of these new currents which I have just mentioned and which are not to be met with in other places where the government is providing similar conveniences, the engineers, I say, had to alter their plans and give a much greater strength both to the piers and to the boom timbers, which necessarily entailed a considerably increased expenditure.

My hon. friend thought he could lay the blame for this extra outlay of money on the price paid for certain dimension timber which he designated, for instance, 9 cents for 9 inch square, 8 cents for 8-inch square, 7 cents for 7-inch square, which seemed to him extravagant prices. If he had lived in the district which I have the honour to represent in this House he would find out that those are the regular market quotations, that is, 1 cent per inch in diameter for the required lengths used in works of that kind. Mr. T. L. Willson, of Ottawa, who at that time built a large lock on his own account, some three or four miles above the government booms on the Shipshaw river, paid the same price for timber delivered on the spot as the government paid for this timber. True it is that some of the piers built for the protection of the booms sustained damage in the first year through unforeseen causes, but the damage has been repaired and the piers are stronger than ever now and steady on the foundations laid by the engineers. Of course these repairs added to the estimated cost of the work, but the amount is so small that it is hardly worth while begrudging it. Critics may find there an object for satisfying their hobby, but practically business people have no fault to find. The special conditions surrounding this undertaking, such as the natural formation and the character of the currents confronted the engineers with difficulties such as they had never experienced before, but which they succeeded in mastering with credit to themselves and in the best technical manner. I will observe moreover to my hon. friend that in order to secure at that particular spot where the booms were erected the necessary timber for such construction one had to drive through many difficulties a distance of ten or twelve miles at least.

The hon. member for Argenteuil stated that he has been informed that the company refuse to pay their legitimate dues to the government because those booms are so utterly defective as to render them absolutely useless for the purpose of retaining logs. I may be permitted to say that

his information is altogether devoid of correctness, and if he will only wait a few days till certain documents are laid on the table of this House he will find out that the true reason of the company's default was due to another but that which he stated. I should think that the government ought to grant the company a partial remittance of dues for the first year, since the booms could not be stretched on time, having been built in the winter season at a point six or seven miles away from their intended location, where they had to be brought down when the ice cleared away in the spring. In the meantime the company had to stretch out their own booms in order to retain their supply of logs in the rising waters of the spring. But ever since the government booms were laid in place they have fully and permanently answered the purpose they were intended for and have, moreover, proved of great benefit to the company when their own booms above those built by the government seemed inadequate.

When my hon. friend and the House have taken cognizance of the papers which will enable them to form an accurate opinion on the matter, they will find out that the company must pay and will pay, willingly or not, all its tolls to the government, arrears and all, and that it is ridiculous—and this is where I appeal to my hon. friend, himself a lumberman—to contend that a system of booms built of British Columbia pine, four feet wide by one foot in thickness, held in place and protected by the chains and anchors usually employed by the government in such cases, cannot safely retain pulp logs of five to nine inches in diameter in an unlimited quantity against all currents and eventualities.

Mr. Speaker, there is another object underlying this criticism which is a formal attack upon the government and the engineers who carried out these works. These technical officers are held under a grave imputation which is as utterly unjust as it is unmerited and against which I must raise my voice. The engineers of the Public Works Department from the chief down are fully qualified and anxious to perform their duties. In the execution of the works placed under their supervision, the same as in private contracts, cases are often met with when owing to uncontrollable and unexpected circumstances or accidents extras have to be charged which tend to increase the original estimate, sometimes to a considerable amount, without for that reason calling down reproach upon either the architect or the engineer who drew up the plans and supervised the work.

I believe I have sufficiently answered the criticism of my hon. friend from Argenteuil and satisfied the House and himself of the good intention of the government in connection with this matter, which is not of a personal nature, but of general interest to the district which I represent in this House.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I thought the Minister of Public Works would have made some answer to these charges, but he does not seem to be in a position to do so. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) has given the House a good many instances where expenditures of public money have been made which certainly were not in the interest of the country, but were in the interest of the gentlemen representing the constituencies, with the view of helping to elect them when the elections come round again. But there are other matters in connection with the Public Works Department that have not been so open. For instance, there is an item in the Auditor General's Report showing where the government wanted to purchase a small boat. They were offered a steamer which they agreed to purchase in the month of February for some $4,000, and after they passed an order in council and accepted it, they still paid rent for that steamer until the month of September following; they paid $1,440 for the use of a steamer that they had purchased several months before. In regard to wharfs, I may refer to a case in the St. Lawrence river where the Public Works Department voted a sum of $5,000 to build a wharf for a private individual at Stanley island. This island is owned absolutely by a private individual, yet he had influence enough with the government to get them to spend $5,000. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Tobin) found fault with me for making a few remarks on this question, yet there is no man in the House of Commons who has been more favoured than the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe in the matter of wharfs. I believe that the bribery practised in his constituency is the reason why he is sitting here to-day in the House of Commons. Why, Sir, at a place called Garthby they are spending $3,000 for a wharf on a lake where there is not a single steamer running. The man who lives there has a little store and a little gasoline launch twenty-five feet long and that is all the steamer there is. It is an inland lake.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Most lakes are inland, are they not?

Mr. J. D REID. No, except those that run out. There was a case where the Finance Minister tried to make an inland lake into a water lake, and all the water ran out. There is not a man in this House who has made greater use of the Public Works Department for the benefit of his constituency than the Finance Minister. He has done every thing he could in the way of building wharfs, trying to make channels to lakes where he knew the water would

run out, and in that way he has got elected to this House. Now the Finance Minister knew, when he tried to make a channel into this lake what would happen. He sent down engineers, and they reported that if that channel was built the water would run out. Although the Finance Minister knew that, he ordered the channel to be built and the water did run out just as the engineers reported.

Mr. FIELDING. That is just as true as everything else the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is true, and all I am saying is just and true as that. I can refer to another case in the province of Ontario, at Monetville on Lake Nipissing where this government built a wharf. That is a provincial matter, the lake and all the lands are owned by the Ontario government, and I claim that it should be looked after by the Ontario government. But there are other departments. Take the Department of Railways and Canals. This government has spent $800,000 in trying to make a channel through the Galops rapids in my constituency. I pressed from year to year to get them to discontinue it, and finally they did so. The channel is not used by any steamer at all. It was undertaken in order to retain the sympathy of friends of the government in order that they might help when the elections came round. The public and the marine men in particular became so disgusted that in the end the government had to discontinue the work, after having thrown away absolutely $800,000 on it. At another place in my constituency they have spent a million and a half or two million dollars in building the north channel. It is a good channel, but the money was wasted on it. It was shown by engineers that an expenditure of $50,000 to $100,000 to remove a piece of shallow would have afforded a better channel than they have to-day. But the argument was used that if they went that way they would have to go through a part of the American channel, although it was shown to them that boats could not come from Kingston down to Prescott without going twenty or thirty miles through the American channel. Still the government could not be moved and for the sake of their friends they expended a million and a half to two million dollars in making this channel. I might also refer to the Morrisburg canal, where they built piers that were of absolutely no use and had to be replaced with others. But I might also refer to some instances in the Department of Railways and Canals where they are continuing to give contracts to middlemen and are spending much more money than they should. I could instance the case, disclosed by the papers a day or two ago, where a man named Wallberg was paid $1,500 for some girders, or something of that kind, that were required by the Department of Railways and Canals and which the department could have purchased for $900. That goes to show that in so far as that department is concerned it is spending money, not in the interests of the people of this country, but in the interest of contractors and of men who are able to cause the government to do these things in order that they may get work, and who, in the end, use their influence, and subscribe, I believe, to political funds in order to help to keep this government in power.

Then the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) is here. He is not innocent of these extravagances. We showed two years ago that it was notorious that he had these middlemen, who were grafting in his department, and who were actually robbing this country of thousands of dollars. We proved it in the Public Accounts Committee. He threw the blame on his predecessor, but he continued to give orders to these grafters the same as his predecessor had done. His department has been spending money in a way that is disgraceful. He has kept this man Merwin on the list. He cannot get rid of him. He cannot shake him off. Is he afraid of Merwin disclosing something? Has Merwin any claim upon him? Has Merwin any claim upon this government? Not only that, but when any other grafter wants to get hold of the government he first makes for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and he has no trouble in getting his clutches on that department and on the minister.

Mr. BENNETT. It is easy.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is an easy task to do this. This man Wallberg, seeing that the minister is easy, strikes for his department and now he has a lot of contracts, and the first thing we know we will be able to show up exactly the same kind of grafting that has been going on in the Department of Railways. This is a very serious thing in so far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries is concerned, but it is not the only case. We have this man Falconer. He goes into the Marine Department. He has no trouble at all about charging these exorbitant prices; he can add a great deal more for his board bill than he actually pays, and everything is lovely. That shows that in so far as this department is concerned, it is badly managed, that the man in charge of it does not understand his business or he would never allow such rascality to go on. We had also the case in the Department of Marine and Fisheries of this man Strubbe. That was a small matter. We have it where he purchased these files and charged almost double for them. Did the minister get rid of Strubbe? Why Strubbe goes up to the minister's office again, and is not only received like a gentleman, but he gets orders three times as great as he had when the minister's pre-

decessor was in office. Then we had this exposure of the 'Arctic.' It was all done by the predecessor of the present minister, but yet the same old crowd are going along in the same old way. The same quantities of goods are purchased to-day without tenders as were purchased formerly. Of course, the minister does not do probably what his predecessor did; he does not telegraph to his subordinates that they must buy from this man and that man, but these people come to him and the department get the same goods and pay the same prices. We had the 'Arctic' supplied for three years, but when she went out again on the following year a new lot of supplies were put on board for her voyage. I know of one case in my own county where there was a carload of abestos lumber purchased by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and no one knew what it was for. It cost $13,000, and it was purchased when it was absolutely not needed. It was piled up there, and I do not know whether they have done anything with it or not. That shows how money is spent in that department. When the Conservative party were in power the expenditure was about $1,400,000 per annum. Now the minister is spending over $6,000,000 per annum.

An hon. MEMBER. You were not doing anything in those days.

Mr. J. D. REID. We were doing as much as is being done now, but we were not doing the grafting that is being done now. We were not purchasing these buoys and other supplies for three times what they were worth.

Mr. FIELDING. Did my hon. friend ever hear of a derrick for which a double charge was made for working on Sunday?

Mr. J. D. REID. I beg my hon. friend's pardon.

Mr. FIELDING. Did my hon. friend ever hear of a derrick for which double pay was charged because it had to work on Sunday?

Mr. J. D. REID. When was that? That was done under the administration of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But I will tell the minister what he has not heard of, that some derricks were purchased at Quebec by this government through middlemen, and the result was that they paid $5,000 more for them than they otherwise would have paid. These are the only derricks that I have heard of, and if they have been working double time on Sundays they certainly should get double payment, but the hon. the Minister of Finance should not allow them to work on Sunday. I do not think the people of the country want derricks to work on Sundays. But here is the Militia Department. It is not free either. I remember when the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) came before the House and showed us what a great thing it was to build this Ross rifle factory at Quebec. He was willing to give very, very many acres of most valuable land to the Ross Rifle Company for nothing. To-day he is willing to pay the Ross Rifle Company for this land that he gave away. He is willing to spend $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 on rifles that are absolutely useless and will never be used in this country.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman knows better than that.

Mr. J. D. REID. I know that is the fact.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman has no business to make such a statement. It is absolutely untrue.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I withdraw that, and say that the hon. gentleman's statement is without the slightest foundation.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister has not been able to show where any of the Ross rifles that have been made are used in this country. They have never been used, and he cannot show where they have been used.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have shown that 8,000 are distributed and are being used.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister has shown that 8,000 have been distributed, but they are not in actual use.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They are in actual use. The hon. gentleman absolutely does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do, I am stating exactly what has been proved.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It has not been proved that the hon. gentleman knows it.

Mr. J. D. REID. I also wish to refer to the expenditure by the minister of $100,000 for sub-targets and his boasting of the propriety of that purchase at that price because the Ontario government had paid $250 apiece for them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I never said that.

Mr. J. D. REID. It was absolutely right because the Ontario government paid $250.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I never said that.

Mr. J. D. REID. If you did not your followers did at your instigation. It was shown on investigation that this contract was made by the Ross government and not by the Whitney government.

Mr. BENNETT. Where is the Ross government now.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What I said was that the contract for the machine guns was made at the same rate as that gun was supplied to the government of the United States and that a clause was inserted in the contract by which, in the event of any reduction being made in the United States (this being a patented machine), the government of Canada is to get the benefit of that reduction. As to the Ontario government, all I can say is that it was the present Ontario government that accepted and paid for this sub-target gun.

Mr. BENNETT. Who ordered them ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT. It was the Ross government.

Mr. BLAIN. Here is the contract signed by Hon. Richard Harcourt, Minister of Education.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I say that the present government of Ontario accepted the gun and paid for it, and more than that the present government of Ontario corresponded with me and asked me to hand them rifles to be used on this machine. I never heard of them disapproving of it in any way.

Mr. BLAIN. The contract was made by the Ross government and signed by Hon. Richard Harcourt, Minister of Education, and the government was bound for two years from December, 1904.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister knows it is a very small way to get out of it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is nothing to get out of.

Mr. J. D. REID. Here is a contract made just previous to the election and if the minister had not baulked an inquiry it would have been shown that money was probably used for the election campaign by these parties. The Whitney government was forced to carry out the contract made by their predecessors. Had it not been that the Ross government made the contract, no subtarget guns would have been purchased by the present government of Ontario.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It did not require any forcing.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) was one of those who agreed to accept that rifle. He was a member of the Ross government at the time the contract was made ; he was one of those who actually made the contract, and he knows that the Whitney government was compelled to accept these machines although it had not been a party to making the contract.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It was a perfectly good contract ; a contract to be proud of.

Mr. J. D. REID. Of course it is, in so far as the Minister of Militia is concerned ; he is proud of any contract that gives graft to the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am telling facts.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I feel a good deal like the man who was kicked by a donkey ; I take it whence it came.

Mr. BENNETT. But the man felt sore after the donkey.

Mr. J. D. REID. I shall not take up any more time of the House. I wanted to refer to these different departments in which I have myself seen graft has been going on—and the people of this country know it. It has been going on in all the large spending departments. The Minister of Militia knows it. The Minister of Militia knows it ; he has investigated his department and if he does not know it, if he will go to the Public Accounts Committee he will know it. The Minister of Public Works knows it ; he has been at the committee and seen proof of it. The Minister of Militia knows it ; he has seen proof of it, and unless something is done the people of this country will continue to be robbed of millions of dollars every year. As I have said, I think the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) is to be congratulated for bringing this resolution before the House, and I hope it will be realized from one end of the country to the other exactly what is being done. If the people can only be led to know what is going on in Ottawa the result will be that the gentlemen now occupying the treasury benches will occupy them but a short time longer.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY. (Minister of Public Works). As I understand the resolution of my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) it is directed against some expenditures in connection with Public Works. I think that is a fair reading of it. The resolution says :

> The revenues of Canada belong to the people of this country and should be expended in the public interest; and that this House condemns the action of the present government in expending public moneys on works which are really for the benefit of favoured corporations and private individuals and not for the public benefit.

I think it is perhaps better that the resolution should be discussed along the lines

laid down by the hon. gentleman who moved it rather than——

Mr. TAYLOR. The Marine Department and the Railways and Canals Department are conducting some works in this country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is true, but the public works constructed by the Department of Marine have, as I remember, not been referred to by the hon. gentleman and I would not call the Ross rifle or sub-targets public works.

Mr. BENNETT. They are not for the benefit of Canada.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I was about to say that although they are not public works they are for the benefit of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is somewhat inconvenient to discuss on a resolution relating to the Public Works Department subjects relating to other departments. I am very glad to have had an opportunity of hearing my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) before I addressed any observations to the House, because the hon. gentleman is very industrious; he is a constant attendant in the Committee of Public Accounts, and I think we might rely on him and on the hon. member who moved the resolution (Mr. Perley) to have unearthed anything that might be wrong in connection with the Public Works Department. When I listened to the cases to which these gentlemen referred and which apparently were the only cases to which they were able to refer after very exhaustive research, I felt that they were bearing silent testimony, silent because it was testimony based on what they did not say, as to the proper administration of the Department of Public Works during the eleven years which have passed since this government came into power. From the statement of the mover of the resolution it would appear that in those years probably $30,000,000 have been expended by the Public Works Department and the only works either of these hon. gentlemen was able to point out in relation to the Public Works Department as deserving of criticism would not amount to over $200,000 or $250,000 in all—a very small amount compared with a total expenditure as I have said of about $30,000,000.

Mr. PERLEY. Does the minister suppose for a moment that we have looked over all the transactions of the Public Works Department? Does he assume that we have nothing else to do?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would assume that the hon. gentleman, with his industry, with his very great research and his opportunities for research, must have been able after going through the report of the Auditor General and having investigated matters before the Public Accounts Committee, to form a pretty good idea of what there is in the expenditure of the Public Works Department that is open to criticism. It might be well to bear in mind the fact that public works are being carried on all over this country, extending from the eastern shores of Prince Edward Island to the western shores of British Columbia and up into the Yukon. There are employed by the department probably 3,000 people, upon whom we have to rely for its honest administration. We have our resident engineers and our inspectors in the various sections of the country. It may be that mistakes will sometimes be made; it may be that minor officials will sometimes be guilty of wrong doing; but it is a striking testimony to the way in which the affairs of the department on the whole have been administered that such a comparatively small criticism has been directed against its administration by the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. Now, let me take the different public works which the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution has made a ground of criticism. To begin with, he made a general criticism with regard to the expenditure. He said: This government boasts of the large amount which it has expended upon public work, and rather assumes that the money belongs to the government and not to the people. Mr. Speaker, the best evidence that we take for granted that the money belongs to the people, that it is their money and ought to be expended in their interest, is that in all parts of this country, wherever public works are necessary, we seek to expend the people's money on those public works, and for the benefit of the people. It must be borne in mind that this country is growing, and growing rapidly. There has been a marvellous railway development in the last ten years. The country is being opened up in every direction, and the wants of the people, so far as wharfs and the dredging of harbours and the erection of public buildings are concerned, are constantly increasing. No one knows that better than the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House in support of this resolution. In the Northwest alone, since 1902, there has been a new country born. That country in the last five years has developed to a greater extent than it did in all the years that preceded. Saskatchewan is rapidly increasing in population; so is Alberta, also Manitoba. The people are calling out in all the towns and cities which have come into existence in the last few years for the custom-houses, post offices and other public buildings which they require, and they are as much entitled to them as the people who live in the older provinces; and I would say to my hon. friends that when they are criticising the public expenditure, let them take any one of the 31 post offices which were given to the House yesterday, in response

to an inquiry, as being now under construction in the various parts of Canada, and let them put their finger on one of these buildings and say that it ought not to be constructed in the public interest. It is all very well for the hon. gentlemen to speak of the largeness of the expenditure; it is all very well for them to speak of the extravagance of the government; but statements of that kind will have no weight with the people of this country unless these hon. gentlemen have the judgment and the courage and the industry to search out any building in any part of this country which is under construction to-day, and say that it is against the public interest that public money should be expended in its construction. That is a challenge which I throw out to my hon. friends opposite. They have the statement of the Postmaster General of all the post offices which are under construction, and if there is one of them upon the construction of which in their judgment the public money of this country is wasted, surely this House and the people of this country have the right to ask that they will indicate it. The same remark will apply to the dredging of harbours. Everything is changing so far as the sea ports of this country are concerned. The old sailing vessels have gone out. They drew a comparatively small number of feet of water, they could rest on the mud flats when they came into any of the harbours along the coasts of the maritime provinces. Steamers cannot do that; they require to float at all times of tide, and they are becoming larger and of greater tonnage year by year; and if the people of the provinces bordering on the sea are to be accommodated, and if the reasonable demands of trade and commerce are to be met, the harbours must be dredged and greater accommodation given to shipping. All this costs money, and a great deal of money. So with regard to the works going on upon the Great Lakes. There is to-day and has been for a number of years a strong feeling among the people of this country that a determined effort should be made to direct the trade of Canada away from the American ports of Buffalo, New York, Boston, Baltimore and Portland, and bring it through Canadian lake ports and on to Canadian seaports, and thus carry on the trade of the country through Canadian channels. Involved in the carrying out of that idea is the improvement of the harbours of the Great Lakes, and hundreds of thousands of dollars, or perhaps I should say millions of dollars, have been expended by this government for that purpose. Will anybody say that that money has been wasted—that these great public improvements are not necessary for the transportation interests of this country and not in the general interest of Canada? It does seem to me that before hon. gentlemen can expect to make any impression on the people of the country, they must be able to point to some of those works that are going on and say that they are unnecessary. Let them begin at Halifax, if they like—will it be said that the large amount spent there to create terminal facilities in connection with the Intercolonial Railway ought not to have been spent or is not necessary? Go to the city of St. John, which has become one of the great winter ports of Canada, to which now the largest steamers of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Allan Company and other lines can go in the winter season. Will it be said that that port ought not to be improved—that the great steamers of those lines ought not to be permitted to go to St. John, but ought to be encouraged to go to Portland in the state of Maine, as the mail steamers did up to the time this government came into power? The cost of that great improvement will necessarily run up into a large amount of money. I might go all over this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific and show that the expenditures which have been made in British Columbia, the large dredging operations which have been carried on have been for the advancement and improvement of the transportation interests of the country and the benefit of the people.

While all these things have been done and are being done to-day in the general interests of the country, let us see what my hon. friend, the industrious and intelligent member who represents Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), and who moved this resolution, pointed out, and what criticism he has been able to make against the department which I now preside over. In the first place, he speaks of the wharf at Hull. Does he deny that that wharf is necessary? Not at all. That wharf, if I remember rightly, was built immediately after the great fire which destroyed almost the entire city of Hull. I presume that at that time there would be a great demand for lumber for the building of the town, and that lumber would cost more than it does under ordinary circumstances. But it must be borne in mind that the wharf built there is one of a most substantial charaacter.

The wharf is built of the best timber, the upper part is built of concrete, so that it is a very substantial work which will last for generations. Does my hon. friend say that it cost too much, considering the character of the structure? Not at all, but he says a cheaper wharf, which would go to decay perhaps in fifteen or twenty years, ought to have been constructed. That is all the hon. gentleman says Hull was entitled to have. He says that is good enough for Hull. Then he criticises it because, he says, only 83 freight steamers went there during the season to which he refers and only two passenger steamers call there twice daily. Well, I am inclined to think that is a pretty good traffic and shows that the wharf is

being used pretty freely. But, he says, no revenue is collected. I suppose he puts that forward as a strong argument against its construction. But there are many wharfs in Canada from which no revenue is being collected and at which a very good business is being done. That has been the case ever since confederation, under both Conservative and Liberal administrations. It is one of the anomalies which have existed in this connection. It has existed ever since the country undertook the construction of wharfs immediately after confederation, and this government is simply moving along the lines they found laid down by their predecessors. The rule is that so long as a wharf remains under the control of the Public Works Department, no revenue is collected, but when it passes to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that department proceeds to collect tolls. I had a remarkable instance brought to my notice not long ago. It was urged that a certain wharf in the province of Quebec should be passed over by the Public Works Department to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I found that the wharf had been built some twenty years ago. It was never transferred to the Marine Department and the people consequently never paid toll; and when informed that it was about to be transferred to the Marine Department and tolls collected, they made the most urgent representations that it should be allowed to remain in the Department of Public Works as it had for the last twenty years. There are many places where it would be considered a very great hardship if the people, who use these wharfs for the purposes of small shipments and getting supplies, should be obliged to pay top wharfage. That would be considered burdensome, and I may say frankly that, in numerous instances, my predecessors have hesitated to pass such wharfs over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, just because these burdens would be imposed on the people. There are about 600 wharfs and breakwaters in Canada and only about 200 have been passed over to the Marine Department. It happens that in the province from which I come, the government wharfs are paying in tolls an undue proportion of the entire revenues which are collected throughout the Dominion. We do not complain of that because they happen to be in a place where there is considerable business and the business is able to stand the burden of the tolls. But in the smaller districts throughout the Dominion, it would be regarded as quite a hardship to impose tolls. Therefore the fact that no revenue is collected from a wharf is no indication that it is not of very considerable public benefit. While on this subject, I may say that this anomaly, which has existed ever since confederation, has been engaging the serious attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and myself and it is not unlikely that a plan will be evolved which will meet the public view and remove from the people certain burdens they have to bear in respect of tolls upon certain wharfs in the country.

The next criticism is that a wharf was built on lake Nominingue. My hon. friend said that this is an inland lake. I take it for granted that all the lakes are inland lakes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Bras D'Or lakes in Cape Breton are not inland.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are not lakes at all. Why they were called lakes I am not able to understand. The question raised by my hon. friend's resolution is one of great importance, and that is as to whether or not all the wharfs upon the inland waters of the various provinces should be constructed by the provinces or by the Dominion. I am not prepared to draw any distinction between the Ottawa and other inland waters. It may be said that the Ottawa is an interprovincial stream, but there is nothing in the Act of confederation which makes that a ground for building wharfs along a river. It is different from building a bridge. A bridge connects the two provinces but a wharf must be wholly in Ontario or wholly in Quebec. There is therefore no reason to warrant the building of a wharf along the Ottawa river which would not equally apply to a wharf built on the banks of the St. John in New Brunswick or on the shores of the Grand lake or Kennebecasis in New Brunswick or on any of the large navigable lakes in any of the other provinces. Yet it has been recognized ever since confederation that it is quite proper for the federal government to build wharfs along the Ottawa. I can well remember when my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who was then Finance Minister and representative from New Brunswick in the late Conservative government, took the ground very strongly that the federal government should not build any wharfs in the inland waters of his own province. He was urged to build wharfs and took the ground that that was against the terms of the British North America Act. But his attention was called to the fact that the government was constantly building along the Ottawa, and the people of New Brunswick could not see any distinction between the two. At last my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) saw the force of that reasoning and agreed to contribute one-half the cost of a few wharfs, at least so far as the St. John river and its tributaries were concerned. I am prepared to go this far, that either the government must recognize the reasonable demands of the people living along the shores of the inland waters of the Dominion or refuse to build wharfs even along the shores of waters which divide any

two provinces. There is just as much reason for building in the one case as in the other. Take Lake Nomininguе, there is no railway accommodation for the people in that country, that country is being rapidly settled, and in order to supply transportation facilities the building of wharfs was necessary, and I am not prepared to say that the building of wharfs was not entirely justifiable in the public interest. I understand the only criticism my hon. friend makes is that these wharfs should have been built by the province of Queebc. Well, I think I am right in saying that it has never been the habit of governments of Ontario and Quebec to build wharfs, but they have allowed that work to be borne entirely, or alomst entirely, by the federal government. Therefore if the federal government had not undertaken to furnish these accommodations, these wharfs would not have been built, and the people would have been deprived of transportation facilities.

Mr. BENNETT. In the great city of Toronto there is not a government owned dock. Every dock is owned by a navigation company or private individuals.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That may very well be. In St. John, up to comparatively recent years, the wharfs were owned by private individuals; but with the development of the idea of transportation and the increase in the wealth of the country, a different policy prevailed, and the people are recognizing that the building of wharfs is intimately connected with the transportation question. And as navigation belongs peculiarly to the federal government and parliament, the federal government might fairly, in the discharge of its duties, undertake to build wharfs on the inland navigable waters of Canada.

The next item in the hon. gentleman's criticism was the work built at Disraeli. The only criticism of the hon. gentleman with regard to that was that the work was not a wharf in reality, but served the purpose of a bridge, because the municipal council had built a bridge from the end of the structure created by the Dominion government to the opposite side and it was really used as a bridge. The hon. gentleman did not say it was not a work of public benefit; he did not criticise it from that standpoint, but only that it could not be regarded as being for the purpose intended.

Then, he spoke of a wharf in his own county which cost $5,000. His only criticism of that was that the wharf was not situated in the best place. That may be a mistake on the part of the engineers.

The hon. gentleman spoke also of the wharf at St. Joseph. I am prepared to admit that with the knowledge I have with regard to that wharf, if the matter came before me to-day I might not enter upon its construction. But, in justice to Mr. Tarte, who has now passed away, and whose reputation as a wise statesman and man of excellent judgment certainly did not suffer by reason of any remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite, it should be said that when Mr. Tarte was Minister of Public Works he went to St. Joseph. He went at the request of certain gentlemen who were attempting to create a popular resort there, who had a scheme for engaging largely in agricultural pursuits, and proposed to build a railway to connect St. Joseph with Goderich. In that scheme, Chicago capitalists were largely interested. Apparently, Mr. Tarte became captivated with the development that might take place there. Now, I am informed that it is not correct to say that the place where this wharf is built is an exposed place. It is at the mouth of a river, and my information is that, if you could get the business there, it would not be too bad a place for the building of a wharf or the establishing of a town. And this must be borne in mind that, if Mr. Tarte erred in judgment in expending $15,000 or so in building a government wharf there, others erred also. I have seen photographs of buildings there, among others a hotel which cost $150,000, and many others. And my information is that the capitalists engaged in the scheme have expended in the vicinity of $600,000 in erecting buildings and in the effort to develop the place and to make it what they expected it would be. No doubt, they have been disappointed. Still, the fact that shrewd business men made a mistake with regard to the opportunities for business may perhaps be some justification for Mr. Tarte having also formed wrong expectations in this matter. However, it is a matter for which I am in no way responsible. The wharf was built some years ago. As I have said, I am not prepared to say that if under the circumstances to-day, the matter were presented to me as it was to Mr. Tarte, I would take the same course as he took. Still, I am not prepared to quarrel with the exercise of his judgment at that time.

Then, the hon. gentleman speaks of the construction of piers and booms on the Saguenay river at Chicoutimi. If I understand him, he does not criticise very strongly the cost of these works, although he rather intimated that they might have been built for less. The only evidence he has given the House as a basis for that opinion is that the spruce sticks used in the construction of these booms cost at the rate of $27 to $30 a thousand. Well, there are sticks and sticks. I can understand that a long spruce tree, such as would be in one of these booms, might cost at the rate of $27 or $30 a thousand, where shorter sticks would not cost anything like the same amount. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perley) was asked the length, he said they would not be very

long, because it would be difficult to get long sticks. The very fact that it was difficult to get long sticks, I suppose made those sticks more expensive than short ones would be.

Mr. PERLEY. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, the timber to which I refer was not used to make booms. The boom timber, I think, was brought from the west or south.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What was the timber used for then ?

Mr. PERLEY. I do not know. This timber to which I referred is used in the round—small round stuff.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perley) does not know what it was used for, surely he will agree with me that his information as to whether it cost too much or not would hardly carry weight. He did complain—and I think this is his strongest criticism on this subject—that the government should have allowed these individuals to construct these booms and piers themselves and have not taken hold of this work as a government work. I am disposed to agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Perley) that in undertaking these works, the government should be very careful, and should undertake such works only under exceptional circumstances. But the very fact that it was found necessary and desirable in the public interest, years ago, to undertake this system of slides and booms on the Ottawa, the St. Maurice and elsewhere, shows that public men of a former time thought there were circumstances which justified the government in entering upon this work. May it not be that there are similar circumstances at Chicoutimi which would justify the government in constructing these works to assist the operators there to develop a great industry which has resulted in the building up of a prosperous town and the giving of employment, if I am correctly informed, to thousands of people ? May not the government be justified in saying : We will undertake the expenditure of $50,000, which, at four per cent, will represent only $2,000 a year, to encourage these companies in the development of the great industry on the Saguenay river at Chicoutimi ? That may have influenced the government. These companies were just starting out on a great enterprise which would have involved the expenditure of millions of money. It may be that they approached the government and said : There are the various lumber interests and we cannot agree as to the management of these booms. We think that you might well, in the public interest, take charge of these works, as you do now everywhere on the Ottawa and on the St. Maurice. Not having been in the government at that time, I am not aware of the arguments which led the government to undertake these works, but I can understand that this might have appealed to my predecessor's judgment and led him to introduce the measure. The hon. gentleman says : We have not collected the tolls from the Chicoutimi Pulp Company. I admit that. And I might explain to the House that there has been an unfortunate difference between the government and the Chicoutimi Pulp Company. When the government undertook the construction of these booms, the company had certain booms themselves, and were desirous that the government should acquire these and make them a part of the new works that the government was about constructing. They wanted, if I remember well, about $30,000 for their booms. The government did not think it in the public interest to acquire these works, but deemed it better to construct entirely new works. And I believe this has been regarded as a grievance by the company from that time to the present day. The company has declined to pay the tolls on the ground that the works are not entirely complete. The engineering staff of the department takes a different view. We have rendered bills for the tolls, and I have instructed the deputy minister to place the matter in the hands of the Department of Justice to enforce the tolls, and we will see whether the government or the company is right in the matter.

Now, I wondered that my hon. friend, in speaking of Chicoutimi and the Saguenay river, did not avail himself of those photographs which have been brought to Ottawa and distributed, showing a pier which was built out by the Department of Public Works into the river, as resting on dry ground. I have been told there has been some gossip with regard to that. In case the matter should be brought to his notice, let me say to him that in connection with the dredging works on the Saguenay river, the government did what it was advised to do, it built an entraining pier for the purpose of preventing the silt flowing down the Saguenay and getting into the portion the government was dredging. This had the effect intended, and while the photograph shows dry land on the upper side of the pier, on the lower side there is water. The pier has been of material benefit to the dredged portion of the river down below the pier. I mention this because I shall be surprised if some hon. gentleman does not refer to it before the debate is through.

Now the next ground for criticism is with reference to two works in Nova Scotia where channels were excavated between the ocean and two lakes. I am not familiar with the subject, but possibly the Minister of Finance may think it worth while to refer to the matter. I do not know whether it is true that the water flows out to the ocean at low tide. But even if it were, I can understand that it would be justifiable to make a moderate expenditure for the pur-

pose of providing a complete shelter for those small fishing vessels so that they may go into this basin at high water and lie there in safety when the tide is out. That might be justifiable on public grounds, because hon. gentlemen must remember that along the coasts of the maritime provinces there are thousands of people engaged in fishing. Their boats are comparatively small and it is an enormous benefit to them for the saving of life and property that at different points along the coast there should be these small harbours of refuge, these places of shelter where they can go and be safe from the storm. Therefore, even upon the statement of my hon. friend, I would not be prepared to admit that the small expenditure which was devoted to this purpose would be money wasted. Now, Mr. Speaker, those are all the public works in respect to which my hon. friend had any criticism to make, and I ask whether, upon that statement in view of the vast expenditures which have been made by the Public Works Department during the last eleven years, there are any statements he has made which would warrant the House in condemning the government in respect to its expenditures upon public works.

But it remained for my hon. friend who represents Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) to add his testimony to the ground for attack against the government, by stating that a wharf had been built upon Stanley Island in the River St. Lawrence. Now, I do not know just where the wharf is, but my information is that although the island may be private, it is an island to which the public resort in vast numbers and this is a wharf which is greatly used by the public. It would be difficult to find any wharf which has been constructed at an expenditure of this moderate amount, which affords greater accommodation to the travelling public than is afforded by this wharf on Stanley Island. I think if my hon. friend were to tell what he knows with regard to it, he would admit the correctness of my statement in this particular. He says there is a wharf on Lake Nipissing. Well, I admit there are wharfs that the government have built on Lake Nipissing. I think they have built a wharf at North Bay, and at another place down some miles west of North Bay; and I am prepared as Minister of Public Works to undertake expenditures of this character upon great lakes like Lake Nipissing and other large inland waters, in all cases where I think the matter is of large importance, and where the construction of wharfs would be of great advantage in encouraging the transportation interests of this country. I think with regard to works of this character, as well as with regard to post offices and other public buildings, we ought to have regard to the fact that there are people in other places in this country than in the cities and larger towns. There are people in villages and in remote districts who are doing their part well in building up a great Canadian nation, and the federal government can be engaged in no better work than in giving them here and there public buildings, and wharfs, and other works of a like character, which are necessary to add to their comfort and increase their opportunities for travelling and getting their products to market.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Now we are going to get it.

Mr. OSLER. Yes, you are going to get it, and that is what has been said so often to the electors of New Brunswick, because the man who held the public purse said to them, I will give you a wharf here and a wharf there, and I will defend it as being in the interest of the public. Now, Sir, there is no man in this House more absolutely in favour of spending the public money for the benefit of this country, than myself.

An hon. MEMBER. For instance, the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. OSLER. Now I wish to ask the hon. gentleman who said that, if there is any institution in this country that has done so much good for the country as the Canadian Pacific Railway? Had it not been for the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had $20,000,000 in the Canadian banks during the past crisis, where would this government have been ? When they needed money to meet unpaid debts to all these contractors, the money of the Canadian Pacific Railway was the only thing that rescued them.

Mr. FIELDING. What does the hon. gentleman mean by saying that the money of the Canadian Pacific Railway came to this government?

Mr. OSLER. I say it helped the banks to carry on the business of this country.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not what he said. Do not mix the country with the government.

Mr. OSLER. I said the government owed money to this country.

Mr. FIELDING. The government owed nobody.

Mr. OSLER. The government, through the Quebec Bridge Company, had borrowed $7,000,000.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman knows that is not correct. The government did not borrow it, it was borrowed by a corporation.

Mr. OSLER. The bonds were guaranteed by the government.

Mr. FIELDING. I will correct the hon. gentleman at once. Loans were obtained by the Quebec Bridge Company covering a period of years, with the guaranteed bonds of the government pledged as collateral. The government never engaged to give the Quebec Bridge Company money, and never owed money to the Quebec Bridge Company at all. It was a matter of convenience between the Quebec Bridge Company and its creditors, and was ultimately a public advantage, to the satisfaction of everybody.

Mr. OSLER. The Finance Minister has made a statement which is quite correct. Yet I say to his face that were it not for the credit of the Dominion government that was at the back of that borrowing, the Quebec Bridge Company could never have got the money, and by borrowing that six or seven million dollars from the Dominion government, so much more money was kept out of circulation in this country.

Mr. CONMEE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not think the hon. gentleman heard me.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) who is speaking has possession of the floor.

Mr. OSLER. I have never——

Mr. CONMEE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me?

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is that the hon. member who has the floor is entitled to keep it, and another hon. member can only ask a question by his permission.

Mr. CONMEE. I understand——

Mr. OSLER. The taunt has been thrown across the floor of my connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, or to any hon. member, to say if, since I have been a member of this House, I have ever referred to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have never advocated any interest or Bill that happened to be before the House, and I have never spoken on any Canadian Pacific Railway interest under discussion. If my example had been followed by the majority of the back benchers on the government side of the House, it would have been much more to the credit of this country. There is no man in this House but will endorse the expenditure of public money for public works if they are for the benefit of this country and if the money is honestly expended. I recognize that down the St. Lawrence and in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia there is a long coast line that must be supplied with wharfs by this government, and that there must be a very large amount of money spent by the public to build wharfs and to provide accommodation for the people living along the river and the sea-coast. These people are not wealthy. They are probably the finest class of people we have in Canada. They battle against the elements, and they are entitled to be protected and to have money spent to provide them with wharfs and every facility that is possible. But with all that, I say that no man can go down the St. Lawrence and go along the coast of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and not come to the conclusion that at least half the money that has been expended there has been expended, not for the benefit of the people, but for political purposes and to buy the votes of the people.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend be good enough to name a single wharf in the province of New Brunswick that is not in the interest of the public?

Mr. OSLER. That is not what I said.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, you did.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me ask my hon. friend this question——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. If the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) will let the hon. the Minister of Public Works have the floor to ask a question, he is quite at liberty to do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may have misunderstood my hon. friend, but did he not say that you could not go down to the provinces without coming to the conclusion that about half the wharfs constructed there were not in the public interest?

Mr. OSLER. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, then, I am hard of hearing.

Mr. OSLER. If I said that, I was mistaken. What I said was——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I accept the explanation.

Mr. OSLER. What I said was that half of the expenditure on these wharfs was absolutely unnecessary. I say that the expenditure on these wharfs, to the extent of at least half of it, has not been in the interest of the people, but has been in the interest of the political party that built them. I have driven down year after year from Metis to Matane, and it was not necessary for me to have my driver point these things out, because all that a man requires is his own eye-sight to see wharf after wharf that is not approachable by any ship.

Mr. TALBOT. How many wharfs are there between Metis and Matane?

Mr. OSLER. I did not count them, because it would be a very difficult job. I am referring to the wharfs that I have also seen myself in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, but only in a general way. From my own observation, I have come to the conclusion—and any man who has any knowledge of business will come to the same conclusion—that more than half of the money that has been expended has been expended uselessly. Wharfs that a few hundred dollars would have built, and that would have accommodated all the shipping that had to be taken care of, have been constructed at the cost of thousands of dollars. I will endorse any expenditure of money that is necessary to give the fullest possible facilities to the people living along the St. Lawrence and upon the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick coast. I think they are entitled to it and they need it, but I say the money should be expended only as it is needed. We have seen the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) bringing in session after session fifty, sixty and seventy votes for wharfs in his own province. The money is not expended. One year after another it is voted and revoted, simply to keep it dangling before the people for political purposes.

Mr. M. MARTIN. (Montreal, St. Mary's). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Did he see a wharf in Montreal previous to 1896?

Mr. OSLER. No.

Mr. M. MARTIN. Has he seen the wharf that is there to-day?

Mr. OSLER. No.

Mr. M. MARTIN. Then we had nothing at all, but now we have wharf accommodation.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. OSLER. I have been speaking of what I have been able to judge from visiting here and there from year to year. Now, I will give an instance from what I know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend pardon me again, because I have great respect for the judgment of my hon. friend? Let us get down to a concrete case. The hon. gentleman says that in New Brunswick he saw wharfs where they ought not to have been built, and that more than half of the expenditure upon them was useless. Will my hon. friend name one single wharf to which that remark refers? He cannot do so.

Mr. FOWLER. We will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) the information a little later.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is all right.

Mr. OSLER. I am sorry if I have raised this little hornet's nest amongst hon. gentlemen opposite. I am telling my impression from what I have seen in my visits to the lower St. Lawrence and the coast of New Brunswick. My judgment may be wrong, but I think it is right and I think it is the judgment of any man who is not biased. It is the judgment of many men who are strong supporters of this government and who have been down there. Now, let me come to a case that I can speak of with absolute knowledge. Two or three years ago in this House there was an appropriation made in connection with a branch of the Trent Valley canal to Newmarket. I forget the amount, but it was some hundreds of thousands of dollars. I made the statement then and I repeat it that there is not enough water in the stream which feeds the high level canal to keep the locks full, and if the locks were as full as possible, there would not be sufficient revenue from the one or two rowboats which would pass up and down the canal to pay the lockkeepers. In the estimates of this year, there is a revote of $3,200 for a wharf at Roche's Point. I may speak with some authority on that point as for 20 years I have lived at Roche's Point for months during the summers. I had a steamboat on Lake Simcoe and had a wharf. That wharf is now in front of my own place and cost, I think, $400. It is in the open, right on the open lake. All the steamers that ever run on Lake Simcoe can tie up at that wharf. There is also a little landing at Roche's Point bay, which is a few hundred yards from my house. For years a ferry ran from Belle Ewart to that point. It was commanded by a captain who sometimes had a boy as engineer, but very often acted as both captain and engineer. This is a very sheltered cove with a smooth, sandy bottom, shelving easily down. The boat comes to this landing, the captain catches the side of the wharf and holds the boat alongside while passengers land. That wharf was taken down each year and rebuilt at a cost of $15. A railway was built two years ago running from Newmarket to Roche's Point, and the ferry has been taken off. It received a small subsidy, but now the mail is carried by train and there is not a single boat that comes to that wharf. There is only one boat on Lake Simcoe which carries excursions. They have already built piers at Roche's Point into eight feet of water and the present plan is to extend the pier into twelve feet of water. The government propose to spend $3,200 and will probably spend $10,000 before it is finished. There is no boat on Lake Simcoe that draws more than five feet of water; the piers are already in eight feet of water and there are still more piers being extended out into the lake. I make that statement from ab-

solute personal knowledge; the others I make from observation, but if I have this knowledge of one pier I can infer very much more than my observation shows me in connection with these other wharfs.

Mr. PERLEY. In what constituency was that?

Mr. OSLER. I hardly like to say, but it was in the constituency of North York. I cannot accuse the present Minister of Justice of being guilty of that; it was the late lamented and respected Postmaster General, the most economical, cheese-paring man who was ever in the House, for whom I must say that when he came to expend government money he did so without reserve.

The Minister of Public Works said we had unearthed nothing. Good Heavens! there is no need to unearth anything, there is no earth over them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. They are bare.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. gentlemen are like ostriches and think that no one sees them if they cover up their heads. The government has such a zeal for spending money. They are now looking forward; they have had a great wave of prosperity and they fancy that this is to continue. They are spending public money in millions and they think because they are taking in millions and have been successful that the public, when it comes to a question of tens or hundreds of thousands look on these amounts as being so small as compared with the millions of which they talk that they do not count, but the people are beginning to find that ten times ten thousand make a hundred thousand and ten times a hundred thousand make a million and that these tens and hundreds of thousands mount up at an enormous rate. There can be only one end to this, and that is disaster. The government is very much in the condition of a supply house for a great mercantile firm. A supply house, as we know, must buy the goods from the parent house at the price the parent house chooses to charge for them. There is a great parent house of middlemen in this country who are the supply house for the government. The government have to buy their small supplies at whatever price their parent house chooses to charge. They cannot kick and so far they have not done so, because they are not the men who are paying the charges; these terrible charges are being paid by the country. It shows how absolutely without knowledge of what they are doing the members of the government or the back benchers supporting the government are. Any serious charge they answer by a guffaw and a laugh and they think they have met the charge because they laugh. It is a cheap laugh, a very cheap laugh, but let me tell the members who sit on the back benches opposite and do the laughing that the five or six members of the government who sit on the front seats are not doing any laughing. They would be very much happier if the members who are so ready to laugh—I suppose it is the only means of expression they have—did not do quite so much laughing.

Now, there was a reference made to something that I do not know about, because it was before I was in politics. It was about some dredge having charged double for work on Sunday. I think that is quite proper. I can illustrate it by an incident that occurred some years ago when I was staying at an inn in a very poor Scotch village on the Clyde. I wanted to have a drive on a Sunday. The Scotch lassie in charge said, 'we do not let out our horses on the Sabbath.' I said, 'I must have a drive.' Then she said, 'If you have it on the Sabbath, it will be double price.' There is another illustration about somebody being damaged by a kick from an ass. There is still another illustration about the dog that went mad and bit a man; but it was not the man that died, but the dog, because the poison came from the man and not the dog.

Mr. J. CONMEE (Rainy River). Mr. Speaker, in the course of the hon. gentleman's remarks I desired to ask him a question, but he did not see fit to extend to me the courtesy which is usually extended under such circumstances. I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman and the attention of the House to some of the remarks he has made. He has told us that this is the first time that he has spoken here of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, I believe that some of the Canadian Pacific Railway people would have thought it better if he had not spoken on this occasion. The hon. member thought the government were very blamable because they had guaranteed the bonds of some company engaged in building a bridge at Quebec. I wished to ask the hon. gentleman if he had forgotten that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had asked the government for a guarantee not only of their bonds, but also of their stock.

Mr. OSLER. I did not object to the government guaranteeing those bonds at all. I made no reference to that. I said it was a government liability.

Mr. CONMEE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the government of this country would have been bankrupt, that it would have been unable to meet its obligations to the public, if it had not been for the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was the only solvent concern of this country. Then, when he was challenged for that statement by the minister stating that the government had not been obliged to call on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or its resources, he retreated. What I understood him to say then was that the guarantee to the company was as unjustifiable under

the circumstances as if the government had advanced the money. Am I putting the hon. gentleman in the right position now? If I am not, perhaps he will rise and tell us what he did say. If he does not know what he did say, he will have to allow me to draw my conclusions. The hon. gentleman did try to leave the impression that this government would be swamped if it were not for certain conditions of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he assumed to himself and his party great credit for the Canadian Pacific Railway. I deny that hon. gentlemen opposite are entitled to any credit for the existence of the Canadian Pacific Railway. They never did anything for the Canadian Pacific Railway; it was the people of Canada who did it. It was the subject of a compact at confederation, and the Liberals have done as much if not more to carry that into effect as hon. gentlemen opposite. This is not the occasion to discuss the Canadian Pacific Railway; but I know some of the history of hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with it, and it is not such as to commend them to the people of this country—they made a most improvident bargain. The Canadian Pacific Railway was bound to come, and it had to come to the government and get a guarantee of $30,000,000. I do not want to discuss how that was paid back. The Canadian Pacific Railway is a great institution and it has done a great deal for Canada; but it does not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to claim any special credit for that. This is all I wished to say to the hon. gentleman at the time he did not extend to me the courtesy of answering a question. My hon. friend tells us that there is a good deal of hilarity on the part of gentlemen occupying the back benches on this side of the House. I suppose my hon. friend considers himself right in the front. He considers that some of the gentlemen in front of us here would be very much pleased if the hon. gentlemen on the back benches, as he terms them, were less demonstrative. I am rather inclined to think that some of the gentlemen in front of him would be better pleased if he were relegated to the back benches himself. The hon. gentleman has made an attack, a very weak attack, upon this government for expenditures on certain public works; but he has sat down without making one single point—without saying, here is a work that should not have been built, or here is an expenditure that was wrong. Perhaps I am wrong in that. The hon. gentleman did find fault with the construction of a pier on Lake Simcoe, and he said, 'No boat drawing more than five feet of water can navigate Lake Simcoe. I am prepared to contradict the hon. gentleman. A boat drawing ten or twelve feet of water can navigate Lake Simcoe. My hon. friend said: 'There is only one boat on Lake Simcoe.' That is not true; there is more than one. I do not live on the shores of Lake Simcoe, but I know something about it. There is a large excursion boat on Lake Simcoe, which probably is the one that my hon. friend has reference to. But would it be justifiable to build a dock which would only accommodate boats drawing five feet of water, in view of the fact that in a short time there might be boats drawing a good deal more water? I do not know about the particular item the hon. gentleman found fault with; but it is a small one, and I do not think it was in the mind of the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution. That hon. gentleman made a general attack on the government for having spent money on public works; but nobody has had the courage to point out a public work which ought not to have been built or on which there has been an over expenditure. The hon. gentleman found fault with some canal that did not do much business. I would ask the hon. gentleman how that canal would compare with the Tay canal, it does accommodate some boats because the hon. gentleman said so, while the Tay canal merely forms a tail-race for a mill belonging to a certain gentleman on that side of the House. If we wanted to contrast the expenditure made under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, of which the Tay canal is a sample, with expenditure under this government, I do not think the comparison would be to the credit of gentlemen opposite. I did not rise to make a speech but only to call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway got a good deal in the early days. I do not think they got too much. I would be sorry to say one word against the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I deny that the hon. gentleman has any right to special credit in that connection. The Canadian Pacific Railway got the aid of the people of Canada, not only for their railway but for wharfs as well. There is one in the city in which I happen to live which they got without a dollar of expenditure on their part and which they are using to-day, so that as far as the representative of the Canadian Pacific Railway in this House is concerned (Mr. Osler) it does not lie in his mouth to make any insinuations in this connection.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). I quite agree with the hon member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) that this is not the occasion for discussing the Canadian Pacific Railway and therefore shall not attempt to follow him on that question but shall confine myself to the matter raised by the resolution before the House. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) is quite mistaken in the assumption he has made tonight. With his characteristic suavity and smoothness, he says that the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) has given all the

instances that can be cited of the expenditure of public moneys in useless and unnecessary public works and in the construction of works, nominally public, but which are really for the benefit of private individuals. But those useless expenditures are not confined to the constituencies of Shelbourne and Queens or Richmond and Wolfe or to the other instances mentioned to-night. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has shown that there are other cases than those mentioned by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley). He instanced the expenditure of a very large sum for a work at Lake Simcoe which is practically useless. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has been very anxious to hear if there are any cases in the province of New Brunswick—that province in which he professes to have such confidence but which unfortunately for him does not reciprocate that confidence. Well, I have in my mind an expenditure of a very large sum in that province for a work which, I am advised, is absolutely useless. The case to which I refer is the Caraquet wharf, which cost the people in the vicinity of $80,000. I find in the report of the Public Works Department for the year ending June 30, 1896, a reference to this work as follows: That in March, 1902 a contract for a deep water wharf for the shipment of lumber was entered into with Messrs Simpson & Burpee of Gibson, N.B. The work was begun that year and completed the 31st October, 1905, and the contract price was $59,990. The report states:

In spring the ice from the upper part of Caraquet harbour, carried by the ebb tide and northwesterly winds, strikes the wharf with great force. Considerable damage and delay was caused by this during construction. Therefore in March and April, 1906, two blocks were built by day labour, about 200 feet from the western side of the wharf, to act as ice-breakers for the protection of the blocks of the approach.

The report continues:

These were built through the ice and were of good service when it moved early in May. The ice, however, carried away the corner fenders at the northwest corner of the pier head, and the fenders and sheathing for about seventeen feet to each side of the corner, and tore out the double-faced timber from the ends and sides and three longitudinal timbers. About 45 cubic yards of ballast were washed out of the works. This damage was repaired in June, 1906. The total expenditure for the fiscal year 1905-6, was $16,971.24.

That wharf, which has cost the people of Canada some $80,000, is practically useless. That is well known in the county of Gloucester. I have here a communication from one of the leading residents of that county, in which he makes these remarks:

A wharf which is wholly useless and which since it was built has not been used except to dry fishing nets upon until the past season when a small vessel running to Miscou made use of it for landing. It was built beneath a hill or bank so high and steep that teams could not possibly get down to the wharf from the village or up to the village from the wharf, so that a slanting or winding road had to be built down to it for about half a mile at a cost of $2,500. Yet it has not been used except to the extent above stated. Thousands of dollars would have to be spent in dredging both at the wharf and in the channel below to make it of any practical value to the shipping interests of the place. There is no prospect of the wharf being used in the next decade. The cost of this wharf and the dredging to it is money thrown away. The wharf will rot without any use being made of it.

Mr. TURGEON. Will the hon. gentleman give the name of the writer of that letter?

Mr. CROCKET. I do not think I can fairly be asked to give the name. The information I have is from one of the leading residents of Gloucester county and furthermore I have other communications to corroborate this in every particular. What caused me to communicate with this gentleman in Gloucester was a statement made to me, during the progress of the work, by one of the men engaged on it, to the effect that this wharf was being built in a place where it could not possibly be of any service. In fact the man was actually laughing at so much public money being spent on a work of this kind. The statement I have read shows that after the completion of the wharf it was necessary to build a road down the hill at a cost of $2,500. Let me now refer to what took place in this House in the session of 1902 when the first vote for this work was asked for. The first vote seems to have been for $20,000. The following discussion took place.

Mr. FOWLER. We would like some explanation of this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That work is practically under contract now. We have asked for tenders and have accepted the tender of Simmons and Burpee as the lowest That work is of great importance. I may say that since it became known that we were going to do this work at that point, several lumber industries have been established there.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the land on which this wharf is to be erected the property of the government, or of private individuals?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineer informs me we have not bought any land yet, but the work is on land belonging to the government.

Mr. FOWLER. Who owns the land at the inland end of the wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am thankful for the suggestion of my hon. friend. I have given most positive instructions to all my officers not to begin any works without having made arrangements with the owners of the land.

And further on:

Mr. FOWLER. Is the site located yet?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the work is located, but there will not be any

trouble about the land, because the work is just on the shore.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister says there have been some verbal negotiations going on; what is the price?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand the price is about $20 for the right of landing there. I suppose the insignificance of the price is the reason why a written deed has not been made.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps the price will be raised now that the site is taken.

The House will observe that, notwithstanding the Minister of Public Works at that time represented to this House that the right of way had been secured by verbal negotiation for $20, the prediction of the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler), that the price would be raised when the wharf was actually located at the site, has been fully verified. This government has been obliged to pay $2,500 for the right of way to and from that wharf. At V—150 of the Auditor General's Report of this year appear the following items :

Purchase price of site and right of way : G. A. Albert, $200; J. A. Albert, $50; J. G. Blackhall, $300; W. P. Foley, $550, total $1,100.

And then there are a number of items in connection with the building of this roadway, the whole representing an expenditure of $2,500. So the hon. minister will see that the instances given by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) and others who have spoken are not the only instances of worse than useless expenditure of public money. I venture to say there is hardly a member of this House who could not give similar instances of the wasteful expenditure of money in his section of the country. The case I referred to struck me as one that might well be brought to the attention of the House. There is another case, also in the county of Gloucester. This is the case of another wharf at Tracadie. There was a wharf at Tracadie, built some years ago by the Conservative government, at a moderate cost, for the accommodation of small vessels. There was no trade for large vessels, and the accommodation provided by the old wharf was all that was needed. A political friend, however, who had got hold of a drift block belonging to the present Snowball property, succeeded in impressing the member for the county with the importance of the government purchasing this asset and using it in connection with the old wharf. The result was that the government bought the drift block at $300 or $400. And it is interesting to note that, in connection with that transfer of the drift block, a legal gentleman in an adjoining constituency was feed to the extent of $75. After the drift block was bought it was discovered that it could not be placed properly to suit the old wharf, and accordingly an appropriation was asked for an extension to connect with the drift block. The extension was made at a cost of thousands of dollars. But not one vessel has been accommodated by the new structure, that could not have been as well accommodated by the old one. There is no trade for large vessels and, in any event, no vessel of any size could get up to the new wharf in consequence of the shallow water in the gully above or below the site of the wharf.



There was a breakwater at Stonehaven, in the same county, built by the Conservative government for the protection of small fishing vessels, which has been converted into a sort of wharf by this government at a cost of upwards of $20,000. It is practically of no use, I am informed, except to Messrs. J. D. Reid & Company, grindstone manufacturers at that place. At Petit Rocher there is a wharf that is said to be of no use to anybody. If the different constituencies were canvassed the amount of money wasted in works of this kind would be found to run up, not only to hundreds of thousands, as has been said, but to millions. I, as one member of this House, feel that there has been enough evidence adduced to justify the adoption of this resolution, and I deem it my duty, therefore, to give the resolution my support.

Mr. ONESIPHORE TURGEON (Gloucester). I have often listened with a certain pleasure to the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) discussing matters of his own constituency, or his own part of the province, concerning which I thought he probably knew something. But this evening he has taken the liberty of going upon foreign ground, with the result that he has displayed ignorance of the geography of the localities and the resources and possibilities of the places he has mentioned, which have caused me to greatly lose confidence in him as a guide in such matters. He has made allusion to three public wharfs built in the constituency of Gloucester, which constituency I have the honour to represent. He has talked a great deal of the wharf built at Caraquet, a wharf which has been four or five years under construction, and which was delivered to the government only about a year ago, and which, for the purpose for which it is intended, can hardly yet be said to be completed. He seems to think that Caraquet is a place of very little importance and very small resources. But let me tell the hon. gentleman that it is one of the most prosperous places in New Brunswick, a place with immense resources at its back. It is the chief centre of the fishing industry in the province of New Brunswick. The fishing industry of Gloucester, Caraquet and Shippegan yields a product of about $2,250,000. There are over 200 fishing schooners registered. These go to the fishing banks on the coast of Prince Edward Island and bring back the products of the sea to an amount which claims the admiration of the people of New Brunswick generally. Back

of Caraquet we have immense forests, with millions upon millions of feet of timber awaiting exportation, but which, for its exportation, requires better facilities of shipment. The time has not yet come to demonstrate the full usefulness of the Caraquet wharf. It will require another year or two for that. But for the building of the wharf Caraquet would not be what it is, one of the greatest fishing ports of the maritime provinces, and one of considerable export. And notwithstanding that my hon. friend and colleague from York (Mr. Crocket) seems willing to join with hon. members from Ontario, who are not so well acquainted with the conditions along the Atlantic coast, in decrying it. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should acquaint himself with the locality, its circumstances, resources and possibilities. If he will come to Caraquet I will welcome him and will escort him to the wharf and explain to him its relation to the resources of the district.

Mr. CROCKET. I understood him practically to admit the statement I had made, when he said that the time had not come yet for the use of that wharf.

Mr. TURGEON. Has not the hon. gentleman known of public works which were at first condemned as useless, but which became very useful in a year or two? The hon. gentleman has often criticised the expenditures made when the late Mr. Blair was Minister of Railways, for a grain elevator at the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway in St. John, which is now used both by the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to the great advantage of St. John. The same thing will happen, I believe, in regard to the Caraquet wharf. It will be used next year ten times more than it was last year. We must not ignore the necessities of the large population along the coast of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. We admit the need in the west of railway facilities for transportation, we also want railways in the maritime provinces, and we want wharfs and means of transportation along the coast of the Atlantic. The hon. gentleman has spoken of a wharf at Tracadie, which he turns into ridicule. Is he not aware that an immense lumber trade is carried on at Tracadie? This trade is greatly hampered on account of insufficient wharf facilities. The people of Northumberland county as well as of Gloucester are requesting further improvements. When that wharf was purchased by this department, a wharf built by our predecessors, it was necessary that a dock should be built in order to make the extension asked by the lumber dealers, who export over 15,000,000 feet of lumber from Tracadie every year. There is a request to-day for further accommodation at that very wharf by these lumber dealers in Tracadie, and if the Minister of Public Works was as charitable to me as he ought to be, he would place in his estimates an amount for a further extension of that wharf in order to accommodate the trade of that locality. There is also the Snowball Company who export seven or eight million feet of lumber; and there is an exportation of lumber from other points to a very large extent. Not only are large numbers of men engaged in winter in getting out the lumber, but in summer 50 or 60 men are engaged around the mills and as many more in the work of shipping. The hon. gentleman has also mentioned the wharf at Stonehaven. Now, if there is one wharf in all the maritime provinces whose usefulness has been established it is this wharf. The hon. gentleman says the Conservative party had commenced the wharf for the accommodation of fishermen along the coast near Stonehaven. Why, Mr. Speaker, there are no fishermen at Stonehaven. There are in the neighbourhood not only vast grind stone quarries, operated by the J. D. Reid Company, who happen to be relatives of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, but there are other interests. Besides the firm to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, there are other large companies operating these quarries. Every year there are immense shipments of freestone to the American markets, which could not be shipped were it not for the accommodation afforded by that wharf. The Conservative government had spent some $15,000 in commencing these works, and this government has continued them on the plan suggested by Mr. Shewin. I know they have cost $35,000, but they are for the purpose of maintaining these large industries, and facilitating the operation of these immense quarries which are the envy of every county in the maritime provinces. I say that the trade of that port in the freestone business alone is more than ten times sufficient to warrant the expenditure. If there has been one expenditure made anywhere in the Dominion of Canada which is justified by its utility, it is this wharf at Stonehaven. I need not say anything more on this question, except to invite the hon. gentleman to make himself more familiar with the topography of our province and of its resources, and especially to give us the name of the writer of that letter, because I attach no importance whatever to that letter until I know the name of the author.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). I was not present when the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) spoke in the early part of the evening, but I understand that he mentioned the Hull wharf, and complained that it had been a practically useless work. Unfortunately I have not in my possession certain data which I asked the manager of the International Portland Cement Company

to furnish me. But I hope to have the documents, and they will prove conclusively that this wharf has been of great use to several large corporations in the city of Hull and the county I have the honour to represent. When I get that information I will be glad to supply the hon. gentleman with it. I may say that the International Portland Cement Company, which has its head office in the city of Hull, is one of the most important cement companies in the Dominion of Canada.

It is shipping from the city of Hull immense quantities of cement and most of that cement is shipped by water from the Hull wharf. The exact quantity I cannot say, but the wharf was in constant use all last summer for the shipping of this cement. Hardly a day would go by but you would see hundreds of packages of cement piled upon the wharf. I do not want to give exact figures, because I have not got them, but the manager will give them to me and I will be happy to supply them to the House. Not only does the International Portland Cement Company use that wharf, but other corporations use it for shipping lumber and other commodities. There may have been other uses for the wharf in former years, but the new wharf is of immense benefit to the commercial interests of that part of the country. I am very glad that the hon. member for Argenteuil mentioned this particular work in the county of Wright. I am sorry that he should complain of what the Department of Public Works has done for the county of Wright. I have, at the present moment, before the hon. Minister of Public Works demands for several very important works in that county. I have laid before the minister a request for the building of a wharf at the town of Aylmer, and while Aylmer is not nearly the size of Hull I think it will be of immense advantage to Aylmer to have a wharf built by the Department of Public Works. I hope the Department of Public Works will see its way clear to give us this wharf, and even if it is attacked by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, as I have no doubt it will be attacked, as they are in the habit of attacking every work that comes to be built by this government, I expect to be in a position to point out the benefit which this work is to the town of Aylmer as well as to the surrounding country. I have also asked the minister to put in his estimates an item for certain works at Maniwaki in the same county and I hope he will be in a position to grant that request as well. The minister has granted an item for building a wharf at East Templeton. I cannot say, not having been here at the time that the hon. member for Argenteuil spoke, whether he mentioned that particular wharf at East Templeton or not. It is also, I might remind him, in the county of Wright and it will be of immense service to the people of that county and the people of Canada generally. I am sorry that this poor little wharf at Hull should be singled out repeatedly as a cause of attack by hon. gentlemen opposite. Last session the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) took charge of the Hull wharf and attacked it. Now, we find the hon. member for Argenteuil attacking it, and I am glad to have this occasion of pointing out to the House the great utility of the Hull wharf. As Hull is becoming commercially more important every year and promises to be one of the great cities of the Dominion, the wharf will be of still greater advantage as the city grows.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (Kings and Albert, N.B.). I might say for the benefit of the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) that he need have no diffidence whatever about preferring his requests to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) because the Minister of Public Works has already told us that all that hon. gentlemen have to do —that is hon. gentlemen opposite of course —is to ask for wharfs all over the country and they will be immediately granted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If in the public interest.

Mr. FOWLER. I know the hon. Minister of Public Works well; I have the honour to come from the same province as the hon. gentleman does and I know that he is ready to promise anything in sight.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You used to be a very warm supporter.

Mr. FOWLER. Never of yours.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Never, except when you were a Conservative and were running as our candidate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the local House.

Mr. FOWLER. I had the honour to be about the county of Kings with the hon. gentleman assisting him with his campaign when he was making an effort on behalf of honest government previous to that famous letter which he sent to the secretary of the Liberal-Conservative association regretting that his candidature had not met with the support that he expected in a certain locality, and proclaiming himself a member of the grand old party that had done so much for Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What has that to do with wharfs?

Mr. FOWLER. My hon. friend must not object because he brought it on himself by his interjection. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) deserves the thanks of the House for having brought forth such an eloquent speech from the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon), but, unfortunately, the hon. member for Gloucester was obliged to admit the

truth of the charges which the hon. member for York had made with respect to the expenditure on wharf after wharf. He had to admit that the wharf at Caraquet that had cost a large amount of money, not only to build in the first place, but to repair in the next year, was absolutely useless, because there was no trade for it, although he hoped that in time—I suppose when the Quebec bridge is finished, which will be some time during the present century—the wharf may be of some use. By that time whatever remains of the wharf, what has not been swept away by the winds or carried away by the tides, will be rotted away so that this expenditure will be perfectly useless. The hon. Minister of Public Works in his remarks seemed to try to convey the idea that the opposition want to oppose all public works throughout Canada. That is a perfectly absurd contention for the hon. gentleman to make and he knows it to be absurd. The opposition do not object to the expenditure of public money in this country. The opposition recognize as every right thinking man recognizes, that it is necessary to have large public expenditures, but what the opposition do object to, what they find fault with, is the manner in which these expenditures are made. They object to the wasting of public money in connection with these expenditures on account of the rascally way in which these works are carried on. The hon. gentleman criticised my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) and said that he only mentioned half a dozen instances. If we were to mention all the instances which are within the minds of members of the opposition we would require as long a session as the famous session of a week or two ago. Each member who has spoken has referred to the instances which are within his own knowledge. We are only giving samples. The hon. minister has said that the item to which my hon. friend from Argenteuil referred only amounted to some $200,000 or $300,000. To an hon. gentleman whose ideas are as large as those of the Minister of Public Works this is a mere bagatelle, but to the opposition, and to the business men of the country $200,000 or $300,000 is a matter of some moment. But, as I said, we are only giving samples. There are these expenditures over the whole width of this country, 4,000 miles in extent, hundreds and thousands of them going on everywhere and if we are to judge of the whole mass of the expenditures by the samples that we have given here to-night and which are within our own knowledge the waste of public money must be very great indeed and we must conclude that the statement of an hon. member that at least one-third of the public money that is expended on different public works is absolutely wasted is not far astray.

In the county of Kings there have been expenditures of the most outrageous character. For instance, there was an armoury built at Sussex. I have spoken of that matter before, but perhaps the Minister of Public Works is not acquainted with it. It was necessary to have a clerk of works to look after that building. The substructure, being built of stone and brick and the superstructure of wood, one would have supposed that a mason or a carpenter would have been engaged to supervise the erection of that building. But, no, a tailor was employed. He used to go up at noon when his shop was closed for lunch. He would take a hasty lunch and go up and look over this building. The contract price for the building was $4,700 and how much do you suppose the clerk of works drew from the public treasury for inspecting that building?—over $1,900. All you have to do is to turn up the Auditor General's Report to see a statement of that expenditure. It is also contained in the answer to a question that I asked in the House. The answer was brought down to the effect that something over $1,900 was paid to this gentleman for acting as inspector of this building, although the contract price was only $4,700. The time employed in carrying out the contract was only four or five months, and yet this gentleman drew $3 or $3.40 a day—I forget which—for somewhere near eighteen months. They forgot that he was employed there and he went on and drew his pay and got his check monthly. That is one way in which public money is being wasted. In the county of Albert there are a couple of wharfs lying very close together, there is not half a mile between them. One was all that was necessary, but there would not have been quite so much graft in one as there would be in two and therefore they had two. The sheriff of that county is a very strong supporter of the present administration. He had a leaky old scow that had to be constantly bailed. Some repairs were being made to the wharf and this gentleman's scow was engaged at $8 a day. They only required to use her about a day a week to convey materials but they would take the material all off the scow except a couple of barrels and then leave that on her for the days in which she was not required, so that she drew $8 a day for the storage of a few barrels of gravel. The people in these different communities know these things. These are samples that I would commend to the attention of the Minister of Public Works.

Some difficulty occurred to-night between the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway. As I understand this was the position: The government found it necessary to come to the rescue of this Quebec Bridge Company. There now, is a public work that I would commend to the attention of the Minister

of Public Works if he wants to do the right thing for this country. This Quebec bridge is one of the worst things that ever occurred in connection with public works in Canada, not alone on account of the awful waste of public money but also owing to the appalling loss of life caused by somebody's blunder—and it seems to me that even with the partisan report of the commission appointed by themselves, the responsibility for this must lie at the door of this government. It was necessary for the Quebec Bridge Company to have money, the company was formed in the first place without money; they relied on the subsidies they were to receive from the city of Quebec, the province of Quebec and the Dominion government and the bonds which they might float to build this bridge. It was just as in St. John, where a cold storage warehouse has been built, as I understand, out of the subsidies provided by the local government and the Dominion government; the parties who own the warehouse have not found it necessary to put any of their own money into it. It was necessary for the Quebec Bridge Company to have a large amount of money. They could not get it without a guarantee of bonds from the government because they could not float bonds notwithstanding all their subsidies. They came to this government asking them to guarantee the bonds and I am informed, and I think correctly informed, that the government found it necessary to borrow from the Bank of Montreal a very large amount of money for this Quebec Bridge Company and that they had to pay for this money a very considerable rate of interest.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman is absolutely incorrect. The Quebec Bridge Company borrowed its money, of course they had the government guarantee of their bonds behind it, but the government of Canada did not borrow a dollar for them.

Mr. FOWLER. It is immaterial whether the Quebec Bridge Company borrowed the money or the government borrowed it, so long as it was borrowed on the credit of the government of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. There was no dispute about the borrowing of the money. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) said that the government was in debt to the Bank of Montreal and that was the cause of the trouble. The question of the guarantee was never at issue.

Mr. FOWLER. Some one interjected something about the Canadian Pacific Railway and the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) said if it had not been for the fact that when the crisis came the Canadian Pacific Railway had several million dollars, I think $20,000,000, lying in the various banks of Canada, if the banks of Canada had not been indebted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the crisis would have been very much worse; and the government, instead of coming to the rescue of the banks, were large borrowers from the banks and in that way added to the financial insecurity.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman for Toronto (Mr. Osler) said that it was incorrect; but I will do him the justice to say he did not say that.

Mr. FOWLER. Does he say it is incorrect that the Canadian Pacific Railway had a large amount, several millions?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know if they had or not, but what has that to do with the government? If the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) said that the banks could not have paid their debts unless the Canadian Pacific Railway helped them, it is a reflection on the banks but it is none of my business.

Mr. FOWLER. The point is that the hon gentleman is squirming away; he has a peculiar facility in squirming away. The fact is the money was borrowed from the Canadian banks by the Bridge Company.

Mr. FIELDING. All right, yes.

Mr. FOWLER. They were enabled to do that by being able to give the government as security for the money and I say it is immaterial, so far as the withdrawal of that money from the use of the ordinary industrial occupations of the people is concerned, whether it was withdrawn by the government or the Quebec Bridge Company. That is the point made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler). That was considered a sufficient ground for hon. gentlemen opposite to get up and make a wanton attack on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No one made any attack on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister must have been out at the time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was here.

Mr. FOWLER. I heard the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) make a most bitter attack on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not so understand it.

Mr. FOWLER. My hon. friends opposite say: Oh, no. It sounded much like that to us. I am not here to advocate the claims of the Canadian Pacific Railway or to come to their defence but if it is true that when this great financial crisis came on this country, a crisis which has operated so disastrously for the people to the south, the Canadian Pacific Railway had $20,000,000 lying in the banks of this country which the banks were enabled to use in order to assist in carrying on the industrial business

of Canada, I say they have in some measure paid the debt which they owed to this country. It ill becomes hon. gentlemen opposite to make that a basis of attack on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will pardon me. Was he here during the whole discussion, or was he informed that an attack was made? I deny emphatically that anybody on this side of the House made an attack on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. FOWLER. I was present when the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) spoke, and he seemed to be in a very bitter, very savage, very fierce and vindictive mood. What he said was bad enough, but the manner in which he said it was infinitely worse. If he had made the statements in the suave manner that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works always adopts no matter with what bitter venom his words may be charged and which is a sort of antidote for the wound he inflicts it would have been very different. But the hon. member for Rainy River got up in a very malignant and vindictive way, and made a very bitter attack on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think I remember very distinctly the words of the hon. member for Rainy River. He said the Canadian Pacific Railway had received large aid from the people of Canada in the way of money grants and land grants, that he was not going to say that it had received too much, that the Canadian Pacific Railway had done a great deal of good to this country, but that it did not lie in the mouth of the hon. member for West Toronto, in the face of that, to complain of the expenditures of this government.

Mr. FOWLER. He said a great deal more than that. If he had made only the kindly remarks my hon. friend from Kootenay says he made, why was it necessary for him to make that insinuation with respect to the $30,000,000 loan, with the remark that he did not know how they had paid it back. They paid back the loan with land which is worth infinitely more to-day than the loan, interest included. They paid it back, part in land, and part in money. The whole loan is paid. There are many things in regard to which the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway might be attacked, and properly attacked; but what the hon. gentleman said had no basis whatever. Now, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House do not complain of the expenditure by itself; they simply complain of the manner in which it has been made; and the numberless instances which they have cited are only a few samples among many thousands that might be cited, in the Public Works Department and in every other department of this government, including the Department of Militia, which above all others should have been kept clear of graft, partisanship, and everything wrong and bad. We find graft everywhere. Take the matter of this Ross rifle, this weapon which is more dangerous to the man who uses it than to the man against whom it is used; the Ross rifle, which has never killed a man except the man who fired it. What sort of favourite is this Sir Charles Ross, who has been able to come out here and hypnotize this government to give him everything in sight? Is it because he is a baronet of the United Kingdom, or why is it? Why was he given 19½ acres of that old historic property, the Plains of Abraham, as a site for his factory, which it is now proposed to buy back for a cool million or million and a half of dollars? Take the Department of Marine and Fisheries; look at the oufitting of the Arctic—Paris plumes for the dusky belles among the Esquimaux, champagne, Laurier cigars, songs, all the delicacies of the season. Look at the outfitting of the 'Montcalm.' Look at the fact that it cost as much to supply the raw material for the food of the individual sailors on board the 'Montcalm' as it does for a guest at the Waldorf-Astoria. This is the way the public money of this country is wasted. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works looks astounded at this statement. The hon. gentleman is accustomed to a smaller sphere, to the restricted area of New Brunswick, where there is not much to steal, if you stole the whole of it. He is not accustomed to the wider sphere of this great Dominion, extending for 4,000 miles from east to west and 800 or 900 miles from north to south. But wait till he gets accustomed to it; wait till he gets his sea legs; and if we do not have an election until next year, if in view of what has occurred in the province of New Brunswick hon. gentlemen opposite think it better to hang on to a sure thing than to venture upon an uncertainty, and decide to postpone the election for another year, the hon. gentleman will show what he can do in the larger field. He has done well in the smaller field; he has lived fully up to his limitations, only restricted by the size of the field. When he has an opportunity to display himself over a country with 4,000 miles of frontier, he will be equal to the occasion. So I say to hon. gentlemen who want appropriations for their constituents, don't be afraid to go to the minister, even for a wharf like that at Caraquet, for which there is no traffic and which can be of no possible use unless possibly in the dim and distant future; but if you can catch a few votes, my hon. friend, in that pleasant, smiling way of his, washing his hands in invisible water, will say to you, 'I am surprised, my dear fellow, that you ask for so little; don't you want a larger appropriation?' I say, in view of what takes place day by day in this House and in the Public

Accounts Committee, when we are allowed to show it, by the grace of the obstruction club that takes its post in that chamber, and in view of the fact that we are here as trustees for the people of this country, I am compelled to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Argenteuil.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). I regret very much the lateness of the hour, but I consider this discussion too important to allow it to pass without putting myself on record. I am not going to travel into foreign lands as my hon. friend from New Brunswick did, but I want to refer to three or four expenditures in the riding I have the honour to represent. I wish to be fair, and therefore I admit that the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) is not responsible for these expenditures, as the works were built before he had charge of the department. Now, I would be the last man in this House to criticise proper expenditure, and should be very glad to see money spent in my riding, provided it is spent in the public interest. But the expenditures I am about to refer to were certainly not of that character. In the first place, I shall refer to the wharf built at Rondeau at an expense of about $5,000. Had that wharf been built as it should have been, it would be of some use to the public. It was begun just as soon as the general elections were announced, and has never given the public any benefit. If it was worth while building a wharf at all, one should have been built to the proper depth of water. I now come to the wharf at Jeannett's creek, on the river Thames, which was built two years ago, and to the manner of building which I drew the attention of the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman). Had that wharf been properly built, it would no doubt have been of great benefit to the farmers and the village of Tilbury, but it is practically useless, although it cost some $5,000. It was a cement wharf, built upon piles, and built under the charge of inexperienced men. The result has been that the cement practically split in about twenty places. The department had the wharf built on the edge of the channel, intending to dredge away from the face of it and fill in the back, but when they came to do that the wharf split in about fifteen or twenty places. No boat can land there. The 'City of Chatham,' a passenger boat, has landed a few times, but can only run in head first. She cannot run in sideways, and no boat drawing any reasonable draught can use the wharf. After the wharf was built it was simply useless to the public. When that wharf was completed the department undertook to build a wharf at the River Thames lighthouse, just a mile and a half below. I drew attention to this former wharf in order that the department might be advised and take precautions so that the new wharf might be properly constructed.

Mr. FOWLER.

I was informed that Mr. Lefebvre would have charge, and that there would be no ground for complaint. Well, that wharf was completed last year, and so far no boat has ever stopped there. It is practically in the same position as the former one. The cement has split and no boat can land at it, because they are afraid it will fall to pieces. I now come to the fourth public works expenditure in my riding. I refer to the Tecumseh park breakwater. I recommended that a wharf should be built where the old wharf now is, situated upon the site of that park, and such a wharf would be of great benefit to the citizens and boat-owners. However, some gentlemen—I presume the then government candidate, or the ex-member, or the present government candidate—recommended that the breakwater should be built at Point Tecumseh park, which is a beautiful point that every resident is proud of. But the breakwater built there, upon the plans submitted to the government, simply spoils the whole view. It is a large cement breakwater, built up six or seven feet from the level of the water. Had a proper cement breakwater been built there, a few feet high and properly built, the expenditure would have been perfectly justifiable instead of being money thrown away. Let me quote from the 'Planet' of January 22 of this year:

> The new breakwater on Tecumseh park point is slowly toppling over. The new government work will soon be a mass of ruins unless something is done immediately. The whole bank is gradually sliding into the creek —a bungled job.

I am not protesting against the expenditure made in the public benefit, but against expenditure which is utterly useless. Then there is this breakwater. I do not know the cost, but I am satisfied that it could not be less than between $4,000 and $5,000. A short time ago, when I was at home, I saw this whole massive structure, which is in 20-foot spans, all out of line like a broken down rail fence. The thing is a complete failure. Only one thing can be done with it, and that is to take dynamite and blow it up. It is nothing but an eyesore; it should never have been built as it was built. Now, these are only a few examples in my own constituency. I shall not, as the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) said, travel to foreign ground.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is there nothing done in the hon. gentleman's constituency which is to the public benefit?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Had these been properly built, and built in the right places, I would have been the first to give the government credit for its work. As I have stated, I recommended both these wharfs on the River Thames, but I did not recommend the breakwater in that beautiful park, though I did recommend a small expenditure on the side of the park in es-

tablishing a wharf. The minister (Mr. Pugsley) has been in charge of the department since January last, so he can bear out what I say, that his engineers went up there to look into this breakwater, and we had the spectacle of these gentlemen asking the city council of Chatham to bear part of the cost of repairing this bungled job which had practically tumbled down. Some talk of jacking these immense abutments of cement and repiling it. But the minister knows something of cement work and knows that this cannot be repaired. If the department had taken $5,000 and thrown it into the river, the public would have got just as much benefit from it as they get from this expenditure. As to the expenditure at Rondeau harbour, if you want to make that useful, you must build a wharf out to a depth of water that will enable it to be reached by vessels drawing at least five or six feet, so that the structure can be used for shipping in coal or shipping out small produce. I hope the minister will look into this matter and see if the public cannot be given some use of the wharf.

Mr. R. N. WALSH (Huntingdon). I had not intended to take part in this debate, and would not have done so, but for a remark of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). That hon. gentleman said he was willing to spend money where it could be spent in the interest of Canada. Would he consider an expenditure in the interests of Canada if it would reclaim 20,000 acres of land worth $400,000 for an expenditure of $80,000 ? The hon. minister does not answer, so I suppose he thinks this is not worth while. Well, if I tell him that the damage done to this land is due to work done by this government, would that be any additional reason why he should undertake this expenditure ? Let me explain the case, which is an old one and well known in that section of country. This land lies in the county which I have the honour to represent. My predecessor in the representation of the county urged this matter upon the government, and an engineer was sent to make a report in the year 1902. His report was to the effect that 20,000 acres of land was flooded as a result of work carried on by this government which raised the level of the river St. Lawrence. The engineer reported that, at an expense of some $80,000, this land could be reclaimed, and that the land was valued at $20 an acre which would represent $400,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. N. Walsh) asks me a question, and I desire to give him the courtesy of an answer. I would say it all depends on what may be called the national character of the work. If by a public work, a vast quantity of land could be prevented from flooding and a large number of people can be benefited, I think that would be a work fairly within the purview of the federal government.

Mr. R. N. WALSH. I think it would be as much benefit to Canada as to build a wharf where there is no water.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no such wharf. A remark of that kind was made about D'Israeli wharf, but I find from the report that there is twelve feet of water there.

Mr. R. N. WALSH. The report of the engineer showed that the work was feasible and also that the damage had been caused by the government. The government recognized their liability, for they have spent money in building a breakwater alongside the St. Lawrence below that. In the session of 1903, $15,000 was put in the estimates for this work. But nothing was done until the following year, when the matter assumed considerable importance. The following is a telegram sent to the engineer :

Ottawa, October 11, 1904.

To J. L. Michaud, Resident Engineer,
Merchant's Bank building, St. James street, Montreal.

You are hereby authorized to proceed by day labour with improvements in River Laguerre, for which sum fifteen thousand dollars granted by parliament during last session.

(Sgd.) EUGENE D. LAFLEUR,
Acting Chief Engineer.

That looked very well. But, unfortunately, on April 18, 1905, the following was sent :

April 18, 1905.

Sir,—I have to inform you that the hon, the minister, has requested that no further action be taken with regard to improvement between St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe. You will, therefore, kindly govern yourself accordingly.

Yours obediently,
EUGENE D. LAFLEUR,
Chief Engineer.

J. L. Michaud, Esq., Resident Engineer,
Merchants' Bank building, Montreal, Quebec.

That is as far as the work got. In the estimates of 1905 there appeared the sum of $10,000 for this work. I made inquiry at the time to find out what had become of the other $5,000. It was said that it had been expected that $5,000 would have been spent up to that time. But only $600 had been spent. Some of that was for surveying. Well, I had the curiosity to look up the Auditor General's Report, and I find that the men who drew the money were not surveyors. But, what is more, getting the return, I find that the plans, surveys, maps, &c., were made in 1902, consequently the money could not have been used for that. Now, I ask the minister if this is not a case which should receive some consideration ? Does not he think that this is a case in which money could be spent to the advantage of the people of Canada ? I at least. do. I think that the action of the

government in bringing down these estimates and having them voted, and in doing the work, acknowledge their liability to carry out the work.

Mr. G. W. GANONG (Charlotte). I rise principally to warn hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. The hon. member for King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler), from his personal acquaintance and long experience with the present Minister of Public Works warned the people of New Brunswick just before the election that they would probably have splendid promises. I want to read one of these promises, because I think it is worth going on 'Hansard':

Office of the Minister of Public Works for Canada,

St. Johns, February 15, 1908.

H. H. McLean, Esq., K.C., city.

Dear Colonel McLean,—In answer to your inquiry of this date as to my decision regarding the building of wharfs on the St. John river, to the necessity of which you have several times called my attention, I have to inform you that from the report of the resident engineer of my department it appears that the work required on a number of the wharfs would be in the nature of repairing or rebuilding existing whafs, which might properly be attended to by the provincial government.

This is the nice part:

As to the following wharfs, however, namely, at Maugerville, Sheffield, Oromocto and Burton, in respect of which the engineer has made surveys and reports, I have decided to build these, and have given directions for the preparation of the necessary plans and specifications so that tenders may be called for their construction.

I am yours faithfully,
WM. PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is there wrong about that?

Mr. GANONG. The election took place on March 3, and this was written to the gentleman who is selected as the candidate for that district for the Dominion parliament by the present Minister of Public Works himself. To follow that out, let us see what action Colonel McLean has taken, who is to be the Dominion candidate. The gentlemen referred to in this letter were candidates in the county of Sunbury, the county which had the honour to return Mr. J. Douglas Hazen, who is leader of the new government in New Brunswick:

St. John, N.B., February 22, 1908.

Dear Sir,—Enclosed please find copy of letter from the Hon. Wm. Pugsley. I am sure you will be glad to know that the government have decided on building the wharfs named therein. Without Dr. Peake's and Mr. Thurrott's assistance, I am satisfied I would not have been successful in impressing on Mr. Pugsley the necessity for these works.

Yours very truly,
HUGH. H. McLEAN.

This was sent broadcast to every elector in the county. This is the class of campaign stuff that we had in the last local election in New Brunswick, and I warn hon. gentlemen that if they ever receive such letters as that, to pay no attention to them, or they will be snowed under. The hon. gentleman knows what it is to be snowed under.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is not the first time he has been snowed under.

Mr. GANONG. But there never was such a snowstorm as that in the history of the province. At one time he stood very high in the councils of the province, but to-day he is simply a wandering Willie, and he will find that out when he again attempts to influence the constituencies of New Brunswick. Now my hon. friend suggested a coalition government. And here is a little point that has not been brought out by the Minister of Public Works, no doubt he has forgotten it. The member for King's and Albert spoke about a letter being written after the hon. gentleman concluded that the sledding was very poor in King's county in 1896. He went to St. John. At that time the hon. gentleman contended that Sir Charles Tupper was too Catholic for him, he could not support him on the Manitoba school question; and Sir Wilfrid Laurier was more Catholic, so he could not support him. The hon. gentleman at that time was dreaming dreams and seeing visions. He ran as an Orange candidate in the city of St. John and claimed the support of Orangemen. He was also, I believe, the candidate for Grand Master.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will pardon me. I beg to assure him that the Orangemen had no candidate in that contest.

Mr. GANONG. Oh no, the Orangeman had not, but my hon. friend was canvassing all over for the Orange vote, and he was understood at that time to be a candidate for Grand Master in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I say again that my hon. friend is entirely misinformed. I never was a candidate and never thought of being a candidate.

Mr. GANONG. I believe the people who tell me that belonged to the Orange order just the same.

Mr. BENNETT. Did he ride the white horse?

Mr. GANONG. No, but his visions ran that way, he hoped to be the leader of some great party.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is no disgrace to be an Orangeman.

Mr. GANONG. I have not said it was. We have some very respectable men among

the Orangemen. But apparently the hon. gentleman did not get the position he was after.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I do not rise to take part in the general debate, but only to refer to some allusions made by several hon. gentlemen in regard to Nova Scotia, and particularly to my own constituency, which call for one or two remarks. No one would be surprised at the rather reckless statements made by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) who was kind enough to say that all the expenditures of public money in the counties of Shelburne and Queen's were bribes to the electors. But I am bound to say that I expected a little more serious consideration from my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) than I think he has given to this matter; and I would make the same remark with regard to my hon. friend from Toronto West (Mr. Osler). He was very free in his criticisms of public works in Nova Scotia. Will my hon. friend tell me, did he make a trip along the coast of Nova Scotia, and from personal observation obtain the information he has given to the House tonight?

Mr. OSLER. I think I stated frankly that my statements were made from observation, going down from Quebec to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

Mr. FIELDING. Did he go along the coast of Nova Scotia and see these wharfs himself, or what wharfs did he see on the coast of Nova Scotia? I am not unreasonable in asking him to give me the names of these wharfs, if there is that discreditable condition he describes. He must have some information. Is it fair in the hon. gentleman to come into the House and make these scandalous statements of mismanagement of the Public Works Department, without giving us a single fact to sustain them.

Mr. OSLER. I said that I made my statements from observation, I gave them as of my own knowledge. All you have to do is to take up the estimates and examine them. I think that in last year's or this year's estimates for Nova Scotia—I have not the estimates before me—there are votes of $327,000 of which $227,000 are revotes kept dangling before the electors for no other than election purposes.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Would the hon. member say what particular places he visited in Nova Scotia?

Mr. OSLER. I could not say what they were.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not understand whether my hon. friend definitely stated that he personally visited the province or coast of Nova Scotia and saw these wharfs. Did he say so? I want him to say yes or no.

Mr. OSLER. I said that I had personally visited the St. Lawrence and the coast of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

Mr. FIELDING. I am speaking particularly of my own province of Nova Scotia and I ask him in all fairness to say if his observation extended to Nova Scotia?

Mr. OSLER. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. Then the hon. gentleman did visit Nova Scotia and saw these wharfs themselves? Is that correct?

Mr. OSLER. Part of it.

Mr. FIELDING. Will the hon. gentleman give us some information as to what part? It might not be fair to the hon. gentleman to ask him to give any extended list, but what part of Nova Scotia did he visit?

Mr. OSLER. I have made my statement. Does the hon. gentleman say that it is not true?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not wish to say things that are unparliamentary. I believe the hon. gentleman to have made a statement that is scandalously untrue.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FIELDING. I have given the hon. gentleman a chance——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FIELDING. I have given the hon. gentleman a chance——

Mr. TAYLOR. Order. 'Scandalously untrue' is unparliamentary.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman challenged me to say that his statement was untrue. I stated that I did not like to use language of that kind because it was improper and then went on to say that I believed that his statement was scandalously untrue. He forced me to say it.

Mr. OSLER. I have no objection to the statement of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FIELDING. I withdraw it in deference to the parliamentary rule. I am giving him an opportunity of showing some ground for that statement that he has made. He will not even say what part of Nova Scotia he visited.

Mr. OSLER. I have made my statement.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but the hon. gentleman will not state what part of Nova Scotia he visited, or in what county he made these observations. Surely my hon. friend is not going to allow himself to remain in that position. If he does—well, I am sorry for him. I think it is a mistake, I think he is not doing himself justice to

make a statement of that character, and, when challenged, refuse to state even the county in Nova Scotia where he made these observations.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think the hon. Minister of Finance has any reason to show so much temper in this discussion nor do I think that the language that the hon. gentleman used——

Mr. FIELDING. Is my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) raising a point of order or asking a question ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend wishes to ask a question I will yield at once.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought the hon. gentleman was through.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I am only beginning.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then I rise to a point of order. Now, I have the floor and I think it is only fair that the hon. Minister of Finance should take back or apologize in some way for the expression that he used when he said that the statement of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) was 'scandalously untrue.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He did take it back.

Mr. FIELDING. In the first place I did not use it in that way, and in the second place the language which I did use was forced by his own statement, and I stated that it was unparliamentary, and that I did not wish to use it and I did withdraw it and do now. Now, the only excuse that the hon. member from Toronto has for this or these statements which are unjust, which are absolutely unwarranted—the hon. gentleman has not given us the ground on which they were based and has not even stated the name of the county in Nova Scotia that he visited or in which he made these so-called observations——

Mr. OSLER. I do not believe that I could state the name of a county in Nova Scotia.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman could not even name a county in Nova Scotia does he not think that he might have been a little less rash in plunging in with a statement that there is mismanagement of the public works in that province? If my hon. friend knows as little as he professes to of Nova Scotia he might at all events pay himself the compliment of making no observations about that province at all. But my hon. friend says that the pages of the estimates will prove that there is something wrong in connection with these public works. He says: Look at this list of estimates which are revoted and are kept there simply dangling before the eyes of the electors. What right has the hon. gentleman to say what motive is in the minds of hon. members on this side of the House ? Why should he attribute motives to them ? How can he say what is in their minds ?

Mr. OSLER. By their actions.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman can point to no action which justifies his remark. It has long been the practice to take a vote for a public work and then to discover, as the year rolls on, that you have not the machinery which enables you to put the expenditure into operation. You have to get the amount voted even if you are never able to go on with the work. Then the end of the season comes and you are obliged to revote it. Session after session, ever since we have had the estimates, that has been done and there is nothing wrong, nothing unparliamentary in it ; yet, hon. gentlemen see fit to repeat that in this matter there is something unfair, something unjust and something that has in it a political purpose. I am sorry that the hon. member for Toronto has taken that position, because we have a right to expect more consideration from him. He does not visit us in this House as often as we should like to find him, but when he comes so seldom he might at least conduct himself in regard to attacks upon the government with a little more fairness and consideration.

Now, in regard to the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) I may say that I would expect the serious discussion of public questions by him. The hon. gentleman made reference to two or three works in the constituency of Shelburne-Queens. I did not catch the name of one of them, but one was a work at Gunning Cove and another was a work at Red Head. Let me say generally of these works in the counties of Shelburne and Queens that I cannot speak of them personally, or from personal knowledge or personal observation as my hon. friend from Toronto seems to think that he can speak for them, even although he never goes near them. It is a misfortune that the exacting public duties of a minister prevent him, especially if it is in a remote part of the country, from visiting his constituency as frequently as he would desire, and I therefore would not undertake to speak from personal observation of these things. But I know that there is no public work undertaken in the counties of Shelburne and Queens that has not been undertaken under either one of two forms ; it was either undertaken as the result of the application of the people themselves by their petition, or it was undertaken upon the recommendation

of the district engineer in consequence of his own observation and knowledge. I make that statement generally. If the people of a given district petition for a work and that work is constructed surely it is quite improper for an hon. gentleman to come into this House and say that you have given them that work as a bribe. Mention has been made of a little wharf that was constructed at Gunning Cove. What is the accusation? I have not all the facts under my hand—this discussion has come on at a moment when the public works offices are closed and I could not turn up the files—but my recollection is that this wharf was applied for, it was represented that arrangements were being made by the municipality to secure a right of way, and as we desired to please the people proceedings were taken and a wharf was constructed. I forget the cost of this small work. It turned out afterwards that there was a difficulty about getting the right of way. That was not a very serious matter. It would only show that the desire of the government was to meet the wishes of the people. My hon. friends would imply that there could be nothing but what is political in all these things. It is my misfortune not to have a great many friends in the district of Gunning Cove. If the view the hon. gentleman thinks we hold in these matters prevailed there would be no wharf at Gunning Cove. Ever since I have had the honour of representing that constituency, I have had to admit that I had not the support of that district. It voted three or four to one against me in every election and will continue to do so. But the people in that district, although they voted three or four to one against me, sent in a petition to the department, I have no doubt, to have a little wharf constructed there, and regardless of political consequences, and simply and solely with a view of accommodating the people, that little wharf was constructed.

Reference was made by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) to a work at Red Head. I think I am correct in the reference? The hon. gentleman says, yes. Here he says a work was constructed which was absolutely useless, and in fact its only purpose apparently to drain a lake. That was a grave, a serious accusation and I asked the hon. gentleman for his authority. He could not give me any, he could only say: I am informed. I put it to him as a fair man, is it reasonable, right or decent for any man to stand up in this House and make an accusation of that character and say: I am informed by some one else?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FIELDING—and when asked by whom he was informed he declined to say. I put it to the sense of fairness of my hon. friend that this is not fair politics, I would expect better things from him. But what are the facts? This is an old fiction, a thing which was brought into this House years ago, a miserable pitiful fabrication, the life of which was crushed out six years ago, and which has never been mentioned here from that day to this. Six years ago the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) stated in this House that he was informed—he went no further—that this was a useless, wasteful work. He was informed that its only effect was to allow the water to run out of the lake. I need not quote at length but I have the quotation here. The locality was not identified, but later in the discussion it was identified, as Red Head. He said:

> Take the expenditure for the purpose of cutting a canal between a lake at Black Point in the County of Shelburne or Queens—I do not know which—and tidal water. The information given me by a gentleman, who has personal knowledge, is that the project was to cut a canal between tide water and the lake for the purpose of affording shelter to fishermen. The project had been reported on years ago adversely by the engineer in charge, Mr. Dodwell.

I want that point emphasized, because Mr. Dodwell was an engineer who had been in the employ of the government many years, a gentleman of eminence in his profession, appointed by our predecessors, continued in office by us and still one of the engineers of the government in Nova Scotia. He went on:

> Mr. Dodwell has said it was no use undertaking the work because the bottom of the lake was higher than tide water, and the construction of the work could not possibly result in any advantage to the fishermen; but under Mr. Locke's report——

Mr. Locke was the engineer under whom the work was constructed.

> —the canal was cut at considerable expense, and it was found that the bottom of the lake was above tide water so that the water simply ran out of the lake and the expenditure was absolutely thrown away. This is worse than waste of public money, and the Minister of Public Works should inform the House whether or not the statement I have made is correct.

It will be observed that the statement then made, six years ago, by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) in consequence of information that he said was given him, was substantially the same statement that my hon. friend (Mr. Perley) has repeated here to-night. The fact that these gentlemen, who profess to have such a fund of information with which to attack the government, come here again and again, warming over the old issues of by-gone years, telling the same old stories that they told in by-gone years—surely that must be taken by the country as an indication that they do not feel any of the confidence which they profess in their ability to assail this government on that class of questions.

What are the facts? You will observe that the statement was made by an irresponsible person to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the name was never given. We are able to draw inferences. I have reason to believe the information was given to the leader of the opposition by a gentleman whom he personally did not know and could not know but who was simply a disappointed office seeker who wanted a job on the work and did not get it and sought by that means to make trouble. However that may be, the hon. gentleman himself could have no means of knowing. I suppose he got a letter and he made inquiry. We sent a communication to the engineer in charge. Whose opinion is to be taken in this matter, that of the irresponsible people whose names nobody will mention, or that of the engineer who has a reputation to uphold in the country? Here is the report made at that time by the engineer in charge, Mr. Thos. J. Locke.

At Redhead, Shelburne county, we expended about $2,100 to convert a pond on inside of beach into a boat harbour in the spring of 1900.

I said this was six years ago. It is worse, it is eight years ago; the thing was almost before the flood.

And built cribwork protection walls to low water about 300 feet in length. On November 10, 1897, Mr. Dodwell reported on examination of this place. The work is substantial and the boat harbour is now and has been used as a shelter successfully. The class of boats used are skiff boats about 18 foot keel. The channel, from low water to pond is 20 feet wide and at low tide the boats seek its mouth as shelter, and as the tide rises go into the pond at about approximated half tide.

For additional particulars Mr. Locke refers to his report in the Public Works records. Turning to that fuller and more detailed report, we have a description of the whole operation, and then:

I may mention that the estimated cost of this work was $2,360, and although we constructed more work than was at first estimated to be necessary, yet the total cost was slightly under $2,100. The credit for this apparent saving is due to no engineering skill, but to the earnest and honest manner in which every labourer engaged in the work performed his duties. Too often in employing labour upon government works are the employees inclined to shirk responsibility, thinking in their ignorance that the money to the credit of the work is inexhaustible, but in this case each and every man knew that the building of the work meant a great deal to himself personally and in consequence we received more than just recompense for the wages paid to labourers. The work is strong and substantial and I have much pleasure in informing you that this work is satisfactory in every respect.

That is not the report of an irresponsible man, that is not the report of somebody who refuses to give his name—that is the

Mr. FIELDING.

report of a well known young engineer in the province of good reputation, who has his reputation to maintain. What does my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) think to-day when he says: I am informed that this thing is wrong. He has not a name or authority to give against that young man's report. It will be remembered that in the statement made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) some years ago he told us he was informed that Mr. Dodwell the old engineer had reported against this work. That was almost the essence of the complaint, that Mr. Dodwell, the capable engineer, had reported against the work and that notwithstanding that the government had taken up this work and built it. That is a very important, a very material point. But what do we find in the public records? We find that in 1897 this very Mr. Dodwell, who we were informed had reported against this work, was the first engineer to report on it, and he reported in its favour.

November 10, 1897.

L. Coste, Esq.,
Chief Engineer, Public Works Department,
Ottawa.

Sir,—In accordance with instructions contained in your letter No. 2866, of August 6, 1897, I made a survey and examination early in September at Red Head, Shelburne county, and I now beg to submit the inclosed plan and the following report:

Red Head is a small promontory or headland on the west side of the mouth of Shelburne harbour, twelve miles due south of the county town. The settlement on and near the head comprises some two or three hundred people dependent for a living almost exclusively upon fishing.

A fresh water pond of ten or twelve acres in extent, separated from the ocean by shingle beaches, through which was a narrow channel used many many years ago to afford a safe and convenient harbour for the fishing fleet, but it gradually filled up owing to the drift of the gravel until it was with difficulty that a boat could be forced through even at high water. Some few years before confederation, therefore, an attempt was made to re-open the channel and a grant of $100 was made by the provincial government. With this sum together with labour and materials furnished by the inhabitants, a piece of crib and pile work about 200 feet long was built on the south side of the channel. The north side of the channel being unprotected, it soon filled up and the work gradually became buried in gravel. At the present time, and for some years past, the fishermen of the neighbourhood, on the approach of a storm, and also for winter quarters are obliged in order to save their boats from destruction to haul them on the beach, and often before this can be done they are dashed on the shore and injured or broken to pieces.

To enable the fishermen to carry on their operations under somewhat more favourable conditions it is desirable that the boat channel be permanently re-opened. This can probably be accomplished by the construction of the two-winged walls of cribwork, and the digging

of the channel between them as shown on the accompanying plan, which would give a protected channel having about six feet of water at H.W.O.S.T., spring tides rise 7 feet, neaps 5½ feet. That would probably remain open for some years and prove a great boon to the inhabitants.

I estimate the cost of this proposed work at $2,360.

Yours obediently,
(Sgd.) C. E. W. DODWELL,
Resident Engineer.

Now, Sir, I say that every point intended to be made in connection with this work was absolutely false and unfounded. In the first place, the hon. gentleman tried to make it appear that it was an utterly useless and wasteful work. We have the evidence as far back as before confederation that the government of the day granted money, and the people gave their own time and their own labour, to make a harbour there. We have the evidence of Mr. Dodwell, who the hon. gentleman said had reported against it, and he puts on record his statement that it would be a useful work, and that it would cost $2,360; and we have the evidence of Mr. Locke, the engineer under whom it was constructed, that they were able to complete the work for $2,100, because the people, realizing the value of the work to themselves, in saving their property and perhaps their lives, worked unusually hard and gave more than value for what they received, with the result that for an expenditure of $2,100 we have a work there of the utmost value to the people. And that is one of the class of cases my hon. friend from Argenteuil has taken up to-night, and on which he bases the motion which he has made.

Mr. R. L BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that the Minister of Finance, who is attempting to lead the House in the absence of the Prime Minister, should have given such an exhibition to the members who are present as that which he has just given. The fact that he used unparliamentary language, with the knowledge that it was unparliamentary, is a curious example for him to offer to hon. gentlemen on either side or the House.

Mr. FIELDING. 'Hansard' will answer that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I dare say it will, and it will prove exactly what I have stated.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I am incorrect in that, why was it that the Minister of Finance, two minutes after he made the statement, saw fit to withdraw it?

Mr. FIELDING. That is only part of the story, and the hon. gentleman knows it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know exactly what I am stating. The petulant fit of temper in which he rose to-night does not do him any credit, and will not enhance his prestige or standing in this House.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think my hon. friend is a judge of that question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman is giving an exhibition now—an exhibition of dignity and leadership in this House which I am sure must delight all those who sit behind him.

I am not going very fully, Mr. Speaker, into the matters which have been discussed. The very statement the Minister of Finance has read to the House amply justifies my hon. friend from Argenteuil in bringing this matter to the attention of this House. What is the statement of the Minister of Finance on which he relies for the defence of this particular work? That it is useful to the fishermen after half tide. That is the best he could get from the engineer who has superseded Mr. Dodwell in Nova Scotia in order that some of those works might be carried on. That is generally known and recognized in the province of Nova Scotia. For my part, I would like very much to have Mr. Locke examined before a committee of this House, or before some competent tribunal, before I would be inclined to accept every statement in that report as being absolutely unqualified in respect to the condition of this work and the character of its usefulness to the people at large. It is idle for the hon. gentleman to fly into a temper and endeavour to persuade the people of Nova Scotia or the people of Canada that no public money has ben wasted in the county of Queens and Shelburne. It is universally recognized in the county itself, even by the hon. gentleman's own supporters, that public money has been wasted there, and wilfully wasted. I have no doubt that many of the works constructed there are useful works; I am making no wholesale condemnation; but I heard it stated by the hon. gentleman's opponent in the last election, Mr. James J. Ritchie, with respect to one of these works, that he went to a supporter of the Minister of Finance and asked his opinion of a public work which could be seen from that man's window, and the man said: 'It is absolutely of no use whatever; if Mr. Fielding desired to benefit us in this way, why did he not take the money this has cost and divide it up among the people in this neighbourhood?'

Mr. FIELDING. Will my hon. friend give us the name?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have given the name of Mr. J. J. Ritchie, and if the hon. gentleman wants to inquire into this, I will have the man brought before a committee of this House. I want to tell him also that Mr. M. H. Richardson, the local Liberal member for the county of Shelburne, regarded one of these works as absolutely useless, and, in a

little poem which he published, he designated it as Fielding's Folly, and it is known as such throughout the length and breadth of Nova Scotia to-day. I do not say that all of these works are useless; I dare say many of them are useful and would be supported by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House; but when the hon. Minister of Finance attempts to drive it down the throats of the members of this House that there has been no waste of public money in Queen's and Shelburne, he is undertaking a task that is too large even for his eminent abilities. The hon. the Minister of Finance might as well have devoted his attention to some other matters to-night. Why did he not give his attention to the payment of $1,900, as stated by my hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Fowler), to a tailor for supervising the work upon a public building which cost $4,-200? What does the hon. gentleman think of that?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who does ?

Mr. FIELDING. As I did not, I did not speak of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman very conveniently does not know anything about some of these things very much to the detriment of the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Rather ancient.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How so ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It occurred five or six years ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend endeavours to create a sort of statute of limitation for these things. I do not know at what term he would wish to consign to forgetfulness the lesson he has lately received in the province of New Brunswick ? Without attempting any detailed criticism, it is apparent to every one who pays any attention to the matter, that there is absolutely no system governing the appropriations of public money for public works in this country. My hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) brought that out very well when he pointed to the construction of certain wharfs in small lakes. If you are going to undertake works of that kind, where are you to stop? And on what principle do you construct them? I can well understand the principle upon which the late Alexander Mackenzie and his government are said to have proceeded, namely, that where these works are of a federal character, they would be provided for out of the federal funds; where they were partly of a federal and partly of a provincial character, they would be left entirely to the provincial treasury. I can understand such a principle as that, but I cannot understand, at least I cannot appreciate, the principle under which these works are constructed throughout the country by this government—solely according to the political expediency of the moment and the amount of political advantage which hon. gentlemen in office for the time being may think they can derive from them. Surely that is no principle, yet I challenge any man to state any other on which the expenditure of public money for public works has been carried on. The illustrations given by my hon. friend from Argenteuil were but samples. There are many others in my mind, which I would give if the hour were not so late. Take, for instance, the wharf at Grande Vallée, in the province of Quebec, where $60,000 of the public money was expended.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is that Seven Islands ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, it is an expenditure which has been pretty well discussed in this House within the past three or four years and for which there was absolutely no defence. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) does not seem to realize that in these matters he has very great responsibility. He seems rather inclined to give the lead in his own county and furnish an example to his colleagues on the treasury benches and their supporters to show how appropriations for public works may be obtained and used. Let me point out to him the language of a man whose opinion he will respect—the language of William Ewart Gladstone—with regard to the duty of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain, and these duties are precisely of the same character as those my hon. friend has to carry out in this country :—

> No chancellor of the exchequer is worth his salt who makes his own popularity either his first consideration, or any consideration at all in administering the public purse. In my opinion the Chancellor of the Exchequer is the trusted and confidential steward of the public. He is under a sacred obligation with regard to all that he consents to spend.

Then Mr. Morley, from whose work I take this quotation, continues himself :—

> This tone of thinking and feeling about the service of the state spread under his majesterial influence from chancellors and the permanent officers that bear unobtrusive but effective sway in Whitehall, down to tide-waiters and distributors of stamps. As Burke put the old latin saw, he endeavoured to give us his system of economy, which is itself a great revenue.

On another occasion Mr. Gladstone said :

> I mean this, that together with the so-called increase of expenditure there grows up what may be termed a spirit of expenditure, a desire, a tendency prevailing in the country which, insensibly and unconsciously perhaps, but really, effects the spirit of the people, the spirit of parliament, the spirit of the public departments, and perhaps even the spirit of those whose duty it is to submit the estimates to parliament.

On another occasion he said :

The Chancellor of the Exchequer should boldly uphold economy in detail; and it is the mark of a chicken-hearted chancellor when he shrinks from upholding economy in detail, when because it is a question of only two or three thousand pounds, he says that is no matter.

And as Mr. Morley remarks in another passage, democracy is apt to be spendthrift and any Chancellor of the Exchequer should endeavour to put the brakes on. But instead of doing that, our Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) sets the example to every one of his colleagues and supporters by lavish, extravagant and absurd expenditures in his own constituency. At this hour I will not trespass further, and only regret that the hon. the Minister of Finance should have seen fit to give way to the temper he has exhibited this evening.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (South Cape Breton). Our hon. friends opposite are in the habit of discussing from day to day at great length matters of importance only from a party point of view, but here is a question of importance to the people, and therefore I propose to detain the House for a short while, even at this late hour, in putting myself on record with regard to it. The hon. leader of the opposition opened his remarks by asserting that the Finance Minister had given an exhibition and proceeded to lecture him. Well, if the signs of the time point correctly, it will be many a long day before the hon. gentleman has any license to lecture the Minister of Finance or any other hon. member on this side as regards making an exhibition of himself. But what I want to deal with particularly is the remarks made by the leader of the opposition regarding certain works in Queens and Shelburne. With regard to those the hon. gentleman said that the best that could be said of them was that they are useful to the fishermen only at half tide.

If the hon. gentleman had any appreciation of the needs of the fishermen of Nova Scotia and on the sea-coasts of Canada generally, and the conditions under which they labour, he would not quarrel with an expenditure which would benefit them even at half tide. It is because he has no knowledge of conditions among the fishermen that he has made his criticisms of this evening. If he had the interest of the people of this country at heart he would familiarize himself with the conditions that obtain among the fishermen; and if he had enough interest in their welfare to go among them and learn how their work is done, he would not quarrel in this House with an expenditure that would benefit them. The hon. gentleman says that the universal opinion in the counties of Queens and Shelburne is that the public works in that county are useless. The hon. gentleman has no knowledge of the situation. But let me say, with some knowledge of the situation, that that statement is not correct—and that, I believe, is as strongly as I am allowed to put it. I have been in Queens and Shelburne. The hon. gentleman had his opportunity to go there not very long ago, but he took mighty good care not to go. Had he gone into those counties he would have ascertained the facts, and he would know that this statement concerning the opinions of the people of Queens and Shelburne is wholly wrong. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) does not relish being told the truth. But, so far as I am concerned, the truth he shall hear.

An hon. MEMBER. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) is going away.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I would like to have the graveyard statesman remain, for I have some observations to address to him also. I should have liked it much if the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) had remained in his seat. But I know that his reason for not remaining is that he does not care to be confronted with the facts of the case.

Mr. GAUVREAU. He can't stand it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, he can't stand it. But it is time that the country understood that the statements made by the leader of the opposition and the gentlemen who support him are wide of the mark. It will be our duty to educate the hon. gentleman as to what is going on in this country, for he has been asleep for ten years.

Now, I come to an observation of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler). He is not in the House just now. He is not very often in this House. I want the people of this country to know that the gentleman who comes into this House and undertakes to lecture 'back benchers' on the government side is rarely in his seat. If his constituents have their own interests and the interests of the country at heart, they will take the hon. gentleman to task for absenting himself so much from this House. I would not call attention to this but for the fact that the hon. gentleman rarely comes into this House without making himself offensive to gentlemen who sit on this side —gentlemen who do not propose henceforth to take lectures from him or anybody else. I call attention to the matter for the reason that when the hon. gentleman comes into this House, which he does only on occasion, he seems utterly incapable of conducting himself as he ought to do. When the hon. gentleman says that he makes his comments as the result of observation in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, I say, at least so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, he is speaking incorrectly. I do not know how far you will permit me to go, Mr. Speaker, in emphasizing that statement. I read a statement by the hon. member for West Toronto made outside this House and during the recess. I suppose I should be within my right in characterizing that statement

correctly, it having been made outside. Very well, Mr. Speaker, I understand I have not the right to characterize that statement correctly. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) made a statement that this government, during all the years it has been in power, had never made an honest contract. Well, that statement was exactly on a par with the statement made by the hon. gentleman in regard to having personally observed wharfs in the province of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman was obliged to admit that he had absolutely no foundation for the statement he has made. I want to call the attention of the people of this country, both inside and outside this House, and ask them what they think of a man who, placing himself in the forefront of a great political party, would come to the House of Commons and make a statement for which he has absolutely no foundation in fact. I am sure the people will measure these statements at their correct worth, and will judge the hon. gentleman accordingly. The hon. gentleman talks about 'back benchers.' 'Back benchers,' indeed. There was an occasion when the hon. gentleman was brought to the front. Those who were present will live long before they forget it. A more humiliating spectacle was never presented in this House of Commons than that we witnessed that afternoon when our hon. friend was selected to reply to the financial statement delivered by the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman was a 'front bencher' just for once. But have you seen, or has any other hon. gentleman seen, the hon. member for West Toronto trotted to the front since that? Never. While the hon. member for West Toronto may, in his own estimation, believe that he is a very important statesman, hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side have sized him up correctly. I make the prediction that you will never again see him in the front bench, no matter what he may think of himself.

So far as the expenditure in Nova Scotia is concerned, I challenge any hon. gentleman in this House to indicate one particular work which they would declare useless in the presence of the people of the constituency in which it is placed. It was so in the counties of Queens and Shelburne. The Conservative candidate in the last election, far from criticising the public works constructed in those counties, indicated his willingness to support further extensions of public works. Yet the hon. member for Argenteuil, entirely ignorant of conditions in those counties, without a knowledge of the facts, has placed this motion in your hands upon information which he is either ashamed or afraid to place before the people of this country. Knowing the source from which he got his information, I do not wonder that he declined to place it before this House. So far as we in Nova Scotia are concerned, we are prepared to stand



behind any Minister of Public Works who will follow in the lines laid down by his predecessors since 1896, and construct those works which the people petition for and which can be shown to be needed in the public interest. The hon. member for Argenteuil neglected to inform himself of the facts in regard to these expenditures. I am afraid he was animated with a desire not to render a service to the country, but to make political capital for his party, and under those circumstances he cannot hope for any support from this side of the House for his resolution.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). I am sure the House is disappointed that this debate was not allowed to be closed by the Minister of Finance and by the leader of the opposition. I would not have spoken had not the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) felt it his duty to do so. If there is any man in this House who should stand up and make an apology it is that hon. gentleman. It is not for him to attempt to lecture so important a representative as the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler). There is no member in this House who commands a wider measure of respect in the country generally and who has more fully the confidence of his constituents, than the hon. member for West Toronto, and I am sure the hon. member for Cape Breton, on reflection, and when he reads his remarks in the 'Hansard,' will feel it to be his duty to apologize, not only to the member for West Toronto, but to the people of Canada. In looking over expenditures for public works I find that my hon. friend himself does not appear to much advantage. I have a return in my hand in which he figures conspicuously at a place called Glace Bay. In this correspondence I find a letter dated Ottawa, March 17, 1903:

Hon. J. I. Tarte,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—We beg to recommend that provision be made in the supplementary estimates for the following works in our county. They are all important and we trust will receive your attention.

A. JOHNSTON,
A. KENDALL,

The first request is for Glace Bay harbour improvements, $10,000; Piper's cove protection, $500; Main-à-Dieu, $2,000. Then they mention two other places for which no particular sum is asked; I suppose they were willing to trust to the generosity of the Minister of Public Works in regard to them. I presume the request was in response to the circular sent out by this government some years ago. If there is any hon. gentleman who should take special notice of this circular, it is the Finance Minister who guards the treasury. This was a circular sent out by the government themselves, dated, Ottawa, March 13, 1900:

My Dear Sir,—During Mr. Tarte's absence I have been requested to take charge of his department for him, and it would be of great service in enabling me to take up his work if you kindly write me at your earliest convenience with reference to the following subjects :

1. For what works in your constituency has there been a parliamentary vote?
2. Have these works been begun? If so, in what state of progress are they?
3. If not begun, what is your advice as to whether or not they should be begun?
4. Are you asking for provision being made in supplementary estimates for :
(a) New works;
(b) Carrying on or completion of works already authorized or begun; If so, what are your views?
(a) As to sum required;
(b) As to what work should be performed?
5. In case of any work not now under contract, but authorized by vote of parliament, please state whether you advise its being carried out by contract or by day's labour.

Here is a circular sent out to Liberal members and defeated candidates. May I ask the hon. Minister of Finance if it is a circular that the government is proud of ? It is not a circular, in general terms, representing that hon. gentlemen are prepared to devote a part of the public money to construct works wherever they are required, but it is a political circular asking for information which ought to be found within the limits of the hon. gentleman's own department. This is the first request contained in this circular :

For what works in your constituency has there been a parliamentary vote.

The government, in sending out that circular——

Mr. FIELDING. Who sent out the circular ?

Mr. BLAIN. It is signed 'Wm. Mulock'.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Do you repudiate it.

Mr. FIELDING. No, what is the date.

Mr. BLAIN. March 13, 1900.

Mr. FIELDING. There seems to have been two general elections since then.

Mr. BLAIN. This was issued just a few months before a general election.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman asked me if I repudiated it. I do not want to repudiate it, but it seems as if the people had approved of something like that.

Mr. BLAIN. Approved of that ?

Mr. FIELDING. Approved of the general results.

Mr. BLAIN. There has been an election in New Brunswick since then.

Mr. FIELDING. The new premier of New Brunswick says that it was not on party lines but that it is a coalition government.

Mr. BLAIN. If it is not on party lines I would suggest to my hon. friend that the people who have been supporting his party rose up and condemned the policy of the government.

Mr. FIELDING. You must not go back on Mr. Hazen.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was not the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) down there doing something ?

Mr. FIELDING : You must not go back on Mr. Hazen.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend is very anxious to know the date. I have given the hon. gentleman the date and this is the point that I want to direct the attention of the House to. It says :

For what works in your constituency has there been a parliamentary vote?

What public good would be served by sending out a letter of that kind to Liberal members and defeated candidates asking them in what constituency there has been a parliamentary vote ? Does not the fact of a minister of the Crown sending out a letter of this kind to people suggest political corruption ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend smiles. Could he take any other suggestion ? If it were a public document and the government were seeking to obtain information as to the parts of Canada in which money should be expended in the interest of the public, it would have been sent to every representative of the people, but this was a circular sent out to their own political supporters and suggesting that if they had not asked for votes of money they should ask for votes of money. That circular was used in the political campaign in November, 1900. It was taken around by the Liberal candidates in the different constituencies and it contained a suggestion from this government that they were prepared to do any thing that was required in order that their party should be sustained at the polls. That letter was not repudiated and the Minister of Finance does not repudiate it to-night but rather suggests that it was a very good letter.

Mr. FIELDING. I said that the results seemed to be approved by the people.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman contends that since that time it has been endorsed by the people of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but that is a little ancient.

Mr. BLAIN. Then I would direct the hon. gentleman's attention to something that is a little modern. A few days ago his party were defeated in New Brunswick on federal issues because the hon. Minister of Finance sent his colleague the Minister of Public Works down to take charge of the campaign. When we were asking the other day for some information about the Department of Public Works we were informed that the head of that department was down in New Brunswick taking care of the election. Of course, he has come back with his answer.

Mr. D. ROSS. How would it do for you to win some elections yourselves ?

Mr. BLAIN. What does the hon. gentleman say ?

Mr. D. ROSS. You might get a little more encouragement if you would win some elections as a federal party and not take so much credit for provincial elections.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman might take heed of the people of his own province because he has been asked to resign because of the policy of this government. A resolution was passed in the hon. gentleman's own province and I am sure that the hon. gentleman has a copy of the letter in his pocket or in his office asking the hon. gentleman and every colleague supporting this government to resign because the policy of this government is not in accordance with the wishes of the people of that province.

Mr. D. ROSS. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that———

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) has the floor.

Mr. D. ROSS. The hon. gentleman made a statement in reference to myself and I want to give the explanation. I never received such a resolution and the only resolution which was passed was passed by the Asiatic Exclusion League of Vancouver and I do not represent the constituency of Vancouver in this House.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend deny that in the city of Vancouver there was a resolution passed calling upon every member supporting this government from British Columbia to send in his resignation ? The hon. gentleman does not deny that.

Mr. D. ROSS. I tell the hon. gentleman that the Asiatic Exclusion League of the city of Vancouver passed such a resolution. The Asiatic Exclusion League does not represent the majority of public opinion in Vancouver and has nothing to do with the constituency I represent.

Mr. BLAIN. The Asiatic Exclusion League could say the same thing of the hon. gentleman. He does not represent the whole of the people of British Columbia. He only represents a portion of them. However, I will leave the hon. gentleman to settle that with the Asiatic Exclusion League.

Mr. D. ROSS. I think you had better.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to deal a moment or two with the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston). The hon. gentleman is very anxious to enter into a discussion with some of the members on this side of the House and I want to point out that he used his influence with this government to get them to spend $25,000 on private property. I direct my hon. friend's attention to the fact that when the government proposed $10,000 to be expended at Glace Bay the hon. gentleman dropped in at that moment and wrote this very interesting letter.

Sydney, N.S., Canada, January 22, 1903.

Hon. James Sutherland,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa, Ont.

My Dear Sir,—Following up my conversation with you while in Ottawa recently, I desire to emphasize the importance of making provision during the coming year for providing suitable harbour accommodation at Glace Bay. There is growing up there a very large community, and you can readily understand it is of the utmost importance to them that some steps be taken looking to the re-opening of the harbour. This matter was up for consideration during the last session of parliament, and a start was made by placing in the estimates a sum of $10,000. It was not intended at the outset that this amount would be sufficient. I understand that the matter was reported upon, and an estimate made indicating that about $60,000 would be required for this work. The Dominion Coal Company have, however, submitted a proposition by which, I think, the necessary accommodation can be provided for the sum of $25,000. Dr. Kendall and myself beg therefore to request that provision shall be made for this amount during the approaching session of parliament.

In the meantime, I remain,

Yours very truly,
A. JOHNSTON.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear, he is all right.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friends applaud not my statement but the hon. gentleman's letter. What does the letter say ? It calls upon the government of Canada to spend $25,000. Where ? In the interests of the public at Glace Bay ? No, but on the private property of the Dominion Coal Company at Glace Bay. That is the statement and I ask the minister's attention to it.

Mr. FIELDING. I know all about it.

Mr. BLAIN. Would my hon. friend deny it ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I do not deny it, I prefer to have my hon. friend continue.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend endorses it. He allows $25,000 of public money to be expended, and rather applauds its expenditure, not upon public property for public purposes but upon private property for the Dominion Coal Company and a toll is charged by the Dominion Coal Company for every resident of that district who attempts to cross over the threshold of that harbour. Is that in the public interest? Worse than that is the fact that the government entered into an agreement, a copy of which I have here, allowing the Dominion Coal Company to take $25,000 of the people's money which was handed over by the Finance Minister—to be expended by the government? Oh no, to be expended by the Dominion Coal Company themselves. With what result? With the result that after this agreement is entered into the company sent a bill to the government for about $16,000 for money expended by them prior to the agreement being entered into, and the minister allowed a portion of the $25,000 to go to pay the Dominion Coal Company for money expended upon the harbour before the agreement was entered into. What does that mean? The hon. gentleman who represents the county came to the rescue by telegrams and letters pleading with the government that they should allow this amount out of the $25,000 to be used in this way.

The Auditor General entered his protest against this expenditure and pointed out that it was a wrong expenditure. He stated that this was the first time in the hisory of Canada that public money had been expended upon a private wharf and the people who owned the private wharf were permitted to charge the public wharfage. He entered his protest against it and in this correspondence I find a letter written by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, pleading with the Finance Minister and with the government to find out if there was not some way by which they could get the Auditor General to pay this money over to the Coal Company, asking the government to interfere with the duty of the Auditor General. He writes this over his own signature, asking if some pressure cannot be brought to bear upon the Auditor General to allow a wrong account to be passed through in this way. I wish to express my approval of the resolution and I shall of course record my vote in favour of it. I would point out to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that the government has never laid down any policy with respect to the expenditure of money upon wharfs. They have no policy in that respect except to make expenditures where they will most assist them in elections. I would also point out that notwithstanding the enormous public expenditures the revenue from wharfage in Nova Scotia is less than it was ten years ago.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member will also find that the revenues from canals in the province of Ontario, notwithstanding the enormous expenditures upon the canals, are less than they were at that time.

Mr. BLAIN. That may be.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Have you free wharfs down there now?

Mr. FIELDING. In some cases; you have free canals up here.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We ought to have.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not find any fault with them that is the difference.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend answers that we have free canals. They were made free by this parliament and endorsed by every member. The government are constantly telling the people that wherever they expend money it is in the interest of the people, and they are making efforts to get revenue from these expenditures; but as I have pointed out the revenue from wharfs in Nova Scotia is less than it was ten years ago.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). I thought I heard a reference to the New Brunswick election, and the statement that federal politics did not enter into that election. That is hardly correct, at least so far as one party to the election is concerned, for while the Conservative party did not appeal directly for support on that point, the Liberal party certainly did. I hold in my hand a circular which was sent to every elector in the city of St. John.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, the hon. member will see that while there may have been some incidental reference to that, if he is proposing to direct his remarks solely to that, it has no relevancy to the question under consideration.

Mr. DANIEL. My point has reference to the offering of public works as a claim for votes, and to the corrupt use of public works for that purpose, and I mention this as an instance in point. The circular that I refer to is as follows:

St. John, N.B., February 28, 1908.

Dear Sir,—We trust that your vote on March 3rd will be for us, and we respectfully solicit it.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Is that pertinent to the question before the Chair?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the point of order is taken I shall have to rule that it is not pertinent.

Mr. DANIEL. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I bow to your decision; I cannot do other-

wise. But the point has been made, I think, several times to-night, that public works have been offered to constituencies in a corrupt way in order to influence voters in those constituencies to vote for the government ticket. I believe that no point of order has been raised in regard to any statement of that kind that has been made up to the present, and I do not see why this reference is any more out of order than previous ones which have been made. If you say it is not in order, Mr. Speaker, of course I cannot read it; but it is a plain intimation to the electors of St. John that they should vote for the Liberal ticket in order that public expenditures may be made in that constituency. That is the appeal that was made by the Liberal party, and it was, I take it, fully and wholly a corrupt appeal. In the same way, I have copies of posters that were put up with the same object in view—such a poster as the following:

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, this is really not relevant to the question before the House. The motion indicates that the spending of public moneys is for the benefit of favoured corporations and private individuals. There is no suggestion that it is for political purposes. Under the circumstances, I cannot see that the hon. gentleman's remarks are at all pertinent to the question before the House. I must rule that they are not.

Mr. DANIEL. If I am not in order, Mr. Speaker, I will of course not continue. I shall probably have another opportunity of bringing the matter before the House. At the same time it gives me an opportunity to contradict the statement that was made the other night that there was no federal politics brought into that election.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Perley.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Ames,
Armstrong,
Barr,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Christie,
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Elson,
Fowler,
Ganong,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Lake,
Lennox,
Macdonell,
MacLaren,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Marshall,
Morin,
Osler,
Owen,
Perley,
Porter,
Pringle,
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Wright (Muskoka)—43.

Mr. DANIEL.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Beland,
Bickerdike,
Bole,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carney,
Caron,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Copp,
Delisle,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Devlin,
Dubeau,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gladu,
Graham,
Guthrie,
Hall,
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Knowles,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Law,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Pardee,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Robitaille,
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Oxford),
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turcotte,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—99.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

| Ministerial. | Opposition. |
|---|---|
| Logan, | Lefurgey, |
| Telford, | Tisdale, |
| Gordon, | Reid (Grenville), |
| Conmee, | Avery, |
| Schell (Glengarry), | Foster, |
| Talbot, | Monk, |
| Oliver, | Bristol, |
| Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), | Sproule, |
| Greenway, | Haggart, |
| Paterson, | Maclean (York, S.), |
| Emmerson, | Northrup, |
| Dyment, | Seagram, |
| Harty, | Alcorn, |
| Macdonald, | Kemp, |

Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.), Roche (Halifax), Smith (Nanaimo), Crawford, Fortier, McLean (York, C.), Black, Parmelee, Grant, Clarke, Ross (Cape Breton), McLean (Huron, S.), Finlay, Watson, Cyr.

Barker, Bennett, Ward, Lancaster, Leonard, Martin (Queens, P.E.I.), Clare, Worthington, Chisholm (Huron), Lalor, Forget, Beattie, White, Lewis, Thompson.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CALVERT. The hon. member for Bellechasse has not voted.

Mr. TALBOT. I am paired with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier or I would have voted twice against the amendment.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am paired with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) or I would have voted three times for it.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business tomorrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. Items 14 and 18 on the Order Paper and resolution of the Minister of Inland Revenue respecting patent medicines. Then Supply for the Marine and Fisheries Department.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.17 a.m. Friday.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 13, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK W. BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring up a matter of privilege. In the 'Citizen' newspaper of this morning there is an article entitled 'The Ross Rifle Scandal,' and in the course of that article the following language is used :

The difficulty of getting at the truth in connection with this remarkable deal was illustrated in parliament only a few weeks ago. Colonel Worthington put a series of questions to the Minister of Militia, with the purpose of eliciting the fact that the Ross rifle had been tested in 1902 by the British government, and found 'markedly inferior' to the Lee-Metford, and that the government of Canada, had been specially warned of this before it entered into the Ross contract. The reply of the minister to Colonel Worthington was a denial that there had been any 'official' test. Now, notwithstanding this denial, the following is alleged to have occurred: In 1902, Hon. St. John Brodrick, then Secretary for War, communicated with Lord Minto, then Governor General of Canada, and pointed out that though the Ross rifle would use the same cartridge as the Lee-Metford, the parts of the rifle were different, and would not be interchangeable. This would be a serious matter in the event of a war in which Canadian troops were co-operating with the British army in the field. About this time a test of two Ross rifles and two Lee-Metford rifles was made by the commandant of the School of Musketry at Hythe, with the result that he reported the Ross rifle 'markedly inferior' to the Lee-Metford rifle, which is the arm of the British service. This information was also forwarded to Canada, and should have been sufficient to at least cause the Canadian government to act with caution; but, notwithstanding all this, the extraordinary agreement with the Ross Rifle Company was closed.

Now comes the curious part of it—

This is the part that I wish to call your attention to Mr. Speaker.

This correspondence, which took place in 1902, was published in a report of the British War Office for 1906, and it was only when this report was added to the collection of volumes in the library of parliament that the existence of this correspondence was discovered.

Now, in large type the following words :

Since the discovery the volume has disappeared from the shelves of the parliamentary library, and there is no record in the books to show who took it away. In other words, it has been clandestinely abstracted.

I thought it proper to call the attention of the Librarian of Parliament to this matter, and I have just received this communication. A portion of the article that I have read from the 'Citizen' is cut out and pinned on the paper from which I am reading :

With regard to the foregoing you may care to have the following report :

1. No report of the nature indicated appears in the imperial parliamentary papers for 1906; see index herewith.

2. No report of the kind has ever been received in this library from any quarter whatever.

3. All the army volumes of 1906 that have been received up to date are on our shelves at this moment; not one has been taken away by anybody.

(Sgd.) MARTIN J. GRIFFIN,
Parliamentary Librarian.

## PROPRIETARY AND PATENT MEDICINES.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) moved that the House go into committee on Tuesday to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure providing for the inspection and the regulation of the sale of proprietary and patent medicines.

Motion agreed to.

## CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When may we expect the report of the Civil Service Commission and what is the reason of the delay ? I understand the committee ceased its active labours some two months ago.

Mr. FIELDING. In consequence of the representations made in the House I communicated with the chairman of the commission who informed me the commission expected to have the report ready shortly, but he did not fix a date.

## MR. R. L. DRURY, OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Prime Minister promised to lay on the table of the House the order in council appointing Mr. R. L. Drury, of British Columbia, to represent Canada in Japan in connection with the arrangement made with the Postmaster General. I hope that will not be overlooked.

Mr. FIELDING. The Prime Minister is not present to-day, but I will see that it is brought down on Monday.

## ALLEGED IMMIGRATION FRAUDS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of the Interior promised to make a statement with regard to certain reports that have appeared in the public press relative to the immigration service at Halifax. Is the minister prepared to do so to-day ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) asked certain questions yesterday and I may read the answer prepared : It does not appear advisable that a public statement should be made as to the means taken by the government to discover the improper practices mentioned, as they are necessarily of a confidential character. The Dr. Dickey referred to is H. L. Dickey, M.D., of Halifax, who has been medical inspector for the Department of Immigration at the port of Halifax for some years. The department has no knowledge as to the identity of W. Dodd ; he has no position under the government. The government has dispensed with the services of Mr. Dickey.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know whether the government has heard of the belief entertained in certain quarters at least, that the name 'W. Dodds' is an assumed name, and whether they are taking any steps to ascertain the identity of the person who has evidently addressed communications under that name to persons in Great Britain for the purpose of carrying on work which certainly is not in the public interest. I should imagine that a telegram sent to the offices of the department in Great Britain would easily bring about an examination of the papers sent and in that way it could be ascertained whether or not any person in the public service is the author of these letters, and used this assumed name to sign them.

Mr. OLIVER. The matter is not closed so far as the government is concerned and I will probably be able to give the House information later.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). When will the return ordered on the 12th of February in relation to breaches of the Inland Revenue regulations. be brought down ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The return was laid on the table of the House a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I could not find it in the office up stairs.

## THE RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Bill (No. 112) to amend the Railway Act as respects the constitution of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—Mr. Graham—read a second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Section 1.

1. Subsection 1 of section 10 of the Railway Act, chapter 37 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, is repealed and the following subsection is substituted therefor :—

2. There shall be a commission known as the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, consisting of six members appointed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. LENNOX. The figure '2' seems to be a clerical error there. It probably is not necessary to have any figures at all, but if it were it should be the figure '1.'

Mr. GRAHAM. We will strike out the figure altogether.

On section 2,

2. Subsection 5 of the said section 10 is repealed and the following is substituted therefor :—

5. One of such commissioners shall be appointed by the Governor in Council, chief

commissioner, and another of them assistant chief commissioner of the board.

(a) Any person may be appointed chief commissioner or assistant chief commissioner who is or has been a judge of a Superior Court of Canada or any province of Canada, or who is a barrister or advocate of at least ten years' standing at the bar of any such province.

(b) The chief commissioner shall be entitled to hold the office of chief commissioner, and the assistant chief comissioner the office of assistant chief commissioner or that of chief commissioner, so long as they respectively continue to be members of the board.

(c) The assistant chief commissioner shall have all the powers of the chief commissioner.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the effect of this section ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It appoints an assistant chief commissioner and two commissioners.

Mr. BERGERON. It is practically creating a new board.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the minister considered the effect of subsection (c). It may be quite proper but I have a little doubt about it.

(c) The assistant chief commissioner should have all the powers of the chief commissioner.

There must be some one who has supreme power in a body of this kind. I apprehend that that only is intended to mean that the assistant chief commissioner shall have all the powers of the chief commissioner in the absence of the chief commissioner. It may work out all right as worded but it seems to be a little inconsistent to say that the assistant chief commissioner shall have all the power of the chief commissioner. I call the attention of the minister to that.

Mr. GRAHAM. If that clause were alone in the Bill it might be as my hon. friend says but at page 2, section 4, it will be seen that the duties are outlined as follows :

The chief commissioner, when present, shall preside, and the assistant chief commissioner, when present, in the absence of the chief commissioner, shall preside, and the opinion of either of them upon any question arising when he is presiding, which in the opinion of the commissioner is a question of law, shall prevail.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If that regulates the whole matter what is the use of subsection (c) ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Subsection (c) does not refer at all to the position he will occupy when the board is meeting but to the powers which he shall possess.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What powers are you intending to confer by subsection (c) ? I cannot quite understand it, it seems to give two co-ordinate authorities exactly the same power.

Mr. GRAHAM. Section (c) gives the assistant chief commissioner power to sign orders, because under a section of this Bill two of the commissioners may constitute the board.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Cannot any one of the commissioners sign orders ? I am asking for information.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The position is exactly analogous to the present position as to the powers of the deputy chief. Under the present law, in the absence of the chief or his inability to act, the deputy shall exercise the powers of the chief commissioner in his stead and in such cases all regulations, orders and other documents signed by the deputy chief commissioner shall have the like force and effect as if signed by the chief commissioner. This is an analogous provision.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is an analogous provision except that it goes a good deal further. In that case it is said that the deputy shall exercise certain powers in the absence of the chief commissioner. That is perfectly plain and perfectly proper but it is not this provision, which is as follows :

The assistant chief commissioner shall have all the powers of the chief commissioner.

If this were a provision that in the absence of the chief commissioner, the assistant chief commissioner should have all his powers, it would be an exactly analogous case to that which the Minister of Justice has just mentioned. I do not quite see the analogy however, having regard to the difference in the language.

Mr. LENNOX. I noticed section 4 which corresponds to section 12 of the old Act and provides for a case where we have a larger number of commissioners to deal with. But the difficulty I find in this is that when you say the assistant chief commissioner shall have all the powers of the chief commissioner, without saying under any special circumstances, it amounts to this that if the whole six were sitting together, as they might sit on some occasion, the assistant chief commissioner would have just as much power and could assert his power as effectually as the chief commissioner. That is not intended and it conflicts with section 4.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) is firmly of the opinion that the clause should stand as it is, owing to the fact that this board will sit probably many times in two sections. We want it made clear that the assistant chief commissioner shall have full powers to do every-

thing that the chief could do, and with the other part of section 4, on page 2, the matter seems to be fully defined and made clear. He is strongly of the opinion that section (c) should stand as it is.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not want to persist too much but I think that state of things is adequately provided for in section 4, which says :

2. The chief commissioner, when present, shall preside, and the assistant chief commissioner, when present, in the absence of the chief commissioner, shall preside, and the opinion of either of them upon any question arising when he is presiding, which in the opinion of the commissioners is a question of law, shall prevail.

If they are sitting as a divided court we have the provision there in section 4, but you have on the other hand in this preceding section, the broad, unqualified statement that the powers of the assistant chief commissioner shall be equal to the powers of the chief commissioner.

Mr. GALLIHER. Surely the explanation of that is this : In the first place, in order to give the assistant chief commissioner the same powers as the chief commissioner in the absence of the chief commissioner, you have first to put in a clause that clothes him with that power. Subsection (c) clothes him with that power, then section 4 states under what circumstances he shall exercise that power.

Mr. LANCASTER. I quite agree that the explanation of the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) makes it reasonable. The trouble is that the explanation is not in the Act and I think we should in some way qualify subsection (c) so as to make it not contradictory and not in conflict with section 4 of the Bill now before us, because certainly on their face the two sections do conflict. I understand the intention to be just as the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) says, but the trouble is that that is not in the Act, and I would suggest in the absence of anything better that you should say in subsection (c) :

Subject only to section 4 of this Act.

And then go on to say that the assistant chief commissioner shall have all the powers of the chief commissioner. If you do not do something like this then a case might arise where the board would consist of the chief commissioner and the assistant chief commissioner only as the Act provides that only two commissioners may form a quorum. In such a case, as they would have exactly the same power they might disagree upon a point of law and come to an absolute deadlock. With such a provision as I have suggested the opinion of the chief commissioner would prevail and there would be no possibility of a deadlock. If the chief commissioner and the assistant chief commissioner have exactly the same powers then when they are sitting together, either with or without other commissioners, they may disagree on points of law and a deadlock ensue.

The Bill I think is also a little defective in that it does not permit of the board sitting without the chief commissioner or the assistant chief commissioner.

Mr. GRAHAM. The deputy can sit.

Mr. LANCASTER. If it is mentioned that any two commissioners can sit you must give more power to some of these commissioners than has been given. A case is actually pending to-day in which two commissioners other than Judge Killam sat, but as the chief commissioner had not decided a point of law the decision is held up owing to the regrettable death of the chief commissioner although this is a case on which he did not sit. If we are to allow two commissioners to sit, we must give them absolute power to decide the case, points of law as well as other matters ; and unless you provide that when they do sit either the chief or the assistant chief must be one of the two, you may have an ineffectual hearing, a case that cannot be decided because of the absence of any body competent to decide a point of law.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have left in the Act the clause which gives the deputy chief the power and the assistant chief. We have three divisions sitting, with the head of each one competent to give rulings and decide points of law, so that each division, if it sits in a section of two, will be a complete board in itself.

Mr. BERGERON. It will be one commission which can be divided into two or three if necessary.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. With reference to the other contention, I see the objection that might possibly be raised, and to remove all doubt, I would suggest this as an addition to 'c.' :

Such power shall not be exercised by him except in the absence of the chief commissioner.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You might express it more simply by saying : In the absence of the chief commissioner, the assistant commissioner may act.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It seems to me that this clause 'c,' as it is worded, is absolutely essential. It confers upon this official certain powers. How is he to be given those powers, let alone exercise them, unless by some distinct enactment of this parliament. When conferred, as they will be by the passing of clause 'c,' then he is vested

with them and may exercise them or not as occasion may require. Even though the the powers be not exercised, he is vested with them, and this clause means the conferring of those powers by special enactment. The assistant chief shall have those powers but is not to exercise them when the chief is present.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what I desire to see expressed but it is not at present. I agree that the assistant is not to exercise those powers when the chief is present, but you ought to express that in the statute.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think this wording of mine is the best, even if it be layman's law. Let me read the clause as I have it, and see if it will not meet the point:

The assistant chief shall have all the powers of the chief commissioner, but such powers shall not be exercised by him except in the absence of the chief.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am perfectly willing to accept that.

Mr. LENNOX. The only objection is this, that you will have in the one Act of parliament two different modes of expressing the same thing. By section 12, what was contended for by my hon. leader is exactly the system as carried out in the old Act: In the case of the absence of the chief commissioner, or his inability to act, his deputy shall exercise the powers in his stead. However I am quite satisfied with the sugestion: But such powers shall not be exercised by him except in the absence of the chief commissioner.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN Eventually it will give some court the opportunity to decide why you use one form in one section and another in another section for expressing the same thing. It will be a nice academic discussion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the hon. minister considered the advisability of placing a few words in the Act regarding the political complexion of the commission. In the United States Civil Service Act, it is distinctly provided that not more than two out of the three commissioners shall be adherents of the one political party; and judging from the complexion of the old commission—not saying a word against the chairman—we cannot help but think that possibly this government are going to appoint these six men from the ranks of the one political party. I notice in the votes and proceedings that my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Lewis) has given notice of an amendment, on the third reading of this Bill, to the effect I am suggesting. I have given a good deal of attention to this matter in the way of investigating the composition of different commissions in different countries, and I find there is no government which has the same power as is granted to the ministers of the Crown in this government. Not only in appointments to the Post Office Department but in the appointment of senators and judges, they seem to have absolute control. In other countries the very opposite is the case. Take the Civil Service Act of the United States, it distinctly says that there must be only two commissioners out of the three adherents of the one political party. You can follow it all the way down through the Post Office Department, and you find that even in the case of applicants to positions of mail carriers on the rural mail delivery, of the three examiners two only can be appointed from the one political party.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. Does the hon. gentleman know whether the Interstate Commission is composed wholly of members of one political party?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand that only a majority are of one party. Mr. Black, a commissioner in the Post Office Department, was one of the most prominent Democrats in the United States previous to his appointment to that position. Some measure of civil service reform should be adopted in this country without any further delay, and I believe that this is a good time to commence it, when we have before us a measure providing for the appointment of a commission which is supposed to be an independent commission, dealing with the interests of the people in general. I believe that some means should be instituted whereby no political party could have the power of making all the appointments to that commission from their own ranks. I quite agree that it might be possible for a political party to select from its own ranks men of ability and integrity to fill those positions, but is it fair or reasonable towards the people at large? This is supposed to be a business institution, but if it is run like all the other departments of the government, we may be sure that no man will be appointed to it unless he is an adherent of the party in power. Consider the control the Postmaster General has over the civil servants in that department; consider the control the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has over the civil servants in his department, or consider the absolute control the ministers of the Crown have over members of parliament and senators. Then you can appreciate the importance of having placed upon our statute-book a drastic measure of civil service reform. When you consider what the civil service have been doing in many of the departments of this government in the last few years, you must admit that it is time for us to take active steps in this direction.

Mr. GORDON. Has that policy been adopted at Toronto?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not know that we are running provincial institutions here.

We are here for the purpose of devising the best possible legislation in the interest of the country, and it is our duty to see not only that the best men are appointed, but that the people of Canada will not be able to point to the commission as they pointed to the last commission and say, 'look at the political appointments this government has made on that commission?' The hon. gentleman is well aware that the Premier of Ontario has already appointed many Liberals magistrates throughout the province, I might say hundreds; but this is an entirely different matter. Here is a government about to appoint six men, who are supposed to be independent men, looking at matters from a non-partisan standpoint. Would it not be wise for them to consider the advisability of appointing say two men from the opposition party? I may call the minister's attention to the fact that the Prime Minister of Ontario appointed the editor of the 'Globe' on an important commission. My hon. friend from South Kent (Mr. Gordon) has forgotten some of these things.

Mr. GRAHAM. What commission was that? Was it not on the Board of Toronto University?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is that not an important board?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend misunderstands me. He did not say a board; he said commission.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is practically the same thing. In the United States in the last few years the President has taken up the question of civil service reform in an enthusiastic manner and he has been able to revolutionize the whole civil service of the country in a way that is entirely satisfactory to the people. By the application of civil service reform to the different departments he has saved to the people something like $10,000,000. I hope the minister will take this matter into his consideration, and that, when the time comes for making these appointments, he will decide not to look only at one part of the country or at one political party, because I do not think I am far astray when I say that the bulk of the voters in the Dominion of Canada to-day are in favour of the Conservative party, and let the election come when it may, I feel confident that hon. gentlemen opposite will be transferred to the opposition side of the House. For these reasons I hope the minister will investigate this matter and see if it is not possible to provide in this Bill for the suggestion I make.

Mr. CONMEE. I rise to say a word or two in regard to the very important matter which the hon. member has brought to the attention of the House, that is, civil service reform. As I understand his proposition, it is that this commission should be clothed with authority to appoint the civil servants of the country. I cannot agree with that proposition.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I do not wish to take away from the government the power of appointing these men, but I have suggested that in appointing them they do not look merely to one political party.

Mr. CONMEE. I would like to understand the hon. gentleman if I can, but his explanation has not made clear to me what the object of his remarks was. Did the hon. gentleman not wish to suggest that this commission should be clothed with authority to make the civil service appointments?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I made no reference whatever to that Bill.

Mr. CONMEE. Then am I to understand that the hon. gentleman's remarks had reference only to this particular board of commissioners?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think the minister understood my remarks very well. However, I may say that in the appointment of six men I was urging upon the minister the necessity of looking not solely to one political party but to see that some members of that commission were adherents of the opposite party. I did refer to the Civil Service Act of the United States, in which only two men out of three can be adherents of one party. I referred to several examining boards in the United States to show that a similar law is in force, and is giving satisfaction throughout the country.

Mr. CONMEE. I am prepared to accept that version of the hon. gentleman's earlier remarks. For myself I should be opposed to any measure that would take out of the control of parliament appointments to the civil service. I believe our system is better than that of the United States, and better than that which is invoked as in operation in the mother country.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) suggested that members of one party were confident the government would change hands at the next election. I ask him if he really thinks that those gentlemen give proof of a judgment sufficiently mature to warrant them being placed on a board of such great responsibility?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is the best kind of proof, because the minister will realize that so far as this party is concerned, one of the strong planks in our platform is to bring about civil service reform in this country, and my suggestion as to appointments on the commission would be one step in that direction.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend weakens his argument again that we should take men from the Conservative party for this commission, because it does not show as mature judgment as it ought to show for a man to be qualified to take such a responsible position. The question of civil service reform is one that I will not discuss at present. I think my hon. friend has taken an undue advantage of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in getting in ahead of him on this great question of civil service reform. Now as to the appointments, no person will argue that the late Mr. Justice Killam was a partisan. At the present moment I have not the faintest idea of what his politics were, or ever had been. He was selected as a man of great ability, without any reference whatever to his politics. So as a matter of fact, appointments have not all been made from one political party.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What about the other two ?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend only asks for one-third of the appointments, and when I point out to him that all the appointments have not gone to the Liberal party, he ought to be satisfied with that, without asking any more. Now as to the chief commissionership, I want to say that no applications for this position are being considered or will be considered. The government is looking for a man, and no man is looking for this position : if he were ; we would think that a reason why he should not have it. The government is trying to get for the position of chief commissioner the best man available. I may say that in this case men are not seeking for the position, but the position is seeking for the man. The salary is not as large possibly as it might be, but still the government is in hopes of securing a first class man to succeed the late Justice Killam, and if he occupies that position as ably as the late justice did, the country and the government will be satisfied. As to the other appointments, I would remind the hon. gentleman that in Canada a large number of independents are springing up, and my hon. friend might get somewhat at sea if he went on the assumption that there were only two parties in this country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I distinctly said that no matter what government was in power it would be their duty to see that only four out of the six members of this commission should be adherents of one party. I did not say what party the others should belong to.

Mr. GRAHAM. I may say that men are changing their minds continually. Many men who were Conservatives a few years ago are now proud to be Liberals, consequently you see the rule might not work. It is said of civil servants that they usually support whatever party is in power, as some other people do. So you see this rule could not be adhered to rigidly. The government has the responsibility of making these appointments, the government is wholly responsible to this House and to the people for what they do. We are in hopes of being able to select men for these positions fully competent to carry out the duties thereof, and we do not propose to permit the question of their political leanings to enter into the decision at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it is unkind for the Minister of Railways and Canals, even in the absence of the Minister of Public Works, to make that indirect reference to the New Brunswick elections. Now as to the appointment of the chief commissioner, or of any position to the bench, it is an extreme form of partisanship which compels, or impels, any government to look solely within the ranks of its own party. I think that the wise course in all such cases would be to look for the best man to fill the position ; and that is a course which I think the government of the late Sir John A. Macdonald, and particularly Sir John himself, followed on a good many occasions. Now the office of chief commissioner of this board demands a very unusual combination of qualities. Any one who has seen something of the work of that board, any one who has appreciated at all the work which Judge Killam did as chairman, must thoroughly comprehend that. The man selected in the first place, ought to be a very able lawyer. If possible it would be well to have one who has had experience for a term upon the judicial bench which will have given to him a certain training in that regard. He ought to be a man of great firmness and strength of character, ready to withstand the encroachments of corporate power on the one hand and the possible injustice of popular clamour on the other. Last but not least if the plan which the government is proposing to adopt in this Bill is carried out, he ought to be a man of considerable executive and administrative ability, a man endowed with the genius for organization, because I believe that if there is one thing more than another which the Railway Commission requires it is a thorough organization of its system and methods from beginning to end. This is certainly, as I have said, a very unusual combination of qualities, and the question is whether or not the salary and position will attract the proper man. I have not as much confidence as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in the belief, or even the supposition, that there are no persons looking after the office at the present moment.

Mr. GRAHAM. It may surprise my hon. friend to know that there are not more than two gentlemen in Canada who have suggested their own names, or whose names

have been suggested by others, as candidates for this position. I would not say the same as to the other positions, but the chairmanship seems to have been left practically in the hands of the government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The positions that I had more in mind were the four appointments to the board and not so much that of the chief commissioner. I would be prepared to accept the assurance of the hon. minister in that regard, but I would like to impress, if there is any necessity of impressing, upon my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals and the government, the very great responsibility which I think lies upon them at the present moment of making a proper appointment to the chairmanship of that board. I do not think there is a single appointment in Canada, not excepting even appointments to the judicial bench, which are as important in the public interest as the appointment to the chairmanship to this commission. Upon the chairman depends, to a very great extent, the future success or failure of the commission. The machinery is there all right, the Act is in very good shape at the present time if it can be worked out—no doubt it will require amendment in the future—but it is capable of being put to the very greatest possible use—the machinery, I repeat, is there, but what is required is steam to work it, and that steam can only be supplied in a great measure by the appointment of the proper man to the chairmanship of that commission. I sincerely trust that the appointment will be one which will commend itself to every man in this House and to the people of this country. I do not think that Mr. Justice Killam was ever known as a Conservative. Before he was appointed to the judicial bench he was an active member of the Liberal party. That did not lead me in the slightest degree to object to his appointment, because I recognized him as a man eminently proper to be appointed to that commission, and in this House and elsewhere I have often referred to the splendid work which that gentleman was doing for the people of Canada; and I only hope that the government will succeed in securing as able and devoted a man as Mr. Justice Killam was for the position of chairman of that commission.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not suppose that the government will act upon the suggestion of my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), but I have a suggestion to make that I believe will meet with the approval of the government in regard to the appointment of some of the new commissioners, and that is that Prince Edward Island should have a representative on the board. We have, as you know, some very difficult problems of transportation, and the board, as at present constituted, is composed altogether of western men who are not familiar with the different phases of transportation in regard to Prince Edward Island and the maritime provinces. For that reason, it is most essential, having reference to the difficulties that have to be overcome there, that the eastern provinces should be represented by a good man. I am not asking the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) to even take that man from the Conservative ranks. We have good men on both sides of politics down there, and there are a number who would be capable of sitting with the representatives of any part of Canada and doing good service, not only for the interests they would be familiar with down in the east, but also with regard to the western transportation problems. I think it would be a rounding out of the commission if the province of Prince Edward Island were represented on it by a good man. There have been a number of other commissions and boards appointed, but Prince Edward Island has been continually left out. There is the Transcontinental Railway Commission. There are four commissioners upon that board, but Prince Edward Island is not represented. Now, we are going to have six representatives on the Board of Railway Commissioners, and it seems to me that the government might very well take into consideration the appointment of one of these commissioners from Prince Edward Island. A number of other boards have been appointed, and on each occasion the smallest province down by the sea, which has interests just as vital as the other provinces, has been left out. Another case is that of the appointment of a commission in regard to transportation. Where we have so many vital questions of transportation, questions of freight rates and the question of the tunnel to be settled, it will be a wise precaution for the minister to see that Prince Edward Island is represented on the board.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I have only a word or two to say, and I would have had nothing to say whatever had not my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) made the suggestion which he presented this afternoon. The principle which has been put forward by my hon. friend seems to me to be one worthy of consideration by this government. I do not know of any other place where that principle would be more applicable than in the appointment of this Railway Commission. In so far as the late Judge Killam is concerned, I knew him personally for a great many years, and there is no doubt that Judge Killam was a pretty strong partisan. He was first a member of the legislature in Manitoba. He was always a strong Liberal, but I do not know of any man in Canada who enjoyed the confidence of both the Liberal and Conservative party as Judge Killam did. Judge Killam did not have to die to receive such expressions of confidence as that to which I am giving utterance at the present

moment. When he was a judge in the province of Manitoba all parties had confidence in him, but I think that our experience is that it is not so easy to secure for this commission men who enjoy the confidence of the country to the extent that Judge Killam did. I do not see why, in a commission like this, the princple advocated by my hon. friend from East Lambton should not be adopted. It does not matter whether this government is returned at the next election or whether a Conservative government is returned in so far as that principle goes. The principle is that appointing men to occupy places on this commission two at least should be selected from the opposite party. I believe that the adoption of such a principle would have a most beneficial result. We see that to some extent in this House. We believe that government by party is the best system we can have, and the present government has a very large majority, and I have not the slightest doubt that the fact that there is an opposition party in this House to watch and to suggest has a very wholesome effect. As was well said by the leader of the opposition, it is of the greatest importance that the people of the west and of the whole Dominion should have confidence in this Railway Commission, and they should feel it is at all events one department of government which is free from partisanship. I could not allow this matter to pass without expressing a strong view on this point. Although the idea may be novel, still it is well worth the government considering the appointment of one or two men to that commission who are not political friends of the government.

Mr. PATERSON. If I understand the argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) it was that a certain number of the commissioners should not be in a political accord with the government.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. Then the hon. gentleman from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) said the day was near at hand when the Conservative party would be in power.

Mr ARMSTRONG. I said that.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, this commission cannot be constituted much before the time when that change will take place, and if you appointed Conservatives now and the Conservative government came into power these appointees would be in accord with the government, a thing which would not suit the views of my hon. friend. If the Conservatives are coming into power in a year or so it will serve the hon. gentleman's purpose to appoint Liberals in the meanwhile, and then when the Conservatives get to power the members of the commission will not be in political accord with them. It seems to me that that is the logical result of the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Minister of Customs is not so dense as he would wish us to believe he is. He knows perfectly well that if the principle is adopted now it will be continued for the future.

Mr. BARR. It would be wise on the part of the Minister of Customs to read the signs of the times, and to set an example by appointing to this commission a Conservative minority. Then, when the Conservatives hold the reins of power the principle would be continued and his side would have a claim upon the loaves and fishes. No doubt if we get a good example now, then—as parties out of power in Canada are fond of carrying out their pledges, as for instance the Liberals did—when the Conservatives come to power they would see that the Liberal party had representation on the commission.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). This question should be above party politics and I am sorry to hear politics talked of in connection with a matter of such vital importance to the country. Above all, good able men should be appointed as commissioners. The commissioners occupy very important positions, and if the government cannot rise above party exigencies in making these appointments the country will be suspicious. The best men should be selected irrespective of their politics. I rise specially to say that no one section of the country should be represented exclusively on that commission, that the east and the west, that British Columbia and the maritime provinces and my own province should have a representative on such an important tribunal.

Mr. TALBOT. Wait till your turn comes.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). I don't expect very much from the new member. Not very long ago I suggested that the Intercolonial should be placed under the control of the Railway Commission and I repeat that suggestion. Every one knows that at the present time the Intercolonial is run by this government merely as a political road to be used for political purposes. It is desirable for the Minister of Railways himself it is desirable for the country that it should be taken out of the hands of the government and placed under the control of this independent Railway Commission. We hear a great deal about transportation in the west but there is nothing done about transportation in the east. Not very long ago, my hon. colleagues (Mr. Lefurgey and Mr. McLean) placed before the Minister of Railways and the House a statement of the high freight rates charged in Prince Edward Island, which was enough to startle the country. I believe that if the Intercolonial Railway were placed under the Railway Commission these exhorbitant charges would disappear

very quickly. I was speaking with one of the Railway Commissioners not very long ago and he said he was astonished that the Intercolonial was not placed under the commission. Why is it that the Intercolonial is not brought under the jurisdiction? Is it that it may be in the hands of the Minister of Railways at election times to do with it as his party interests require? If it were placed under the control of the commission the people would have more confidence in it, the deficits would disappear, and we would have a railroad run in the interests of the people and not in the interests of the party in power.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister of Railways is receiving so many suggestions from this side of the House, and he takes them in such a good natured way that I would remind him of a speech delivered in this House some years ago by a gentleman who held a very high position in the Liberal ranks and in which that gentleman strenuously advocated that no member of parliament should be appointed to an office until two years after he had ceased to hold a seat in this House. That distinguished Liberal said it was most demoralizing and scandalous that a man expecting a position should sit in this House, because he was not a free man. I would suggest to the minister that he should read that beautiful speech in the 'Hansard' of 1895, in order that he may find out what an exceedingly bad policy it would be to choose any men for these important positions from among his colleagues.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. While I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) as to the necessity of civil service reform, I submit that above the question of the party or province which a man belongs is the necessity of appointing not only the ablest and most incorruptible men we can find in Canada for these positions but men who have particular judicial qualities of mind that would enable them to decide impartially upon questions that come before them. For that reason I would suggest that no matter how impartial a railway man would seem to be it is hardly possible for him, having spent most of his life in dealing with railway questions altogether from the point of view of the railway, to disabuse his mind sufficiently of that influence to be an absolutely impartial judge of such cases. The act provides that there shall be two judges or lawyers of ten years' standing upon the board. I have no objection to that, I feel it is necessary; but I also beg the minister not to place any more lawyers upon the board than the two. Of course we all recognize that lawyers are men who can reach a decision impartially to a greater extent perhaps than many others. They would not have the partiality of railway men or of shippers, but the experience of the past must teach us that there is a tendency among lawyers to perhaps string out matters rather too long. This tribunal should be one where questions can be dealt with in a summary and prompt manner, more quickly than is done in our courts. Therefore I would suggest that the other two members to be appointed should be either business men, or men from other professions, engineers, professors—surely in Canada there are in other classes men of the judicial frame of mind and rare ability who would fill this position satisfactorily for the salary named. I agree that the salary is not sufficient, especially for the chief commissioner, to secure the best men in Canada; I believe there are many who would fill that position if the salary were $15,000 instead of $10,000. Many such men are drawing much better pay than $10,000 a year, and if it were necessary to do that I feel that the government and the country would be justified in paying such a salary to the chief commissioner as would ensure obtaining the very best man available. As the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has said, there is no more important position than that of chief commissioner as the board has to deal with questions so far-reaching and of such importance to the whole community. The government cannot possibly exercise too great care and I feel sure they are fully seized of that opinion and will be impressed with that view. I would prefer to see some of these positions left open for a year rather than have men appointed who are not the very best to be found in this country.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not want to overwhelm the minister with advice as to the kind of men he should have appointed, but I wish to draw attention to the question of ages. The commissioners have to act promptly and quickly, to be full of nerve, force and energy. It will probably take them a few years to thoroughly learn how to best use their nerve, force and energy in order to perform quickly their important duties, and I would therefore suggest that we should not appoint men too far advanced in years; as after four or five years, in which they would learn how best to serve the commission, they might be prevented from acting on account of their age. If he finds two gentlemen of equal ability I would strongly advise him to appoint the younger of the two.

Mr. HAGGART. I was not present when the minister introduced the Bill, but I would like him to state what is the necessity for the appointment of three more commissioners and what the expense of the additional commissioners and the necessary staff will probably be. I presume that the work of the commission has become too heavy to be performed by the present commissioners.

In reference to the ideals—I must call

them ideals—of my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) as to the proper men to be appointed commissioners, he has apparently forgotten the maxim of this government. This government adheres to an old maxim which I have heard again and again from my youth upwards :

We'll gae our ain fish guts
To our ain sea maws.

This idea of distributing patronage which is in the hands of the government to your opponents is very nice to talk of when you are in opposition, but when you are in power and your government depends to some extent for existence on the distribution of patronage and other such means and has not enough patronage to go around among all your friends, it is another matter and to preach an ideal of what is correct and right for this government to do is, I think, wasting time.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will remember that when I presented the resolution I made a full explanation as to the necessity for the enlargement of the board. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) has really covered the whole question. The work has greatly increased already and we are adding to it by placing telegraphs under their control and making certain amendments to the Act which will enlarge their duties and powers, so that if the board is to be at all of the advantage the country expects them to be, will have to have an enlargement. As to the cost, the chief commissioner receives $10,000 ; the assistant chief commissioner, $9,000 and the other four commissioners, $8,000 each. The cost of the offices I suppose will depend on the distribution of the commission, where they are employed. If they do a great deal of travelling the expense will be greater.

Mr. BERGERON. Some additional secretaries will be required, I suppose ?

Mr. GRAHAM. They will have to have some additions to their staff undoubtedly.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it expected that they will all be residents of Ottawa or will some of them live in other portions of the Dominion?

Mr. GRAHAM. That question is now under consideration. Under the present Act all the commissioners must reside in Ottawa. We have not given that as much consideration as we might but the advisability of adhering to that particular clause of the old Act is being considered.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I was not present when the minister introduced the resolution but as a great number of suggestions have come from members in this House to the Minister of Railways I would like to say a word or two on behalf of the practical railway men and to suggest that when the commission is being enlarged a man with practical knowledge of the operation of railways should be appointed on the board. There are a great many reasons why that should be done. Laterally many prosecutions have been brought against railway employees for remissness of duty and representations have been made to the minister by the railway men regarding this matter as I understand. As I understand the law and the practice, recommendations have been made by the Railway Commission, in certain cases, that certain prosecutions be started against the employees. Under the circumstances the railway employees are entitled to have on that board a representative who will stand between them and the agitation created in the public mind against them, owing to recent prosecutions.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know that the commission has ever suggested that action be instituted. The commission has an official who investigates and places, as best he can, the responsibility for the accident and advises some means for preventing its recurrence. The suggestion of my hon. friend is entitled to consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is another reason why it should be considered. The powers and jurisdiction of the railway board touch very closely the every day work and life of the ordinary railway man. The board has jurisdiction respecting the running of trains, the provisions to be taken for the safety of the passengers and employees upon these trains and other cognate matters, and it is desirable that some man, having practical knowledge of those duties and that every day work and life, should be appointed to this board. I do not think it would be very difficult to find a suitable man. I have met at various times, during the past two or three years, delegations of railway men, and have been very much impressed indeed by the evident ability and thoughtfulness of these men, by their regard, not only for their own interests, but the interest of the roads and the corporations for which they work. No doubt they have a very vigilant regard for their own interests. They would not be human unless they had, but I have found a certain broadness of view among them which would perhaps not be realized by any one who had not come closely in touch with them. It would not, therefore, be difficult to find a suitable man in the ranks of the railway employees, and the suggestion ought to be very carefully considered by the government.

Mr. LENNOX. As regards the appointment of a man identified with the railway interests, I have not been in favour of appointing one from the class who have been managing the railways, because I realize the possibility that such people had become so wedded to certain ideas that unconsciously they would be governed by them after

they became commissioners. But I would not have the same objection to a selection from the ranks of the railway employees. They are especially an intelligent class of men who, by their own efforts in many cases, have risen very considerable from the position in which they originally started. I have a pretty intimate knowledge of that class, and I believe that they could furnish a very efficient commissioner. It would be only fair to that large army of useful workers in our country that they should be recognized to the extent of having at least one commissioner selected from the more advanced thinkers of their class.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is one other reason why a man from that body would serve on the commission perhaps better than one might at first sight consider. In that very important matter of the saving of life and property, the railway operator knows more about what really causes an accident than all the railwaymen sitting in the head office and not operating trains can possibly be expected to know. A man whose life has been spent in operating trains can do more, on account of that experience and knowledge, on the Board of Railway Commissioners than a score of the best witnesses appearing before it. Where there are conflicting interests, witnesses are called who contradict each other, and a commission, which has not actual knowledge of the operating of trains, does not know which set of witnesses to believe. It is important that the great loss of life and property, which has taken place in the last ten years, should be put a stop to, and I do not believe that anybody could do better service on the commission in that respect than one taken from the ranks of the great body of railway working men.

Mr. MACPHERSON. In my opinion the railway operators, who have under their charge the care of the lives of so many people, should have some recognition upon this board. We have had in the last two years many prosecutions of engineers, firemen and conductors, instituted by the Board of Railway Commissioners. Having lived in a railway town for twenty years among railway men, I do not think there is any class in Canada to-day whose intelligence is any higher than that of the engineers operating our railway trains.

Mr. LANCASTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACPHERSON. There is no accident I have seen—and I have seen many disasters, as I live in the upper part of British Columbia where such accidents have been more frequent than elsewhere—where the engineer himself was to blame. At any rate I know of very few cases in which he was. If an engineer overruns his hours and an accident occurs in consequence or a train is stopped and the conductor fails to send back his rear end brakesman to flag the on-coming train, the case is wide open for the company to discipline the man in default. But to say that an engineer who, on the interpretation of an order, believed that his interpretation was correct, or whose watch may have gone out ten seconds or fifteen seconds or a minute, and a disaster has resulted—to say that such a man shall be placed in gaol as a common criminal is going much further than the laws of the country demand. As a member of the House of Commons I want to warn the Railway Commission that they are attempting something they have no right to do when they place behind the bars of a common gaol an engineer and call upon him to defend himself as a criminal without first having had an investigation.

Will anybody say that an engineer will deliberately run the risk of losing his own life and the lives of the men, women and children on the train which he draws? When an accident happens, I think there should first be a thorough investigation by the railway company, and then, if criminal negligence is found, it will be time enough, and not till then, for the Railway Commission to place any of these men behind the bars of the common goal. I speak for the men; I have talked to many of them; I know the engineers, the firemen, the conductors, the brakesmen in my province, and I know that they have a deep and earnest desire to perform their duties and to run their trains in the best possible way. You will destroy the discipline and the esprit de corps of a class of men whom we want to keep to that high standard if you maintain this system of persecution, which has been, I think mistakenly, pursued during the past few years. Nine-tenths of the men who are in charge of the railways of Canada are men who have worked their way up from being simply road bosses, and they know the duties and the dangers of every man on the road. They are the people who will take action, because they are desirous of seeing their road run in such a manner that the public will feel safe upon it, and they will endeavour to keep in their service the best class of men. Take an engineer who has been running on trains for fifteen or sixteen or eighteen years, and who is brought up before a justice of the peace, and committed to the common gaol. When the men hear of this, a shudder goes through them, and they ask, 'What are we coming to in this country? Are we coming to an autocracy, that we are not allowed to have the same privilege as the man who operates a stationary engine in a factory in case his boiler blows up, of having an investigation by his superior officer before the criminal law is invoked?' I want to impress on the Railway Commission, who have done, are doing, and will do good work, that these persecutions and prose-

cutions they are undermining a class of men who are doing good service for the public. I speak strongly in this matter, because I know the feelings of these men.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think my hon. friend is labouring under an error in supposing that the Railway Commission have anything to do with prosecuting the men for negligence.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The men think they have.

Mr. GALLIHER. That is a mistaken idea. The Railway Commission have nothing to do with that, good, bad or indifferent. With the main portion of my hon. friend's argument I strongly agree. When the Railway Act was amended and a special clause was inserted regarding prosecutions of railway men, there was a strong feeling, and a proper feeling too, that the greatest safeguards should be provided for the travelling public. But to my mind the object sought to be attained by that amendment has not been and will not be realized. In my opinion, when you place a man in a responsible and dangerous position, such as that of a railway engineer or a fireman or a man in charge of a train, his mind should be absolutely clear and free from any idea that there is hanging over him, for what might be due to no fault or negligence on his part, but possibly to a lapse of memory, a prosecution such as could not be applied to a man employed in any other work in Canada. I believe it will have the effect of driving some of the best men from the railway service. Like my hon. friend who has just spoken, I have consulted railway men on this subject, and I will say for them that a finer body of men or men who have more at heart the safety of the people placed in their charge, it would be impossible to find. When you have men who are ready to sacrifice their lives for those people, you have a class of men who are going to do what is right. I believe that men who neglect their duties, and thus cause injury or loss of life, should be prosecuted in the ordinary way under the Criminal Code.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I am very glad to see the great unanimity that there is among hon. members regarding the wisdom of appointing at least one of these commissioners from the ranks of the railway employees. On the occasion of the first reading of this Bill I took the opportunity of suggesting to the Minister of Railways that some such course should be adopted. It seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, that at least one of the board of six commissioners should be a man who, if he has not risen from the ranks of the railway employees, is in thorough touch and harmony with the work and the interests of those men. I think where we have a board composed of six members, as this will be, you could not complete it better than by the addition of one man who is familiar with all the work of railway employees. These men have both a practical and a technical knowledge, some of them have an advanced technical knowledge. So where you get a combination of the two elements of ability as a practical man, with skill and technical knowledge, you have a combination that will be very useful on this commission.

Regarding the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson), he was in error regarding the action of the Board of Railway Commissioners, although I concur entirely with the spirit of his remarks. I think that the member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) hit the nail on the head when he said that there should be but one criminal law for all classes of persons. It does not seem to me that one man should be liable criminally for an act for which his co-labourer in some other department of life is not liable. We must remember that these men are in the forefront of every accident, they are usually the greatest sufferers in such accidents, and it seems to me it is largely taking the nerve out of them when you not only place them in a position of danger, although they assume it voluntarily, but in addition you make them criminally liable for something that in itself is without criminal intent. The test should be criminal intent; intent to do wrong is the test in every crime, and should be in this case. There is, I know, a section of the Railway Act which permits these prosecutions to be taken, but I think the feeling of the community generally is out of harmony with such a provision. I think those prosecutions that have taken place had only the half-hearted support of the community at large, and in cases where imprisonment has been inflicted by the judge the executive have intervened, and in one case at least that comes to my mind, have granted pardon. I think such intervention has met with entire public approval. This may not be a matter for parliament to consider, but it is certainly one that the Railway Commission might consider, and no doubt when the board is fully constituted they will have an opportunity of considering the effect of the various provisions of the Act, including this one.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I understand the clause to which the hon. gentleman refers has been added to the Criminal Code.

Mr. LENNOX. No, to the general Railway Act.

Mr. MACDONELL. I am glad the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) has mentioned it, because that is just where the law should be; it should be in the Criminal Code, and be made of general application instead of applying to one section of the community. I trust the Minister of Railways will give more than a passing con-

sideration to the wisdom of appointing a man who is in touch with the actual operation of these railways, a man who has first-hand knowledge of the business, and not one who gets his knowledge at second-hand by reading reports.

Mr. GRAHAM. The question my hon. friend has raised might be discussed in a proposition to amend the General Railway Act, and I may say that a little later in the session I may have some amendments to propose to the Railway Act which will give ample room for this discussion.

Mr. LENNOX. I think the minister introduced the other day an Act to amend the Railway Act in several particulars, and to give the board enlarged powers.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did introduce a Bill to give the board jurisdiction over telegraphs and telephones, and to enlarge its powers. Amendments to the General Railway Act might have no reference to the Board of Railway Commissioners. The section to which my hon. friend refers in the Railway Act has been brought to my attention a good many times, and I have been giving a good deal of thought lately as to the effect of the operation of what I may call this double-barrelled statute directed against one class of the community. I am considering what might be the effect of removing that provision. Prosecutions under that law do not begin with the Railway Commissioners, but with the attorneys general of each province, whose duty it is to attend to the enforcement of law in that respect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether the Minister of Railways has considered the organization of the Railway Commission in two divisions, one having more especially jurisdiction over matters that might be called litigious, as involving work of a judicial character, and the other division having power more especially to deal with executive and administrative matters, in which, for example, it is not necessary to have hearings. I am not thoroughly familiar with the work of the commission, but I suppose that it might be divided into those two branches. If that could be accomplished it would be very desirable.

Eventually you may work out under the system now proposed three tribunals, one of whom might be presided over by the chief commissioner, another by the assistant chief commissioner and a third by the deputy of the chief commissioner. That ias a very good system so far as it goes and no doubt will facilitate prompt hearings. But it is open to the objection that these different tribunals may give entirely dissimilar decisions, and there is not in the case of a railway commission that correcting power which deals with similar conditions in the courts, namely, a court of appeal. There are various divisions in the court throughout the country, but they are all subject to the appellate power of the Court of Appeal, so that where principles of law have been laid down by one tribunal in one way and by another tribunal in another way, the Court of Appeal corrects them. It has been said that on one occasion the Court of Common Pleas in England decided upon a proposition of law in one way, the Court of Exchequer decided the same point in another way, and the Court of Queen's Bench, in its anxiety to be right, decided the point in both ways. Those were all subject to the power of a higher tribunal. I do not observe any provision in this Bill by which appellate powers are conferred upon the commissioners as a whole to deal with any possible discrepancies of that character and it seems to me that they are very likely to arise under this Act. Of course if they do arise we may prefer to modify the Act later on.

That is all very well as far as it goes, subject to the criticism that I have just now made, but the minister's scheme does not get us very much further along with the executive and administrative branch of the work. I speak on this subject with deference and with a full realization of how little I know of the work of the commission. If rumours which come to us are correct, there are thousands of tariffs lying in the office of the commission which have not even been read over there and work of that kind has not been carried very vigorously up to the present moment. I have no doubt that the failure to carry on that work very vigourously is due to the fact that the commission is overworked. What I have said is not by way of criticism of the commission in this connection. I would like to know from the minister if this subject has engaged the attention of the government and if he thinks that the proposal that I have mentioned will be feasible at a later date if not now.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am glad to get all these suggestions. Our object is to get a Bill that will produce the most satisfactory results. Suggestions from the other side of the House are very welcome indeed. This is a very pertinent question. I was impressed with the view which the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) takes of it when it was suggested to me first that it would be well to divide the commission into different parts, each part having its own specific work to perform ; in fact, it was suggested to me that one department of the commission should be a railway and engineering department, to deal with engineering subjects and to look after the railway portion of the work, that another should be the legal department and that another should be the traffic department, or something of that kind. But this difficulty arose which seemed to be a fair reply to that suggestion. A portion of the commission goes

to British Columbia as the board to hear cases. If that were the traffic portion of the commission it would be unable to hear any cases outside of that particular branch of its work and we would have to go to the expense of sending another branch of the commission out to take up another part of the work. There would be not only the additional expense but there would also be a great waste of time. I have come to the conclusion after a great deal of consideration that to get practical results it is better to have each separate part of the board with power to act as the board with regard to all cases that may be brought up in any particular community in order to get a speedy adjustment and to dispose of these cases as rapidly as possible. As to the question of appeal, I suppose there is no doubt in the world that the board has very wide powers for forming regulations and if the parts of that board were not absolutely satisfied as to a question of law no doubt they could settle it as a whole by adopting a regulation before they gave judgment. Perhaps I am narrow in my views in this respect but, I was trying to guard against the possibility or the probability of there being too many appeals. It struck me that there must be corporations against whom an order was made by the board; that is a portion of the board which is the board. There is in the Act power by which an appeal may be made from the board to the court on questions of law and to the Governor in Council on questions of fact. It struck me that if we were to insert in the Act power by which they could appeal to the full board from the decision of a part of the board possibly some of the railways, or some other companies, or some people might take advantage of that fact to delay the putting into force of an order by asking leave to appeal from a portion of the board to the entire board, getting as many adjournments as possible between the legal men and the companies, then going from the board to the Governor in Council with as much delay as possible with the result that by time time that they got the final decision there would be no use for the decision at all. Perhaps I am narrow in that view but I was trying to avoid too many appeals.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a great deal in that, but what I was suggesting would not involve any of these difficulties. You could insert a clause that would give the board as a whole power to order that any question argued before a division should be re-argued before the board as a whole and not confer the power of appeal on either one of the litigants. However that is a matter for consideration later on perhaps. But I do not know that the minister exactly grasped my suggestion of a moment ago. I entirely agree with him that it would not be advisable to make any distribution of jurisdiction which would involve the necessity of sending first one division of the board and then another to deal with these respective subjects in different parts of the Dominion. But, what I have in my mind —I do not know whether it is feasible or not—is that there must be a great deal of work of an administrative and executive character which would be dealt with altogether by men who would never leave Ottawa at all and who would accept and act upon the reports of their expert officers in regard to the matters they have to deal with. If that could be accomplished I would regard it as desirable; on the other hand if it is not possible to make a division of that character I would be inclined to accept the view that the minister has just now expressed.

On section 3,

Section 12 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

12. In case of the absence of the chief commissioner and the assistant chief commissioner, or of their inability to act, the deputy chief commissioner shall exercise the powers of the chief commission for him or in his stead, and in such case, all regulations, orders and other documents signed by the deputy chief commissioner shall have the like force and effect as if signed by the chief commissioner.

2. Whenever the deputy chief commissioner appears to have acted for or instead of the chief commissioner, it shall be conclusively presumed that he so acted in the absence or disability of the chief commissioner and of the assistant chief commissioner within the meaning of this section.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I suggest that in view of the change already made in the the Act you should say:

Whenever the assistant chief commissioner or the deputy chief commissioner appears to have acted, &c.

In view of the change that you have already made in paragraph (c) of subsection 5, as amended by section 2 of this Bill, the addition of certain words here seems desirable. I have led the minister to make that change and I want to keep him straight as far as I can. I think you should say:

Whenever the assistant chief commissioner or the deputy chief commissioner appears, &c.

Mr. GRAHAM. That would tangle it up in the next case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You have said that the assistant chief commissioner shall exercise the powers you give him only in the absence of the chief commissioner. It seems to me you should state that when he does exercise these powers it shall be presumed that the chief commissioner is absent.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Minister of Justice points out that this section is merely the

old section, adding an assistant chief commissioner.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That has nothing to do with what I have said.

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot convince the Minister of Justice that we should have any other amendment to this.

Mr. LENNOX. This section provides that the deputy chief commissioner shall act in the place of the chief commissioner, but it does not provide that he shall also act in the place of the assistant chief commissioner. Suppose a section of the board goes to Vancouver, comprising the assistant chief commissioner, the deputy chief commissioner and a commissioner, and the assistant chief commissioner is unable to get there you have no provision for the deputy chief commissioner taking his place, although you have a provision for his taking the chief commissioner's place. You should state that in case of the absence of the chief commissioner and of the assistant chief commissioner or of their inability to act the deputy chief commissioner shall exercise the powers of the chief commissioner or of the assistant chief commissioner as the case may be.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If the deputy chief commissioner is acting for the chief commissioner he cannot act for the assistant chief commissioner at the same time, and if he is acting for the chief commissioner he has all authority to act.

Mr. LENNOX. That would be right if he were taking the place of the chief commissioner.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If he takes the authority of the chief commissioner surely he would have full power to act.

Mr. LENNOX. In certain cases he may be acting for the assistant chief commissioner and he should have the same power as if he were acting for the chief commissioner.

Mr. GALLIHER. If we were dividing the board into different heads your argument might be good.

Mr. LENNOX. It now says that the deputy chief commissioner shall exercise the powers of the chief commissioner for him or in his stead. If it said 'for them or in their stead' it would be correct.

Mr. GALLIHER. The first two lines of the clause cover that.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the chief commissioner is not present the assistant commissioner is then chief commissioner, and if neither be present then the deputy chief commissioner is acting for the chief commissioner. When they get together in Winnipeg they are the board. If the chief commissioner is there he is the head; if he is not there and the assistant chief is, then the assistant chief has all the powers of the chief. If neither of them is there, the deputy acts for the chief commissioner and not for the assistant chief.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The minister will observe the necessity of the suggestion I put forward as to the constitution of the board.

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh yes, about the lawyers.

On section 4,

4. Subsection 2 of section 13 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

2. The chief commissioner, when present, shall preside, and the assistant chief commissioner, when present, in the absence of the chief commissioner, shall preside, and the opinion of either of them upon any question arising when he is presiding, which in the opinion of the commissioners is a question of law, shall prevail.

Mr. LANCASTER. That does not provide for the board sitting in three sections. It says that either one of two of the commissioners must preside and therefore only two sections can sit at one time. We should go further and provide that the deputy may preside; otherwise the Act will be self-contradictory.

Mr. GRAHAM. In this we are not dealing with the powers of the deputy. His powers are defined in the existing Act and the section relating to them is not repealed.

Mr. LANCASTER. If we intend to have three boards of two commissioners each sitting at the same time, we should not have this section in this Act because we are clearly saying here that no one but the chief or the assistant chief shall preside at any meeting.

Mr. GRAHAM. Section 13 of the old Act subsection 2 provides:

The chief commissioner, when present shall preside and his opinion upon any question which in the opinion of the commissioners is a question of law, shall prevail.

We are simply in this giving the same powers to the assistant chief, we are not interfering with the powers of the deputy. It is fully provided in the preceding sections that in the absence of these two the deputy shall preside.

Mr. LANCASTER. You have here contradictory sections. I would also suggest that provision should be made to secure a decision where two commissioners are sitting and they cannot agree on a material question of fact. I would suggest for want of a better remedy that we should say, as one of the two has to be either the chief, the assistant chief or the deputy, if their opinions are not in harmony the opinion of the

chief, the assistant or the deputy in that order should prevail.

Mr. BARR. Then you might as well have only one commissioner.

Mr. LANCASTER. No. Two gentlemen trying to do their duty are affected greatly in their decision by the fact that they do not agree and if the opinion of the chief, or the assistant or the deputy was to prevail and if he insisted on it, it would be all the more perfect and likely to be correct from the very fact of its having being criticised by his brother commissioner.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact if it is a question of law the Act provides that the opinion of the chief, the assistant or the deputy shall prevail.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is on a question of law, but I was careful to state that I meant on a question of fact that might decide the whole case. We should provide something to break that deadlock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is partly correct, not so far as the deputy is concerned.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think you will find it in clause 12. I do not think in practice it has occurred but I would say that in case of such a deadlock the case would have to be reheard before an odd number of commissioners, there could not be any decision.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that wise, it is doubling the expense and delay ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Possibly the commission will not often sit in twos and that there may never be a deadlock of the kind suggested. You could hardly provide that on a question of fact the opinion of the legal members of the commission should prevail, nor would it be right to say that the opinion of the other members should prevail. I think if such case arose it would have to be re-argued before an odd number of commissioners.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course you might require some provision for that. The difficulty exists under the present law. There is a provision that two shall form a quorum. I do not know whether any difficulty has arisen, if not it may arise. If you apply the legal rule, then the action fails. You go to the court making application and asking for action. The court is equally divided and therefore cannot act and so your application fails. That is the legal rule and perhaps the same thing would result here. It might be desirable to get some kind of decision and let the parties go on further.

Mr. GRAHAM. Possibly it could be done by a regulation of the board.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as the chief commissioner and the assistant are concerned, the questions of law are already disposed of by the statute but questions of fact are not. I do not know of any very practical suggestion unless you might say you would adopt, for the purpose of appeal, the finding of the chief or the assistant chief or something of that kind. That would be merely an arbitrary way but it is sometimes better to get a decision than let the parties do the fighting all over again.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like to get it into a shape so as not to open the door to an appeal if I could. Possibly we could work out something that would reach the desired effect.

Mr. LANCASTER. Let the section stand.

On section 6,

Section 18 of the said Act is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

2. The Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the minister, may establish at any place in Canada such office or offices as are required for the board, and may provide therefor the necessary accommodation, furnishings, stationery and equipment.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the object?

Mr. GRAHAM. Suppose this board is going to be in Winnipeg hearing a number of cases, the hearing of which will take two or three months. We require a staff and the necessary accommodation. We might have to leave a portion of the board there a longer time and it may become necessary to have headquarters there. It would be cheaper for us to do that and have a permanent place which the public would know is their headquarters.

Mr. BERGERON. That would apply to all parts of the Dominion.

Mr. GRAHAM No, only to the headquarters in that respect.

Bill reported.

## INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUND.

Bill (No. 117) to amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund (Mr. Graham) read the second time and the House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Section 17 of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway Employees' Provident Fund Act, chapter 22 of the statutes of 1907, is amended by adding the words 'and are not reinstated' at the end of paragraph (b).

Mr. GRAHAM. The object is this : As originally passed by this House, the Act provided that employees belonging to the provident fund who had been dismissed would not rank on the fund unless reinstated. The Bill was amended partially in the upper chamber by striking out the

words 'and are not reinstated.' These words were struck out of the English statute and remained in the French statute. There is a case where the preference is given the French language. In the working out of the Act, I find it is possible to do injustice to some worthy employee who might be dismissed under misapprehension or after investigation.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it correct in French?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Then it is an Act of parliament and is the law.

Mr. GRAHAM. The French language and the upper chamber are in conflict.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then the upper chamber will have to give way.

Mr. GRAHAM. My object is to amend the statute so that the provident fund can be better worked out.

Mr. BERGERON. Why not say simply the French version is correct?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend suggests that we should amend the English version. I was advised that that was not the better way to do it. Can you amend half your statute?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will not the result be, if this Bill passes, that these words will go into the French version twice?

Mr. BERGERON. It is the law of the country to-day and we do not require to pass an Act of parliament to change that.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend suggested that we might get a duplicate statute in French. I made that suggestion but was informed by a member of the legal profession that this Bill was the orthodox way to do it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why not insert a preamble stating clearly what the trouble is?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Minister of Justice is fixing it up by inserting after the word amended the words 'in the English version thereof.'

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I would like to ask if the fact that the Senate struck out these words, and by a typographical error they were included in the French version, makes it a legal statute?

Mr. BERGERON. It is legal as long as it is in one of the two official languages.

Amendment agreed to, Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

## DOMINION COAL COMPANY LABOUR DISPUTE.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I would like to read a telegram which I have just received, as follows:—

Glace Bay, Nova Scotia, March 13, 1908.

Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux,
Minister of Labour, Ottawa, Ontario.

Have reached satisfactory settlement of Dominion Coal Company dispute. All parties pleased.

ADAM SHORTT.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

## PRIVATE BILLS.

### CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 110) respecting a certain patent of Frederic C. Rehm, Elias Frank and Isidor Frank.—Mr. Béland.

### NIAGARA, ST. CATHARINES AND TORONTO RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 82) respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—Mr. Adamson.

On section 1,

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I cannot permit this Bill to pass without again recording my protest against legislation of this character being enacted by this House. This Bill is short, it has been thoroughly discussed in the Railway Committee, and it is not my intention to do more than to briefly review its history. It provides for an extension of the right to construct this railway. The company was originally incorporated nine or ten years ago, its powers have been extended on two occasions since, and the time within which this railway should be commenced and completed will expire in the month of June next should this measure not be adopted. The company, it is true, has built some of its line of railway—that is to say, a line of railway from Niagara Falls to St. Catharines or in the vicinity—but the portion they now propose to build, namely, an extension from St. Catharines on to Hamilton—at least part of the distance—and from Hamilton to Toronto is entirely a new undertaking. At most the company has only surveyed that line, so that in applying to parliament to-day for charter rights the company is in the same position as it was when it originally made application, and I submit that we should regard it as if the company were making its application de novo. That being so, parliament should provide all the safeguards which it is customary to provide in a measure of this kind. Now, under the powers contained in the original charter of this company I submit it is a fair statement to say that they have the right to build a

railway into the city of Toronto. I quote from their charter :

And an extension to a point in or near the city of Toronto by way of Hamilton or thereabouts.

Practically speaking, therefore, this company has the power to construct a railway into the city of Toronto.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. Is it a steam road?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. It is in part a steam road and in part an electric road. I am not speaking now of the railroad itself, but it has amalgamated with or taken over one or two other railways, and on its system, so far as it has a system, it is in part a steam road and in part an electric road, in part running on a highway and in part running on its own right of way. It is very hard to say just what the character of this road is, and that is why I say some provision should be inserted in this Bill for the protection of the municipalities, because it may bob up any time as an electric street railway exercising running rights over municipal highways. In the Railway Committee I suggested that there should be a provision inserted to the effect that this railway should not be permitted to operate as a street railway, in whole or in part, within the limits of the city of Toronto. The reason for such a provision is quite obvious. It would be absurd for any one to contend that this railway should be given the right to operate in Toronto. The promoters have declared that they are a steam railway, and if that be so what objection can there be to insert in this charter a provision that this company shall not operate, either in whole or in part, as a street railway in the city of Toronto?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. The hon. gentleman says this is a steam railway in part and an electric railway in part; are they obliged to run by electricity only on a certain part, or can they run with steam on all of the road?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. They can use either, and they are using both as a matter of fact.

Mr. GALLIHER. That does not quite answer the question. Have they power to use steam on any portion of the road ; for instance, the part that they simply have an electric charter for?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. They are a railway declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, and I suppose they have power to use steam the same as any other railway company. There is nothing in their charter one way or the other about it, but I understand they are using steam for hauling freight and electricity for passenger transportation.

Mr. BRISTOL. I might say that in 1901 the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, by chapter 76 of the statutes of that year, were authorized by this parliament to lease or purchase, on such terms as may be agreed upon, the Niagara Falls, Wesley Park and Clifton Tramway Company, or the Port Dalhousie, St. Catharines and Thorold Electric Railway Company, or the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway Company.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. They have power to acquire, purchase and operate these roads, and they have in part acquired and they are operating some of these lines. As the charter stands to-day in its present wide-open manner, this company would have power to operate its line of railway in the city of Toronto. The city of Toronto is not different in the abstract from any other municipality ; that is, in the abstract the city of Toronto is entitled to no greater consideration than any other municipality, but because of the congested condition of the population at that centre, and because of the very great value of the local franchise for operating street railways in that city, the conditions are very different from those to be found in a rural municipality. I cannot perhaps better express this view than to read a short extract from a leading editorial in to-day's 'Globe,' a public journal that I understand the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and those who support him will at least listen to with consideration. The article is headed 'A Case for Sir Wilfrid' :

Sir Wilfrid Laurier has always been a federalist, believing in the fullest exercise of local self-government compatible with the maintenance of an effective central authority for the transaction of national business. The 'Globe' wishes respectfully to direct Sir Wilfrid's attention to the fact that the Dominion parliament has no more right to meddle with the street railway franchise of Toronto than with the snow by-law. The people of Toronto, exercising their undoubted rights, have given a franchise to a company conveying the sole authority to operate a surface street railway within the city limits until 1921. In return for this the city gets over a thousand dollars a day in revenue as its share of the street railway earnings. If there is any ambiguity in the Bill under discussion, any loophole that might force the city to defend itself against an attempt to run a street railway under a Dominion charter, surely it is not asking too much to urge that parliament remove the ambiguity. The Minister of Railways, the man responsible for the drafting of safe railway laws, holds that the amendment could do no harm and yet his advice was thrust aside by the people's elected representatives.

There is need for a declaration from the premier, that, no matter what individual members of either party may do in the Railway Committee, the Liberal party in Canada is still a party believing in the utmost possible exercise of the principle of local self-government.

I hope that the Minister of Railways will approve of what I have just read and as

he is the minister who is responsible for the railway administration in this country, I hope he will see to it that proper means are taken to have incorporated in this Bill the amendment which I moved in regard to having it declared unequivocally and without any doubt that this railway is not to be permitted to do a local street railway business in the city of Toronto. The burden of the support of this Bill in the Railway Committee was something like this: It was said, in the first place, that Toronto had no more rights than any other place. I think one hon. gentleman of that committee said that Toronto had no more rights to consideration than the smallest hamlet. That proposition bears upon its face its own refutation, because, as I have said, the congested condition of the population makes it very different from a rural municipality or a hamlet. It was said that the Railway Commission was ample protection to the city of Toronto. That did not seem to me to be a sufficient protection and I tried to urge that it was not a sufficient protection. Assuming that this is a steam road and that it crosses highways from the western entrance to the city to the terminal this road will cross twenty-seven highways, while, if it goes through the city, it will cross one hundred highways. At many of these streets the traffic is enormous, especially at certain seasons of the year. The city of Toronto is struggling with the two existing railway systems and is receiving their co-operation in the effort to either elevate these railways on a viaduct or depress them and compel them to go by means of subways under the streets which they cross. At some of these crossings as many as 200,000 people pass in a day. These people are not all Toronto people, but many of them are people who come from all over the province and from other provinces in Canada and elsewhere. The city of Toronto is endeavouring to get rid of all level crossings and the railway companies are agreeing to that. The present question is merely as to the method of doing that. The railway companies have their engineers at work endeavouring to devise the best means by which this difficulty can be solved, the question of expense is being considered and it looks as though the city and railways will be able to divide the expense in a way agreeable to both and that they will find a solution of the question as to the best means of crossing the highways agreeable to both parties. Just when that is being done this railway company gets its charter rights renewed which gives it a wide open door to run wherever it chooses, because it may cross whatever highways it chooses and the city has no right to lift its little finger against it. The city can, it is true, appeal to the Board of Railway Commissioners. The Railway Commission has proved a very useful body. Nobody will deny that. Its usefulness is felt more and more every day, but yet it is very largely an experiment. Only to-day we find a Bill going through to provide for appointing additional members of that board. It is yet in its experimental stage, and to leave the rights of a municipality like the city of Toronto to be dealt with, possibly in an off-hand way by a very busy commission, is not fair. By this Bill you actually deprive the city of Toronto of certain rights which a rural municipality possesses. Let me direct the attention of the hon. gentleman to section 235 of the Railway Act. It was laboured in the committee upstairs that section 235 gave the municipality all the protection and power which it wanted or could find any need or occasion for. Section 235, to those who are conversant with the Railway Act, is a very well known section. It is the section regarding crossings of railways and highways. It is this:

The railway may be carried upon, along or across an existing highway upon leave therefor having been first obtained from the board as hereinafter authorized.

That is a railway may be carried along a highway in any municipality if the board gives it leave.

Provided that the board shall not grant leave to any company to carry any street railway or tramway, or any railway operated or to be operated as a street railway or tramway, along any highway which is within the limits of any city or incorporated town until the company has first obtained consent therefor by a by-law of the municipal authority of such city or incorporated town.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. That covers this company in so far as the street railway part is concerned.

Mr. MACDONELL. I am very glad th the hon. gentleman makes that interjection. As far as I have read seemingly that is true, but in subsection 3 of that very section we find this:

Nothing in this section shall deprive any such company of rights conferred upon it by any special Act of the parliament of Canada, or amendment thereof, passed prior to the 12th day of March, one thousand nine hundred and three.

So that any railway company that has its charter prior to the 12th March, 1903 is exempt from that prohibition and the Railway Commission has no power, in the case of a street railway that is incorporated prior to that time, to say to that railway company: You shall first obtain the consent of the municipality.

In cases where railways were incorporated since the 12th of March, 1903, the municipality has the veto power. They may say: You shall not pass along or across the highway or a public place. So Toronto is in the position with regard to this railway,

which was incorporated in 1899, four years prior to the date laid down in the present Railway Act, that the municipality has no right to be consulted whether the railway shall run upon the highway or not. The municipality of the city of Toronto has no right to any voice as to whether a railway shall run across a highway. I say that is the effect of the operation of section 235. I referred a moment ago to the level crossing; that is the question to-day in the city of Toronto and every other big city, both in the States and Canada. The level crossing theory has no application at all to a place like Toronto. The legislation regarding level crossings, the jurisdiction of the board over them, and so on, all apply to level crossings where you can maintain them as level crossings, where you have gates, watchmen, and protection of that nature. But to-day the absolute need is to elevate or depress the railways, or elevate or depress the highways. You must do one thing or the other. The level crossing has got to go, it is a death trap. There is scarcely a week in the city of Toronto that there is not some fatality on some one of these one or two hundred level crossings with which the city is infested so it becomes an absolute necessity to abolish the level crossing, to deal with the matter on a more up-to-date and humane basis, namely, the elevation or depression of either the tracks or the highways. That is the way the difficulty has been solved in other large cities, and that is what it is coming to in Toronto. Now just when Toronto is dealing with other railways, and they are agreeing to elevate or depress their tracks, it seems to me there could be no more unfair measure than the present Bill.

It was urged in the Railway Commission —where the Act was again relied on— that it afforded ample protection in regard to elevating or depressing the railway. Now let me show how far that protection is assured by the Railway Act. I refer to section 237 of the Railway Act. What I contended in the committee and, what I contend here is—and it has not been controverted—that in so far as obliging the railways to elevate or depress their tracks the Railway Commission has no power. Now what does that mean? It simply means that if Toronto says: We do not want these level crossings, we do not want any railway to cross on a level, the railway makes application to have its plans approved and to have the crossing allowed. The matter is considered, on investigation it is shown that these roads must either be elevated or depressed, there cannot be a level crossing. The Railway Commission is asked to make a ruling that they must be either elevated or depressed. Yet under the Railway Act as it stands at present, they have no power to compel the railway to elevate or depress, they have only power to say to the railway company: You cannot cross that highway; they can apply the block system, and there you are, there is a deadlock. The railway company cannot be compelled to elevate or depress, yet the municipality may be compelled, under section 237, to elevate or depress their highway. Now this is a serious matter, and I am glad to see that the Minister of Railways seems to realize it fully. At the present time, as I have tried to show, the Railway Commission has power to order a municipality to elevate or depress its highway, but they have no corresponding power to order a railway company to elevate or depress their tracks. I have an amendment on the Order Paper to amend the Railway Act so as to give the Railway Commission power, in proper cases where they think it is rigbt and just, to order railways to elevate or depress their tracks. That may or may not become law, but in the meantime as the law stands, Toronto is in the position that they cannot force the railway to do this needed work.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman claim that under section 237 the commission cannot order the railway to do the elevating or depressing?

Mr. MACDONELL. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. The import of the whole section is that where application is made by the railway to cross a highway, then the order is made.

Mr. MACDONELL. Section 2 of section 237 reads as follows:—

> Upon any application for leave to construct a railway upon, along, or across an existing highway, or to construct a highway across an existing railway, the applicant shall submit to the board a plan and profile of such crossing, showing the portion of railway or highway affected.
>
> The board may, by order, grant such application upon such terms and conditions as to protection, safety and convenience of the public, as it may deem expedient, or may order that the highway be carried over or under the railway, or be temporarily or permanently diverted.

And so on. There is here no corresponding right for the board to order the railway to be carried over or under the highway. There can be no two constructions put upon it. There is no power in the Railway Commission to order the railway to do that work. What was asked for in the committee was this, not that this railway be blocked from coming into Toronto, but that where it proposed to cross a highway it should not cross on a level without the consent of the municipality; that is, that in cases where there is manifestly a dangerous crossing the city should have the right to say: You shall not make that crossing on a level. That is a reasonable effort on the part of the city to protect life and property. Now this provision was sought to be put in the Hamilton Radial Bill, over

which we had a long fight, and the promoters of the Bill finally agreed to accept it; they will operate under that provision. Now all we ask is that this railway should be treated in the same way as the Hamilton Radial Railway in regard to level crossings.

They are not to stop except at certain intervals and must not do a street railway business. That was asked of the Hamilton Radial Railway people and they put such a provision in their Bill. They can only stop at two points between their entrance into Toronto and their terminals in that city and they have no power to do a street railway business. It must be remembered that there is as yet no money invested in the whole section from Toronto, forty miles to Hamilton and around the bay to Stoney Creek. It is not as if they had entered into bond obligation on the faith of this charter, they have simply surveyed a line. When they come to this parliament nine years after their original application, when conditions have changed, when the level crossings in Toronto are not as they were ten years ago, I think that modern restrictions should be imposed on the company. They should be asked no more than what is fair. There is no desire to restrict them in their powers or to hamper them in their operations, but it is asked that they shall not be permitted to do a street railway business and to perpetuate the level crossings in Toronto with these recurring fatalities. These crossings are no more than death traps.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). I am sure the members for Toronto will take care of the interests of that city; I simply wish to call attention to the fact that this road will be constructed on a right of way purchased many years ago by the Toronto and Niagara Power Company between Hamilton and Toronto. Speaking particularly for my own county, the farmers in selling that right of way sold the land cheap owing to representations that they would have an electric railway so that their small products could be conveyed quickly and cheaply to Toronto and Hamilton. They were anxious to have such an electric service but now they are confronted with the fact that this is to be a steam railway. There are already three steam railways in this part of Peel county within a radius of three miles, the Canadian Pacific Railway main line, west; the Grand Trunk double track line along the lake shore to Hamilton and the Canadian Pacific Railway service under leasehold arrangement over the Grand Trunk double track. This road will run between these two existing lines and the farmers will not have the better service they expected. The steam railways do not give much attention to the carriage of these small products of the farmers. They run their fast passenger trains past the stations in my county when there are hundreds of boxes of strawberries piled upon the platforms at the stations. The farmers have been complaining of this for some years, but the railways would rather attend to the enormous passenger traffic between Toronto and Hamilton and westward to the United States. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) has not many sins to answer for in his department—I do not know about his past history elsewhere—but I must remind him that his government and he particularly will be held responsible by the people if greater care is not exercised in the granting of charters to railways in different parts of the country, permitting these companies to hold out the inducement to the people that they will have an electric road for the carriage of their products and then having the charter taken over by one of the great railway corporations and converted into a steam railway. This will give four lines of railway running within a radius of three miles in my county and the farmers will have no electric service. My friends from Toronto must remember that until the road is built through the counties between Hamilton and Toronto they will not have to worry about entrances into the cities. I would suggest to them that it will be necessary for them to lend some assistance to the municipalities before they may expect much assistance from the municipalities in connection with the demands that they are making upon the railway company. I wish to say that I sympathize very much with the representatives of Toronto in their contention that as Toronto has a large and growing population, it is very important that level railway crossings should be done away with within its limits.

Mr. BRISTOL. So far as Toronto is concerned, we are glad to have railways of all kinds come in and bring people and traffic to us, but we are at a loss to know—and nobody has yet been able to tell us with certainty—whether this Bill has reference to a steam railway or an electric street railway or a hybrid which will take whatever character may be necessary for the purpose of developing its franchise along the most profitable lines. I have had the curiosity to look at its charter and the amendments thereto prior to 1903, because if it were an electric street railway incorporated subsequent to 1903 I think we are amply protected. But if it be an electric street railway or if it has electric street railway powers given to it prior to 1903, I think there is some question in the matter, and it would be in the interest both of the railway company and the cities of Toronto and Hamilton that that question should be set at rest, and I think that the suggestion that the Bill should state that this railway was not to exercise street railway powers in these cities should have been acceded to.

In order that we may understand whether this is really a steam or an electric railway, we are first of all referred to its charter of incorporation, chapter 77 of the statutes of Canada 1899. In that statute the company is said to be for the general advantage of Canada and clause 8 provides :

The company may, upon such terms and conditions as are agreed on with the purchasers of the line of railway heretofore owned by the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company, acquire such line of railway and the rights, powers and franchises connected therewith, and may repair, reconstruct and operate the same; and may lay out, construct and operate an extension thereof to a point on the Niagara river at or near Fort Erie, and an extension to a point in or near the city of Toronto by way of the city of Hamilton or thereabouts, and a branch line from a point on the main line in or near the city of St. Catharines to a point on Lake Ontario, in or near Port Dalhousie, in the county of Lincoln.

Then section 10 provides :

The company may, for the purposes of its business—construct, acquire and navigate vessels upon or across the Niagara river and Lake Ontario to Toronto and points west of Toronto and may carry on generally the business of transportation in connection with its railway and vessels; construct, acquire, lease and sell wharfs, docks, &c.; acquire lands and erect and manage machinery and plant for the generation and distribution of electric and other power and energy; acquire and utilize water-power and dispose of the surplus power and so on.

Then in 1901 the charter was amended, and section 1 of the amendment is as follows :

The Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company——

Which is the company we are discussing.

—may acquire, by agreement of lease or purchase, on such terms as may be agreed on, respectively, with the Niagara Falls, Wellesly Park and Clifton Tramway Company or the Port Dalhousie, St. Catharines and Thorold Electric Railway Company, Limited, or the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway Company (if when and such companies respectively are lawfully authorized to enter into such agreement) the undertakings, rights, franchises, powers, lines, assets and properties, real and personal, of such companies, respectively, and may construct, operate and maintain the same.

So that under section 1 of the Act of 1901, the company is given clear powers to acquire three electric railway systems and operate them as such, and these powers relate also to the towns of St. Catharines, Thorold, Hamilton, Grimsby and other places.

I am not here to make an argument as to the rights and powers of this railway company, but I do say that, taking the original Act and the amending Act of 1901 together, it is certainly fairly arguable that the company has certain powers of a character which are not affected by subsection 3 of section 235 of the Railway Act. That section is as follows :

Nothing in this section shall deprive any such company of rights conferred upon it by any special Act of the parliament of Canada, or amendment thereof, passed prior to the 12th day of March, 1903.

That relates to electric railways. Under the circumstances, the supporters of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) might have given his opinion a little more consideration, and I trust that on this occasion the minister will again give us his opinion on this matter. It must be conceded that cities of the size of Hamilton and Toronto should be entitled to run their own street railway systems and control them without interference from this parliament. It seems to me that that should be a provision of this Bill before we pass it. But my hon. friends thinks that the Railway Act ought to be sufficient protection, so far as the city of Toronto is concerned. The argument was advanced that Toronto and Hamilton and other cities of that character were in precisely, or should be, the same position as the smallest municipality. As far as I am personally concerned I have no argument to offer against the rights of the smallest municipality. If the Minister of Railways thinks that these municipalities have a special right to protection as regards railway crossings on the leved, that is a matter on which he should enunciate a policy in this House. But we find that in the two cities of Toronto and Hamilton the growth of population is such that it would be a wise policy to lay down the principle that their streets should not be closed on the level. It is well known that in New York, Chicago and London you could not find such a thing as a level crossing. There must always come a period in the growth of any large city when it must insist on railways entering it coming in either overhead or underground. I refer of course to through lines of transportation as distinct from tramways. Have Toronto and Hamilton reached that point? These cities pretend that they have and that it would be cheaper both for the railway companies and the cities to insist on either overhead or underground crossings. We find that people are killed once a week at these level crossings; and while we have no objection to any railway coming in, we consider it necessary, for the protection of life, that level crossings should not be allowed. This simply means the expenditure of a little more money by the railway companies for the protection of life. I submit that these municipalities are the ones to judge because it is they who are directly responsible.

They are the parties most vitally interested. In other cities this matter is not left

to be dealt with by railway commissions; and I venture to think that cities of the size of Hamilton and Toronto should have the right—and I do not say that smaller cities should not have the same right—to say where and how a railway shall come in. If the smaller municipalities also are against the level crossing, they have my entire sympathy. I think the time is not far distant when the level crossing, in thickly congested parts of the country, will be a thing of the past, and when the railways will be obliged to build underground or overhead crossings at their own expense as part of the cost of their construction as commercial undertakings. After seven or eight years discussion we have finally got an arrangement with the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway for the protection of the lives and property of people who live in Toronto and people who come to Toronto, and in our judgment it is unfair and unreasonable that we should be compelled to have another eight or nine years of discussion with these people in order to get proper settlement of the question of level crossings in cities. Under these circumstances, unless the promoters of this Bill can see their way to give to the cities of Toronto and Hamilton the protection we ask in this respect, I strongly urge that this Bill should not pass.

The hour for private Bills having expired the Committee rose and reported progress.

## SUPPLY—DESTITUTE DOUKHOBORS.

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

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply I desire to call its attention to a matter which I think is of very great importance, and which ought to be attended to immediately. I refer to the condition of the Doukhobors who are on the tramp and have settled for the winter in the town of Fort William. It would appear from an article in the 'Winnipeg Tribune' of Saturday, March 7, that these people are at the present time herding together like cattle, many of them in an absolutely nude condition, and conducting themselves in direct opposition to the ordinary forms of decency and morality. The article is as follows:

Revolting conditions—Gruesome funeral of Doukobors pilgrims who died at Fort William was stopped by police—Sensations at Coroner's inquest.

Fort William, March 6.—The death of John Czlin, one of the Doukhobor pilgrims, which occurred last Monday, on which date also the crude funeral conducted by his fellow countrymen was stopped by Chief of Police Dodds, has created a sensation here which is only intensified by the discoveries made at the inquest into the death of the man.

Mr. BRISTOL

The coroner's inquest brought out the fact that neglect, starvation, lack of medical attention and pneumonia were the causes of death.

No aid summoned.

Interesting evidence as to the belief and customs of the Doukhobors was given by Alexis, one of the band.

Czlin had been sick for three weeks. He was given all he asked for to eat. All he had for the last couple of weeks was plums and dry bread.

The band intended to place his body in the bush, where it would be devoured by wild animals. This is their custom, and they believe it is the way God requires burials to be made. Dogs would not touch the body, but wolves would tear it to pieces and devour it.

No medical aid was summoned for Czlin, as all believed that Jesus would look after him.

All Doukhobors are brothers and sisters. They have one large family and believe in free love.

Gruesome funeral.

Chief Dodds gave the jury some facts about the house the Doukhobors live in, and he also gave evidence as to the manner of funeral which was being held. The dead body was secured on a home-made sleigh and dragged by six or eight men, and from information which he got from them it was their intention to merely take the body out to the burying ground and there leave it to be destroyed by animals and the forces of nature.

Evidence of the post-mortem examination of the deceased was given by Dr. C. C. Withrow. He stated that the organs of the man were in perfect condition, but though he was six feet three inches tall he weighed at the time of his death only 125 pounds, whereas a normal weight would have been in the neighbourhood of 180 pounds. He was evidently suffering from pneumonia. He had not received any attention, and as the stomach was empty it appeared as though he had starved.

Revolting conditions.

After hearing the evidence of Chief Dodds as to the stopping of the funeral the jury adjourned to make an inspection of the Doukhobor house on May street.

Thirty of the pilgrims were found together in one room, while in a much smaller room upstairs fourteen were huddled together.

Several of the band looked as if they were starving to death, while others had coughs which were almost bad enough to lead to the belief that consumption had taken hold of some of the members of the band. The rooms were all in a high degree of temperature and all the pilgrims were lying around in a naked condition.

After the inspection the jury returned to the court-room, where the following verdict was brought in:

We, the jury empanelled to inquire into the death of John Czlin, find that he died in the house known as the Doukhobor house on May street, city of Fort William, district of Thunder Bay, and that he died at 10 o'clock p.m., March 2, 1908, from a complication of causes, namely, starvation and pneumonia, conditions being aggravated by most evident neglect and lack of medical attendance.

Presentment of the jury.

In addition to the verdict the coroner's jury this morning brought in the following presentment:

It devolves on the coroner's jury in considering the conditions leading up to the death of John Czlin, to visit the house occupied by the Doukhobors.

Our visit revealed a condition of affairs most deplorable and of such a nature as warranted this jury in making a presentment of the facts and an urgent request that some immediate and effective measures be adopted by the proper authorities to remedy the abuses existing.

Many were naked.

The premises are mainly a building 24 by 36, with an addition thereto 14 by 16, large enough in all for possibly eighteen people at the most. In this area we found 76 men, women and children. In one room, 7 by 13, there were 14 inmates all together naked, both sexes, ranging from 13 to 55 years of age. A similar condition was found in other rooms of the house, where men and women, covered and naked were found together, with no regard for decency or respect for common morality. They do not accept our marriage laws, but practice a system of free love, which admits of practices which, in our opinion, are not tolerated in any civilized community and which they were not allowed to pursue in their own country. Under this system the children, of whom we found 19 apparently bright and capable, are lost to their parents and grow up without proper restraint. We, therefore, advise that these children at least be transferred from their present debasing surroundings to some suitable institution where they can be taught the principles of industry, morality and good citizenship.

As for the adults, they do not appear to be amenable to reason and we can suggest no other solution than the breaking up of the community. There is then a possibility of their adopting the usages of our country and becoming good citizens.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no doubt you have noticed that this band, when it first started out, declared their intention of coming to Ottawa. They tramped as far as Fort William in the fall of the year, and there they halted for the winter; but they have declared their intention, as soon as spring opens, of making their way to the city of Ottawa. Now, I would advise the government to consider what the result of their visit would be. Imagine these people walking down Sparks street, imagine the effect it would have upon our young men and women, our boys and girls. If this article is correct, certainly the condition of affairs in Fort William would indicate that there is a weak spot in our immigration laws, and it is time that the government should see that the defect is remedied. Why, it would appear that in far-off Russia, the country from which they came, they are not allowed to live in the way we find them living here to-day. People who practise these customs are neither more nor less than moral lepers, and they should be put in some asylum, or in some moral lazar house, where they could be prevented from setting a bad example to the young people of Canada. I shall blame this government if they do not take steps to prevent these people marching into Ottawa. Evidently we need something more than a medical examination of immigrants, we should have a moral quarantine as well as a medical quarantine. Men who are morally unfit to come into this country should not be allowed to come. I must say that there are other immigrants coming into Canada the tendency of whose conduct must lower the tone of morality in this country. And what is a country worth if its moral tone is lowered? At present there is no country in the world, I think, where the moral tone is higher than in Canada. Let us protect that with care, let us see that immigrants brought into this country are moral and respectable. We know that the old Roman empire went to decay simply because its citizens, who, in the early history of the nation, were moral, patriotic and brave, were corrupted by the barbarians which the wars of the republic had brought in; the tone of morality was lowered, and the fall of the empire is said to have been due entirely to the licentiousness of its citizens. Now, we are told that some of these British and European immigrants were farm labourers in the old country. I do not believe it. They show by their ignorance of farming that they know nothing about it. You cannot make the farmers of Ontario believe that these men were either farmers or farm servants in the old country. You might as well tell me that that desk in front of me is a span of horses and a wagon. I suppose that if an hon. gentleman were to tell me that that desk was a span of horses and a wagon I would have to take his word for it, but nevertheless I would not believe him. In the same way, you may tell me that these people were acquainted with farm work in Britain or Europe, but you cannot make me believe it. I heard of one man who was brought into the country not long ago; he was engaged by a farmer, and after he had been several weeks on the farm his master ordered him to go to the barnyard and drive the cattle to water. A little while afterwards the boss went out into the yard and saw this man waving his hands and shouting, trying to drive the gobbler and an old rooster to drink; he thought they were cattle. The fact is that most of these people come from the slums of cities and not from the farms, although some of them make good farm servants afterwards. They come from places where they have not had a proper training. Some of them may have been in prison, some of them may have come to this country to escape prison. It is to be remembered that when a farmer engages servants he has to take them into the bosom of his family, he has to make them companions for his sons

and daughters. Therefore, I cannot too strongly impress upon the government the need of exercising the greatest care in order to prevent the entry into Canada of farm labourers who are unfit to associate with the sons and daughters of our Canadian farmers. They must be real farm servants and fit to associate with our own farmers and their families. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the government will take prompt action so as to prevent this threatened parade of Doukhobors down the streets of Ottawa.

Mr. PETER ELSON (East Middlesex). After listening to the article which has been read by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) I feel impelled to make a few remarks. Some years ago when I read about the Doukhobors in the Northwest, I got the impression that they were somewhat immoral and unchristian in their habits of life; but I had no idea they were quite so bad as is shown by this article which has just been read by my hon. friend. It appears that these people congregate together in large numbers and that would go to show that it is not a very healthy way for them to live. It seems to me that their homes, so many people being assembled together in them would be hot beds of disease and that diseases of various kinds would be likely to emanate from them. Tuberculosis is something that the people of our country are trying to prevent. The people are spending their money, giving their time and doing their best to prevent the spread of tuberculosis, but, according to the article which the hon. gentleman has read, it appears there is something of that kind amongst these people. There is another thing. It appears that these people congregate together and they go about in large bodies on a kind of pilgrimage looking for something they hardly know what and they are generally, in fact, almost always, quite destitute of clothing, not having enough to cover them. I am sure that it would be most unpleasant and something that would shock the nervous system of any body to meet these people upon the public highway even out in the far west let alone meeting them on Sparks street in the city of Ottawa. These people have been brought here by the government and I must understand that the sum of $5 a head has been paid for them. I do not blame the government. No doubt they thought that they would be desirable immigrants. Then again we have the Lord's Day Act and the various Acts which have been passed by the different provinces for the purpose of keeping people straight and for assisting them to live respectable, but it would seem that it is impossible to cause these people to assimilate with their neighbours around them. As the government of the day have brought these troublesome people in, believing that they might become good citizens it would seem to me that it is up to the government to do something in regard to them. The question is what to do. The solution of the trouble would seem to me to be something like this: If they cannot be brought to assimilate themselves with the good citizens of our country they ought to be handed back, everything that belongs to them, even a little more than absolutely belongs to them, and then they should be deported from our country, returned to the country from whence they came and let the land that they occupied be given to good citizens who would cause the prairies of the west to blossom and bloom like the rose, instead of having these people living there and doing little if any good for the country. I felt a little in earnest upon this matter when listening to the article which was read and I sincerely hope the government will take this matter in hand and try and regulate it so that these people will not be a nuisance. I speak of the Doukhobors only. From what I have heard of other immigrants, I conclude that they are fairly good citizens, but it does seem that the Doukhobors are not a desirable class.

Mr. J. BARR (Dufferin). An object lesson has been placed before us of the foolish course we have been pursuing during the last ten or fifteen years in connection with the immigrants who have been brought out to this country. These Doukhobors were brought from Russia and placed upon some of the best land we have in the west, as I know from personal observation having been out there a few months ago. The portion of the land which was not occupied by these people was taken away from them and hundreds and hundreds of the best citizens of our country put forth every effort to obtain it. Some of our best young men out there were anxious to obtain a portion of that land and being in the east for the purpose of spending the winter, they asked the government for an extension of time, even for a month, in order that they would not have to go back west in the cold winter to file their applications, but they were told that they could not have a day and that if they were not on the land by the appointed time they would lose it. Contrast this with the treatment of the Doukhobors. They were brought from the country of their birth and placed on land in the west at the expense of the Dominion and they have been kept there for many years while our boys were prevented from obtaining land which they desired to occupy. We do not wish to settle that vast western country with foreigners of a class who will not make good citizens, permitting them to occupy the best land compelling our own boys to take land of an inferior quality. We do not desire that these Doukhobors and other foreigners who will never make good citizens shall be given advantages which our own citizens do not enjoy. The time has come when we should call a halt, when we should

review our immigration system and endeavour to people that vast country with good citizens or retain the land for future generations. These Doukhobors have taken possession of a part of Port Arthur and the inhabitants of that city have been obliged to feed them. From a medical point of view these people have become a menace to the health of Port Arthur. The time has come when something must be done because we cannot allow these people to become a menace to our country and probably to start infectious diseases in the communities in which they are living for the time being. It is our duty to see that none are permitted to come into this country who will not make desirable citizens. I believe that one American coming over here is better than probably half a dozen of the other immigrants who are coming in and they are prepared to come in large numbers if we give them the ordinary inducements that we are offering to these foreigners. The result of our immigration policy is that the land is being taken up as rapidly as is necessary. We are paying out annually a large sum of money to encourage immigration. We paid $5 a head for every one of these Doukhobors and from the time they came up to the present we have been nursing them and looking after their wants; yet to-day we find them in a worse state of civilization than they were when they arrived. Have we elevated their morals? There is danger of their presence having a degrading effect upon the morals of this country because these people present an object lesson for our young men who look upon them in Port Arthur and other towns which, to say the least, must have a demoralizing effect. If we wish to become a great nation, a nation among the nations, if we wish to have a quiet Sunday and to have all those conditions which are essential to the highest state of civilization we must have intelligent citizens in this country and we must see to it that the morals of our people are properly looked after.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I am surprised that there is no member of the government who feels himself called upon to answer this charge of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. T. Chisholm) and of the other hon. gentlemen who have spoken. This is a serious matter. We should know how these people were brought to this country; whether they were paid for at the rate of $5 a head and whether the North Atlantic Trading Company of unsavory memory had anything to do with their importation. If we have paid for them it is bad enough, but whether we have or not it would be a good thing for the country to pay to send them back again. I saw some of these immigrants in the west last summer and it was a sad spectacle. I saw them in Fort William too but fortunately, although the weather was more clement then than it is now, they were not so scantily attired as report says they are at present. Since the members of the government seem to be afraid to speak on this question, perhaps the hon. member from Mackenzie (Mr. Cash) who has quite a number of them among his constituents will tell us something about them, and as he is a medical man, and a kind hearted man as well, I am sure his description of them would be interesting. If these Doukhobors can ever be made good citizens of Canada there may be some hope, but if that is an impossibility then the Minister of the Interior should send them home. It is not becoming a Christian nation that we should allow these unfortunate people to live amongst us in such an uncivilized state. It was nothing short of a calamity to bring these Doukhobors to this country, and the sooner they are packed back to their native land the better for all. Then, the member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) has quite a number of them among his constituents at the present time and perhaps he would tell us something about them, if he is not afraid of losing their votes at the coming election.

Mr. E. L. CASH (Mackenzie). The Doukhobors in Canada number about 8,000 and some of them live in my constituency. It appears that one of these people died of pneumonia at Fort William, but pneumonia is a very common disease and it proves fatal to many who have the very best medical attendance. I therefore do not see why all this fuss should be raised because one of these people died without having a physician to attend them. I can say that the Doukhobors living in the McKenzie district do avail of medical attendance and they pay their medical attendant. In the hospital at Yorkton there are Doukhobors at all seasons of the year; they have a hospital of their own there where minor diseases are treated and in their villages they contemplate building hospitals and employing trained nurses. We must remember that those Doukhobors who have gone to Fort William are a fanatical section of the community, and we are glad to get rid of them.

Mr. BERGERON. Did you send them to the Rainy River district?

Mr. CASH. We did not care where they went; we were glad to get rid of them. Now as to the Doukhobors being immoral I can say that if the reports in the newspapers are true their morals would compare favourably with the morals of some people in Ontario. Just a couple of days ago we had a report in the Toronto 'Globe' of a young lady who was living with a man in Ontario and she burned down a barn.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. She was found not guilty.

Mr. CASH. She did not burn the barn.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. No.

Mr. CASH. If some hon. gentlemen would go among the Doukhobors and study their characteristics they would come to the conclusion that they are a moral people. They may do some things that to our civilization seem immoral, but nevertheless, in the light which they look upon these things, you cannot call them an immoral people. Then, again, there are no people more cleanly in their habits than they are. It is true some fanatics have tramped to the constituency of my hon. friend from Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) but we all have our little difficulties in our constituencies and we manage to get along in some way.

Mr. BERGERON. But they wear clothes in Yorkton.

Mr. CASH. Well, we had a pilgrimage into Yorkton and the Doukhobors came unclothed but they were taken charge of by the mounted police, locked up in the prison, and furnished with clothes. Possibly on my advice, a small portion of these Doukhobors were held to be insane. They were examined by two respectable physicians, they were adjudged insane and sent down to Regina. Mr. Haultain who was then attorney general for the territories would not accept the judgment of the physicians and he insisted that the Doukhobors should be charged with indecent exposure, and although the asylum was in my opinion the proper place for them they were sent to jail. That I think was a mistake. Really, the greatest objection I have to the Doukhobors is that they will not become Canadian citizens, However, this very fact will meet the argument of one gentleman on the other side who has said that we may be afraid of losing their votes, because not being Canadian citizens they cannot have votes, and therefore we who have them in our constituencies can speak with perfect frankness about them. I do not think you will find a single criminal record against the Doukhobors in Canada. There is not a class of people in Canada to-day with less crime attributed to them than the Doukhobors. I believe that the action of the government in taking away the large area of land from them was well advised because some of this land, as hon. gentlemen opposite have said, is very desirable land. But in all such land there is some which is very undesirable and that is one advantage which I can see in the community system. Where we have a community taking up land, section after section in a solid block, if they are intelligent and make intelligent use of the land, it should certainly redound to the greater benefit of the people living there for the reason that they would have their hay land, their plough land and their pasture land. In that way the land can be better used than if each man had a quarter-section, because some quarter-sections would not be of any advantage to the men living on them. I do not think I need further detain the House

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). I do not purpose going into the Doukhobor question, which has been discussed over and over again. I think the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) was at one with me in the early days in opposing their introduction to this country. That, however, is not the point to-night, and I am surprised that none of the ministers have expressed an opinion with reference to the state of things existing in Fort William. It is a shame to allow people like these to be brought into this country and then to have a report in the newspapers that one of them, a full-grown man, apparently in good health, has died of starvation. If these people cannot be controlled in any other way, they should be arrested and confined in an asylum, jail, penitentiary or other place of safe-keeping. It is perfectly outrageous that they should be allowed to live as they are—in fact, it can hardly be called living; they are not getting enough to eat and to keep body and soul together. In a civilized country like this that should not be allowed. We may talk about the misfortune of bringing them to this country and of Mr. Preston's great desire to show his ability as an immigration agent, but that does not relieve the situation. The hon. gentleman who brought this matter to the attention of the House is, in my opinion, deserving of thanks. It is an urgent matter; the government is responsible for bringing these people here, and should take care of them. They took care of them the first year they were here, and if they required and deserved care then they should be taken care of now, just as when they first came here, if they cannot take care of themselves. It is a disgrace to this country to allow a whole horde of people to live in a house capable of accommodating only eighteen people. We are told there are seventy men, women and children living in such a place, not half clothed; I do not see how they can live in this climate. It appears to me to be the duty of the Minister of the Interior to make a statement, and to pledge himself that these people will be looked after in some intelligent way. It is a disgrace to Canada. Yet with all these idle people in Canada we have the government still sending special agents to the old country to bring more immigrants, and last January they doubled the bonus on immigrants from Europe. I think it is altogether out of place. I do not think it is in the best interests of this country or of the people that come to this country as immigrants under these circumstances, and I hope the minister will tell us what he is likely to do about this matter, that he will see that these people are not left to suffer as they have been suffering, because they are human beings like ourselves, and quite as capable of feeling and suffering.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I presume that the reading with which my hon. friend from Huron entertained the House a little while ago was just as useful a manner of obstructing the business as any other that he could adopt.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I do not think that is fair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. OLIVER. And the remarks made by my hon. friends opposite are about as much in keeping with the facts and the occasion as is usual under such circumstances.

As to the responsibility for the Doukhobors in Canada, my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Uriah Wilson) has reminded the House that he and I were opposed to the movement to bring them here. I do not at this date remember how far our opposition went or to what extent we voiced our opinions on the floor of the House, but I remember very distinctly that if we voiced our opposition we were the only members of parliament who did. At the time of the bringing of the Doukhobors to Canada public opinion in Canada, I believe, with the exception of my hon. friend and myself, was quite unanimously in favour of the movement, and endorsed it in every particular as being a movement for the advantage of the country.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Would the hon. minister allow me? I do not wish to interrupt or contradict him, but I think the feeling was that immigrants were wanted.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. And that they were almost glad to get any kind to get a start. It was not especially because they were Doukhobors, as I understand.

Mr. OLIVER. I had not stated that yet, but I propose to say so now. Part of my argument was that, with the exception of my hon. friend and myself, so far as I know, public opinion was unanimously in favour of the movement to bring these people, one reason, as was stated by my hon. friend, being that the country needed and wanted immigrants; these people were immigrants, and therefore they were welcomed with open arms by both sides of the House and by the people all over the country. But there was another reason why they were especially welcomed, they were looked upon as a persecuted people, persecuted for religion's sake, as the people of this country understood at that time, and it was because they were a people persecuted for religion's sake that they were more especially welcomed by so many in Canada. It was strange to hear certain gentlemen on the other side who have spoken to-night denounce these people as being irreligious and immoral and undesirable from this point of view, when the very basis of their being brought to this country was that they were too religious for the country in which they lived. The trouble with these people who are to-day in Fort William is not that they lack in religion, or in the ordinary observances of religious life, but that they are fanatics, that they have gone to extremes in their theories in regard to their religion, until, as our friend from Mackenzie (Mr. Cash) has said, they are, to all intents and purposes, insane. As regards the conditions prevailing in Fort William, I deplore them quite as much as any member in this House, and I am sure that to-night's discussion will draw the attention of the authorities, who are really responsible, to that condition and probably induce them to take some action. These people are not immigrants. They have been seven years settled in the country and have earned their right to citizenship twice over if they would have accepted it. This government has therefore no right or authority to interfere. These people are subject to the laws of Ontario; and if they in any way contravene these laws, it is for the provincial authorities to take such proceedings as may be necessary. They are residents of Ontario, and this government has no authority to punish them for any offences against decency or good living. We have an immigration law which gives the federal government authority to deport people under certain circumstances, but that deportation must take place within two years after arrival. Any responsibility which pertains to this government we are prepared to discharge, but we are not prepared to assume a responsibility which rests entirely on the province.

My hon. friend from Dufferin (Dr. Barr) spoke most feelingly of the hardship inflicted on Canadians who had acquired Doukhobor lands in the rush at Yorkton last year. He has hardly stated the case correctly. This government has not interfered with the right of any of these people to hold their land. They can hold them six, eight, ten or twelve months so far as we are concerned; but if some other Canadian comes along and demands that land at the end of the six months which was allowed to go into residence, in our view, one Canadian is as good as another, and the man who has not carried out his agreement must lose his land to the other who will.

Mr. BARR. Is there any difference made between a Canadian and an American?

Mr. OLIVER. Not a bit of difference in the eyes of this government, only in the eyes of my hon. friend This government is not taking any land away from those people who have taken it up. They take it up subject to the consideration that they shall go into residence on it within six months from the date of entry; and if another man comes afterwards, at the end of that six

months and says 'the first man has not fulfilled his agreement and I want that land the government says it is yours.'

I do not think it is necesary that I should go into the general question of immigration. I am sorry to hear some of my friends object so strongly to some immgrants who have come within the past year but I want to say that this government absolutely denies any responsibility for their presence. As a matter of policy or of administration we are not responsible for their presence. Further than that it is part of the policy of this government and its administration that any of those people who have been in this country less than two years may under certain circumstances and conditions which are well known be sent back to the country whence they came on proper demand being made and proper procedure being taken. If these people are objectionable they can easily be sent away. But that can only be done under the law on the demand of the municipal authorities. If the municipal authorities do not see fit to make such a demand this government is powerless to act.

As regards the Doukhobors I have nothing to say for or against them. They have been in this country seven years. There were about 8,000 of them altogether. They have been, as my hon. friend from Mackenzie (Mr. Cash) has, said, moral, law abiding and industrious, and in every way worthy residents except that they have not, as a whole, taken upon themselves the responsibilities and the rights of citizenship. But in morality, industry, thrift and law abiding character, and in their enthusiastic belief in the Christian religion, they are not second to any class of our population. It is only fair that that much should be said on their behalf. There was the objection made for some time they were holding a large amount of land which they were not cultivating, contrary to the spirit and letter of our land laws. But that situation has been changed. The land they held in excess is now occupied by other people. They have been here seven years, during which they have added to the wealth of the country by production on their farms, by labour on our railways and in the woods and in other ways. They have interfered with nobody. They have enterprises which are a credit to them and a model to other people, and I am very sorry that such expressions should have been used towards them as we have heard to-day. These expressions could only have been used out of a lack of knowledge of the facts. I cannot imagine that any hon. gentleman would so distort the facts, if he really knew them as they are.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman has said that this government is not responsible in any way for the presence of these people.

Mr. OLIVER. The government of that day was certainly responsible for the presence of the Doukhobors, but its policy in that regard was unanimously endorsed by this House, barring, I believe, my hon. friend and myself, so far as I know. But I did say that the government was not responsible in any way, shape or manner for the immigrants to whom my hon. friend from Huron took such strong objection, that is to say, the immigrants principally from the old country who are now unemployed in some of the cities and centres of population in Ontario.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who are responsible?

Mr. OLIVER. The charitable associations and organizations of the old country in a large degree ; so far as we have been able to discover, and we have followed up the matter very carefully, both on the other side of the water and on this.

Mr. BERGERON. Doesn't the government pay their passage ?

Mr. OLIVER. I want to say to my hon. friend and to the House that this government does not pay the passage of anybody, and does not pay one dollar to assist the immigration of any class or condition. That is not its policy, and is not its administration.

Mr. BERGERON. Do we not pay $5 per head to agents, $5 per head to steamship companies, and $2 per head to another agency, making altogether about $12 per head on immigrants coming to Canada ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am very glad my hon. friend has given me the opportunity of stating the case as it is, because I can easily see that if a large number of our people have the same idea as my hon. friend from Beauharnois, our immigration policy can scarcely be very popular in the country. I wish to repeat that the Department of Immigration does not, and, so far as I am aware, with the exception of these Doukhobors who have been mentioned, never has paid a part of the passage of any immigrant. The policy of assisted immigration is absolutely contrary to the immigration policy of this government. The policy and the practice of the government is to spend large amounts of money for publicity, to draw the favourable attention of desirable people to this country ; but while it has spent and is spending, and I believe is prepared to spend, large sums of money for publicity, it has not, does not, and is not going to spend one cent for assistance. It spends money for publicity in sending agents to the countries from which we desire immigrants ; it spends money for publicity in printing literature, in advertising in newspapers, and in paying a bonus to ticket agents on certain classes of people who come to Canada.

Mr. BERGERON. How much is paid ?

Mr. OLIVER. Five dollars per head on certain classes ; but that is not in any way an assistance to the immigrant. It is a part of the campaign of publicity, and is an inducement to the booking agent to direct the immigrants to Canada rather than to the United States.

Mr. BERGERON. Do we pay that $5 per head also on the immigrants who go to the United States ?

Mr. OLIVER. No. I wish to state the reason for paying that $5 per head to the booking agent. The steamship lines run from ports in Great Britain to ports in the United States. The booking agent, who holds an agency for the different steamship lines, gets his commission from the steamship company for every ticket he sells, whether it is to Canada or the United States or anywhere else. By Canada paying the booking agent a bonus on each immigrant that he sends here it must be evident that when an intending immigrant asks for a ticket to America, it is to the interest of the booking agent to sell him a ticket to Canada rather than one to the United States. It is on that principle that the money is paid, but it is paid only on certain classes of immigrants.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Can the minister tell us on what percentage of those who come to Canada the bonus is paid ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot tell that offhand; but my hon. friend has a question on the Order Paper, which will come in due course on Monday next, the answer to which will give him the information ; and when he gets that he will see that we pay a bonus on only a fraction of those who come. We are not in any way responsible for the coming of the classes who are absolutely unlike the classes we specifically advertise for. Our literature states very distinctly the only classes we want, the only classes we pay for or instruct any of our agents to induce to come to this country.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Everybody seems to have known of this undesirable class coming to this country, except the government. If they had three or four years ago taken the steps which they are now taking, by passing an order in council, not to allow any to come without the endorsement of an officer in England, we would probably have been saved a great deal of the present pauperism in this country.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no doubt about that. The action we have taken recently might have been taken profitably some time before ; but the necessity for doing it did not arise until recently. At the last session of this parliament the Immigration Department was criticised, and criticised very strongly, I do not say very ably, both by a gentleman sitting on this side and by several gentlemen sitting on the other side, because of the scarcity of help in eastern Canada and because due measures were not taken to supply the demand then existing. While we might be aware that there were people coming whom we did not induce to come, yet so long as there was such a demand for labour as evidently did exist at that time, so long as there was room and opportunity for these people, it did not seem to us that it was our place to raise objections to them. But as soon as the conditions changed, and it became apparent that it was necessary to put a check upon this class of immigration, forthwith we proceeded to put checks upon it, and we believe that the results will be advantageous. Moreover, that is not the point at issue. The point at issue is this, Is this government responsible for the introduction of that class of people into this country at the present time ? I say absolutely no, not in any shape or manner, by inference or by fact. At present, as the hon. gentleman has suggested, we are taking means absolutely to exclude them, not contrary to our previous policy, but carrying out our previous policy under changed conditions.

Mr. BERGERON : I understand my hon. friend to admit that $5 a head is paid to the booking agent for every immigrant of a desirable class that comes into this country. Now I want to put a question to my hon. friend. The other day, in an answer given in this House, it was stated that 25,000 or 30,000 of those immigrants went over to the States. Now I want to know what becomes of that $5 a head that the government paid on these 25,000 or 30,000 immigrants that went over to the States.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, we try to keep track of the immigrants for some time after their arrival, and when we find that any of them have passed over to the States, bonuses are not paid on those men. The bonus of course is not paid immediately on the arrival of the immigrant, not until some time afterwards ; and if we find after the bonus has been paid that the immigrant has crossed the line, that amount is deducted from the next payment that we make to that booking agent. While it is impossible absolutely to guard against cases like that, I would like the hon. gentleman to understand that we are quite aware of this movement taking place, and we take every reasonable means of guarding against paying money on behalf of people who have passed over to the United States. That is one reason why we were not able to settle with the friends of our hon. friends, the North Atlantic Trading Company, as promptly as we would otherwise have done. We had to hold back their final payments for a year in order to check as well as we could payments on immigrants who had gone over to the United States.

Mr. BERGERON. Are their claims all settled ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister explain to us the system of inspection of immigrants after they land in Caanda, by which he may know whether they go into the United States or not ?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not give such an explanation as would fully satisfy the hon. gentleman. We have a very large number of immigration officers, and every one of them is employed from time to time in noting the movement of the immigrants. But what might be done in one case could not be done in another, and the same system does not prevail everywhere.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is quite evident from what the minister says that no check is kept on these men, and that my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) was right when he said that the $5 per head on these 25,000 who went over to the States, is money lost to this country.

Mr. TALBOT. He has not named one.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) will go up to Niagara, or to Port Huron, or to any other port of entry into the United States, he will find a constant stream of immigrants passing over into the United States.

Mr. TALBOT. And the American customs officers watching over there ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, the American officers are watching. I have seen with my own eyes fifty people in one day turned back at Port Huron, undesirable immigrants that the United States would not receive under any consideration. When they were turned back I followed them as far as London, where I understand they were hired by a railway company. I know that hundreds and thousands of these immigrants of a most undesirable class are turned back by the United States authorities at the ports of entries, and become a burden on our community. Go into the hospitals and asylums of Ontario to-day and see the enormous number of these undesirable immigrants crowding these institutions. If you visit the jails you will find the bulk of the prisoners are of this class, people who have been turned back from the United States. Evidently the inspection at our ports of entry has been most unsatisfactory. Would the minister make some explanation of the method of inspection which allowed these people to come into this country ? If the government are not responsible for these people being here, then the officials who made the inspections at the port of entry are responsible.

Mr. OLIVER. I think my hon. friend's imagination is as vivid as that of his colleagues, when he speaks about the asylums and jails of Ontario being full of undesirable immigrants. But if that is the case it is the fault of the provincial authorities, because this government under the present law has deported several hundreds of such people from this province within the past few years, and will continue to do so.

Mr. BERGERON. Where do you send them to ?

Mr. OLIVER. To the country from which they came, and at the expense of the transportation company. Under our immigration law it costs us nothing, that is, if we can fix the responsibility upon the transportation company. Sometimes we cannot fix that responsibility and then we have to pay ; but generally it is the transportation companies who take these people back at their own expense. If Ontario is suffering to-day in the way the hon. gentleman says, it is the fault of the provincial government and not of this administration. Now as to the method of inspection. When the ship lands, the immigrants are passed under close review before one or two medical officers. The inspection is, of course, a hurried one and unless there is evidence of some diseased condition or some unfortunate mental condition the immigrant passes. It is impossible in the hurry of that inspection to locate every case.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I would like to ask the minister if he says that a personal inspection is made.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. If the minister will look at the report of his chief medical inspector he will see that sometimes they inspect them in batches of a thousand.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know what our chief medical inspector has said in a particular case but I have seen the inspection myself. I took the place of an immigrant, went through the chute along with the rest, and I certainly passed in close review before the doctors. The system is the same at the Canadian port as it is at the United States port, and the United States people have the same system of inspection at Quebec as our people have.

Mr. BERGERON. Is my hon. friend sure of that because in the United States they take a longer time to examine them than we do ?

Mr. OLIVER. I quite admit that. They are perhaps more particular than we are and they take a longer time to do it but I do not think they arrive at a better result I think we keep out as fair a proportion of undesirables as they do and if they take a longer time to do this work it is simply because they have more red tape and offi-

cialism, whereas it is a matter of good judgment with us.

Mr. BERGERON. You cannot inspect a thousand immigrants in a few hours.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course you cannot do it effectively and I admit that there are undesirables who slip through. It is because it is absolutely impossible to prevent the admission of a certain number of undesirables that we have the deportation provision under which we can pick them out and send them back. But, there is an inspection at every ocean port, every individual is inspected, and if there is evidence of physical deformity or of mental defect the immigrant is picked out at once, more thoroughly examined and either detained, deported or let go as the case may be. The same is done with the United States immigrants who land at Canadian ports. There land at Canadian ports a large number of immigrants destined for the United States and these immigrants pass inspection by United States officers at Canadian ports just as if they were passing at a United States port, after which they go through to their destinations in the United States.

Mr. BERGERON. And they leave the bad ones here.

Mr. OLIVER. They turn back any who are medically unfit just as we turn back any who are medically unfit. If they let an unfit person pass they are inefficient. If we let an unfit person pass we are, to that extent, inefficient. I think that both sides do their duty and, generally speaking, do it very effectively, and the result is very good. If an immigrant is destined for a United States point and fails to pass the inspection of the United States medical officers he is not allowed to come into Canada. He is excluded at that point and never comes into Canada at all.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If I may be permitted to substantiate the statement I made a short time ago——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can only put a question. He has already spoken.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I want merely to substantiate a statement I made. I have here the 38th annual report of the inspector of prisons and public charities for the province of Ontario, and I turn to page 15 where I find reference to 'undesirable immigrant classes.'

There is marked evidence that public attention should be called to the large number of undesirable and unsuitable immigrants that are being induced to seek shelter in Ontario. This has been found nowhere more noticeable than in the city of Toronto, where more than half of the indigent casuals, who have had to be provided for, belong to the immigrant class. In many instances, however, they prove quite incapable and, when winter comes on, they drift into the cities and are not slow to find the location of the charitable institutions.

Mr. TALBOT. What book is that ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The 38th annual report of the Inspector of prisons and public charities of the province of Ontario. This is the statement of the inspector himself.

The whole fault for this condition must be placed where it belongs, namely, in the system that permits and encourages immigration without a proper discrimination. The present policy of Canadian emigration agents in Europe would seem to be to secure the number and pay no heed to the quality of persons urged to seek a haven in this country. The system of the Dominion government of bonusing agents to send out in an apparently indiscriminate manner a class of people totally unfit to provide a livelihood for themselves is deplorable.

Mr. TALBOT. Is that in order ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman has already spoken. He can put a question.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. He only asked a question before.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I ask a question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think this is going beyond the limits of a question.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. All right, if the hon. gentlemen do not care to hear this.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I think the hon. gentleman only asked a question previously, that the minister answered him and now he is going to make his speech.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will only take a few moments; I am just about through.

During the past years it has cost the hospitals and public charities of Ontario thousands of dollars to provide for these people, who are homeless and friendless and quite incapable of earning a living in this country.

Mr. TALBOT. I rise again to a point of order. I would like to know what this has to do with the Doukhobor question which is the question before the chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman is putting a question to the minister on that subject.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I want to ask the minister what he intends to do in this matter :

More precautions are needed. 'Quality, not quantity,' should be a rule from which there should be no deviation. More than ever before Ontario has been made, during the past year, the dumping ground of a most undesirable class.

Just a few lines in regard to orphans.

The number of children in the orphanages of Ontario is two hundred more than last

year. This is not a hopeful sign, and on inquiry I find that the increase in the number of inmates is, in many institutions ascribed to the many children belonging to the immigrant class, recently arrived in this country, who have had to be provided for.

I would like to ask the minister what he intends to do and if he is going to recoup the province of Ontario for having to pay for this undesirable class of immigrants.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the question at issue between the hon. member and myself was as to the immigrants who are now inmates of gaols and asylums of Ontario and my hon. friend has not informed us as to any who are in either gaols or asylums.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We will have no trouble in doing that a little later.

Mr. OLIVER. So far my hon. friend has had the opportunity, he has had the book and he has failed to do so. Regarding the statement contained in the book which has been read that there is a campaign in European countries without regard to the quality of immigrants, I can only say that my hon. friend is not warranted in reading such a statement, and that he would not be warranted in making it himself after the statement I have made. I do not think it is right or proper that a statement which was evidently written so maliciously or ignorantly should be placed before this House in the way in which my hon. friend has done it. I want to say further that if the city of Toronto is suffering from the presence of immigrants within its limits as my hon. friend here suggests the city of Toronto has just the same remedy in that regard as it had in the months of November and December in regard to certain other immigrants in Toronto who were deported at the order of the municipality. There was no limit placed by the Department of the Interior on the number of immigrants that the city of Toronto might see fit to deport. The only question was whether they were subject to deportation under the laws of Canada, and if they were any immigrant the city of Toronto wanted deported has been deported. If these people are there to-day to the injury of the city of Toronto, the city of Toronto is responsible and not this government.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The Minister of the Interior has no justification for saying that this official report was written maliciously or in ignorance. I believe the person who penned that report was just as honest in his intentions, as sincere in his aims, and as truthful as the Minister of the Interior is himself. Those who know the gentleman who prepared that report will never attribute any such character to him as the minister has. This is the report of the hospitals and charities of the province of Ontario for 1907 printed by order of the legislative assembly of Ontario, and it does not deserve any such criticism as the minister has passed upon it. But the minister seems prone to that kind of argument tonight. He started out by saying that the conduct of the opposition was useful for obstruction only, and I want to tell him that neither as minister of the Crown nor as member of this House has he the right to use such language.

Mr. TALBOT. Oh.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman from Bellechasse laughs at that.

Mr. TALBOT. So well he may.

Mr. SPROULE. Does he know that under the rules of the House, no member, whether he be minister or not, has the right to impute motives. I am in the judgment of the House when I say that the opposition were not only within their rights but that they were justified, before granting supplies, to bring this grievance to the attention of the country and to ask the government for a remedy. The minister says that these people to whom reference is made are not immoral. Is it his idea of morality that 60 or 70 men, women and children, in a nude state should be crowded into the one House. That allegation has been made and the Minister of the Interior has not contradicted it. He says they are insane or they are fanatics, but if they are insane why did the government bring them to this country and pay $5 a head for them? The minister also told us that when the Doukhobors were brought here they were welcomed by both sides of the House and that none but himself and the member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) raised an objection. That statement is not in accordance with the facts. because I know that I for one, and that many other members of this House protested at the time.

Mr. OLIVER. I said I did not recall having opposed it in the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that the Doukhobors were received, with open arms except by the member for Lennox and himself.

Mr. OLIVER. I admitted holding an opinion adverse to the immigration of these people, but I said I did not remember having voiced that opinion in the House, although I may have.

Mr. SPROULE. Why, I remember the Minister of the Interior when he was a private member declaring against the policy of the government, stating that Canadians were a moral people, an intelligent people, and a civilized people, and then asking did the government hope to raise that civilization higher by importing this kind of immigrants. I remember the Minister of the Interior speaking in strong condemnation of

the policy of the government. I admired him for it, because as he told us he came from the west and he knew more about it than other people did. I remember that he condemned the government strongly and many members of the House agreed with him, but to-night he forgets all about it. Then the Minister of the Interior told us that the government has not and does not spend one cent for immigration.

Mr. OLIVER. For assisted immigration.

Mr. SPROULE. What is he paying the booking agents $5 a head for, is it for sending out cattle or merchandise. What is it for ?

Mr. OLIVER. For publicity.

Mr. SPROULE. And what is the publicity for if not to bring immigrants out here? What is the use of telling any man who is fit to be outside a lunatic asylum that the government is not assisting immigration? Such a statement is not complimentary to the common sense of the members of this House. The government must be responsible for bringing these immigrants here, and, as a member of the government, the Minister of the Interior cannot evade a share of that responsibility. To-night the Minister of the Interior said that this government had nothing to do with these immigrants ; but if so, why does he send out his agents occasionally to corral them, put them in wagons, tie them down and, with the assistance of the Northwest Mounted Police, take them off to a place where they are kept like prisoners ? After doing that, surely they will not say to-night that they have nothing to do with them ; they have tried to keep them on the land, they have prevented them from killing their cattle, taking the cattle from them, and yet they say the government has nothing to do with them. If they have no right, why did they interfere with them ? They were practically wards of the government. They had to corral them and drive them like cattle, they took care of them for days and weeks—I think in one case for a month—because they were brought into the country by the government and taken care of by them. Those now at Fort William may well be left to the tender mercies of the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee). The minister speaks of the vivid imagination of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. If any more vivid imagination can be displayed by any member than the minister has shown to-night, I would like to see it. For these reasons, I say that we are not only within our rights, but simply fulfilling our bounden duty in bringing this matter to the attention of the House, and no member has a right to assert that we are trying to retard or obstruct the progress of business. The minister himself spoke nearly as long as all the members on this side together, and he will not say that he was obstructing; he was simply doing his duty as other members were, and he should not apply such expressions to hon. members on either side of the House.

Mr. JAMES CONMEE (Rainy River). I rise to correct a wrong impression that may be created by some remarks that have been made. I understand that the newspaper quoted by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. T. Chisholm) stated that this man died from starvation and pneumonia. That is not in accordance with the facts. I was at Fort William when this occurred, and the information that reached me as to the cause of the mans' death was not at all that it was starvation, but that, in the opinion of the coroner's jury, exposure had something to do with hastening his death. It would be a mistake to have that wrong impression go abroad.

One or two hon. gentlemen opposite have given us to understand that we may regard the conduct of these people as immoral. I shall not quarrel with any hon. gentleman as to his opinion in that respect, but I do not think it is believed by those who have had more opportunity of observing the character of these people than hon. gentlemen who have perhaps never seen one of them, that their conduct is in any sense immoral. It is a system of religion to which they have been trained from their early youth, and they desire to practise it. Anything that would prevent them from doing that would be regarded by them as persecution and tyranny, and therefore, from that point of view, I do not think they should be wrongly judged ; I do not know who is in a position to judge them in that respect. If there is responsibility for the presence of these people at Fort William, I do not think it attaches to this government. As has been stated by the minister, they have been here seven years, they have been here beyond the limit of time for which the laws relating to deportation apply.

There is a condition of things in connection with these people for which there is responsibility, but I do not believe that responsibility rests on this government. There are some thirty or thirty-five children amongst the number at Fort William, ranging in age from sixteen years down to a few months old. I do not think that these children are having what the majority of the people of Canada would regard as a good example. The Ontario government have laws and machinery for the care of neglected children, and they have authority, where children are neglected, or where the parents are judged to be immoral, or for other reasons incapable of taking proper care of the child, to take it away and care for it under the provincial institutions. My hon. friend likes to air the virtues of the government at Toronto. That government has been petitioned to take action in this case ; the member for the city of Fort William, who is a supporter of the Ontario government,

has been requested to see if he could not do something to relieve the situation of these unfortunate children, but so far nothing whatever has been done by the provincial authorities.

As to the report which the hon. gentleman has read to the House from the Inspector of Prisons for Ontario, I do not hesitate to stamp that report as a partisan report. It does not state the facts, it states what is untrue, what cannot be proven or established, and the inspector who wrote it has, in my humble judgment, gone out of his way to prepare campaign literature for some party in a way that his duties do not call on him to do.

Mr. BLAIN. Since my hon. friend has made a political reference to the Ontario government, may I ask to what political party that inspector belongs?

Mr. CONMEE. This inspector is a good Conservative.

Mr. BLAIN. Oh, no.

Mr. CONMEE. Oh, yes; and appointed since the present government of Ontario came in. They discharged the inspector, Dr. Chamberlain, when they came in and put another in his place. I am not quarrelling about that, but I can assure my hon. friend that the inspector has just as strong political opinions as he has himself. I do not want particularly to make an attack on the Ontario government in regard to these Doukhobors, but if there is responsibility for the unfortunate condition of the younger people in that community, I feel quite justified in pointing out the fact that the Ontario government have the institutions, the law and the authority to relieve these children from their present surroundings. So far they have not done it. I am told that a man should not impute motives, certainly not behind the back of those to whom these motives might be imputed, and therefore I shall not state my opinion of the reasons that action was not taken in this case. I leave that to hon. gentlemen to work out for themselves.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). I should not have risen but for a remark of the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), which was rather an insinuation that hon. members on this side were not in a position to judge the Doukhobor immigrants because they had not seen any. I for one have seen Doukhobors who have come to this country; I for one have seen the Doukhobor immigration to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. CONMEE. I said that the people of Fort William had knowledge of these people and were perhaps in a better position to judge of their morality than the hon. gentleman who perhaps had never seen them. I did not say that no hon. gentlemen had ever seen them nor did I wish to convey the opinion that hon. gentlemen are not entitled to their opinion.

Mr. CONMEE.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's statement. From the very first I thought the Doukhobors were not the class of people we should have in this country. I spoke on many platforms in different ridings adjoining the one I have the honour to represent, and I strongly protested, before I came to this House, against that immigration. I do not believe there is an hon. gentleman on the government side who will say that the Doukhobors brought into this country by this government are a class of immigrants who are a credit to this Dominion. I visited their settlement last summer; and after seeing their manner of living and the treatment they submitted to at the hands of their high priest Peter Veregaen, I came to the conclusion that it was very unfortunate they should ever have been admitted. So far as nationality or religion is concerned, I would be glad to see any immigration of people who are prepared to be Canadians and live up to our laws; but so far as I could judge there never has been a death or a marriage registered among the Doukhobors since they have been here. They entirely ignore any British or Canadian laws, and I would be wanting in my duty if I did not protest against such immigration. If there was any chance of deporting the whole bunch, the government cannot do it too soon. This government brought them out here at great expense; and if they allowed the opportunity to pass when we could have deported them, that is to their discredit.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). I was somewhat astounded a moment ago to hear the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) lecturing the Minister of the Interior about imputing motives to the members of the opposition during the obstruction carried on by the opposition during the last two or three weeks. Well, I came across something published in the papers lately in which the hon. member for East Grey has alluded to that very obstruction. In the Toronto 'Globe' of the 12th inst., page 9, there is an account of an Orange Grand Lodge meeting at Mount Forest. Among other insanities given expression to on that occasion is the following language credited to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). That hon. gentleman was introduced by Mr. Essery, of London, Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Ontario west, in the following words:

> I introduce to you the Sovereign Grand Master of British America, the greatest Orangeman of the empire, a member of the House of Commons, who does not earn his $2,500 by lying around saloons.

When it came to Dr. Sproule to reply, he used the following language:—

Mr. BLAIN. I rise to a point of order. Does the reading of this article come within the scope of this discussion ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. On a motion to go into Supply, great latitude is allowed.

Mr. TALBOT. Here is the language credited to the hon. member for East Grey :

When I have thought it my duty to stand up in the House of Commons to say something I considered it my duty to say, there were from ten to fifteen French and Irish Roman Catholics jumping up to interrupt me, and I regret to say that some Protestants joined in those interruptions.

The hon. gentleman ought not to be surprised when he is interrupted, for I do not know that there is an hon. member of this House who has filled the columns of 'Hansard' with more nonsense. Standing up on every occasion, he says every thing that comes into his mind and always bases his statements on creditable information, on something he heard on the street and so on. There is not a day when he does not get up and say something of that kind. He is probably one of the most expensive members we have as regards 'Hansard.' On the occasion of this Orange meeting, the hon. gentleman, to his discredit, referred to the conduct of a late member, a dead man, one of his colleagues and friends, and what language did he use ? He referred to him in this way :

He criticised the action of the late Mr. Martin, then member for the riding in which Mount Forest is located, and some other members who had refused to present to the House petitions from the Orangemen.

It speaks very poorly for the hon. gentleman that he should have made references of that kind to one of his late friends. I would commend these utterances very strongly to the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and for his special benefit I will read another specimen of the sentiments expressed at that meeting. Here is what was said on that occasion by a leading grand master of an Orange lodge about the inhabitants of the city of Montreal. That should prove interesting to my hon. friend and cause him to have greater admiration for the company of the hon. gentleman who sits alongside him (Mr. Sproule) :

Mr. H. C. Hocken urged that the Protestant missions in Quebec should be supported with abundant funds, for unless Quebec becomes Protestant it will become Atheistic, like France, Italy, and even Spain. There is no city in Canada where Atheism and Anarchy prevail as they do in Montreal. What is happening is that the working classes are becoming socialists or anarchists, the wealthy and the educated are becoming atheists, and the rural districts just now are under the control of the church, and to counteract all this the Protestant mission should be very greatly strengthened.

This is very good political literature for the back lodges of Ontario, and I am not at all surprised at the language of my hon. friend. But I want to draw his attention to it and the attention of my hon. friend from Beauharnois. What kind of language have we been sometimes met with when we paid high compliments to Sir Wilfrid Laurier before French Canadians ? How does my hon. friend from Beauharnois like this particular language ? I leave that to him and to the hon. member for East Grey; and if parliamentary usuage permitted me to say what I feel with reference to this, I would use some very strong language indeed. All I can say is that it is with the greatest contempt and scorn that I read this language which I have every reason to believe my hon. friend used.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say in reply that if I were permitted to go into the private life of the hon. gentleman and refer to some of his language, and put this alongside of that, I think it would compare very favourably with it.

Mr. TALBOT. I defy the hon. gentleman to go into my private life and to state anything he knows of it, in this House or anywhere outside of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. Don't defy too far.

Mr. TALBOT. I defy the hon. gentleman to say it now or anywhere else.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose I may be allowed to say one word, as my hon. friend has brought my name into this.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can only make a personal explanation, as he has already spoken.

Mr. BERGERON. As my hon. friend has brought my name into this, I am bound to defend myself. The hon. gentleman reads from the Toronto 'Globe,' which does everything in its power to set creed against creed and race against race ; that is one of the fundamental principles of the Liberal party. We have suffered from that for many years. I remember the time when the Prime Minister boasted that there were no Orangemen in his party, although at that very time one of the principal organizers of the party was an Orangeman, an ex-member of this House. We are suffering from the same thing in Quebec to-day. 'Le Soleil' and other Liberal papers almost every day mention the fact that I am sitting in this House beside Orangemen—that, in fact, I am sitting between two of them, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). And yet the Orangemen in the province of Quebec—and I say it here to the Grand Master—vote with that party which is insulting

them on almost every occasion. I do not see why the hon. member for Bellechasse brought my name into this. The hon. member for East Grey can say what he wants to say, just as the hon. member for Bellechasse can. There are other things in the paper which the hon. gentleman might have read, but he did not read the whole article.

Mr. TALBOT. Read it yourself.

Mr. BERGERON. No, I am not a scavenger. It is very small politics when we have to come down to this. There are different creeds and nationalities in this country, and I say it to the honour of the Conservative party that it has included in its ranks men of different nationalities and creeds, and in doing so it has worked in the best interests of Canada. It has been the policy of men like my hon. friend from Bellechasse to do the reverse. It is time that they ceased. This country is getting large, and if we want to make a great country of Canada, we must put a stop to all that kind of nonsense.

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

River St. Lawrence ship channel, $760,000.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). This amount is required for the purpose of dredging the St. Lawrence ship channel between Father Point or La Traverse and Montreal, and the maintenance of the ship yard at Sorel. The work to be carried out consists of dredging at Cap à la Roche, and at the same time enlarging the ship channel at Lake St. Peter. We are providing also for the dredging of the St. Lawrence at Beaujeu Bank. The Shipping Federation and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been urging this in order to get a depth there of thirty feet at low tide. That is the only place below Quebec where we have not that depth. Above Quebec at high tide we have now reached thirty feet; but we are working to obtain thirty feet at low tide. We expect that the work at Cap à la Roche will be completed in two years. We have now six dredges at work there. Dredge No. 7 is working at Lake St. Peter. The cost of dredging last year was $302,-677.37 and the quantity dredged was 3,110,-000 yards, at an average cost of 15·55 cents per yard.

Mr. BERGERON. Are all these dredges the property of the government ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many months in the year are they at work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They generally work from the end of April till November, and they work day and night.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the width of the channel where No. 7 is working?

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. BRODEUR. Five hundred feet.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that the width which my hon. friend wants to have everywhere ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is proposed to make it 450 feet on the straight line, and 750 feet at the curve.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the 'Galveston' a successful dredge ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Very successful. The superintending engineer is entirely satisfied.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice in this report that three gentlemen were sent down to Galveston, Texas, and their expenses were paid. Was that in connection with the Galveston dredge ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. Before we purchased it we sent Mr. Cowie the superintending engineer to examine the dredge to find out whether it would be suitable for our purpose.

Mr. BERGERON. When was the dredging between Montreal and Quebec commenced ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In 1851.

Mr. BERGERON. Can the hon. gentleman give us an idea of the cost of the dredging until now ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The entire cost, including all accessories, has been $9,345,121 ; the cost of dredging alone, $6,232,647 ; expenditure for plant, staff and surveys, $3,112,-470. The quantity dredged has been 51,-038,680 yards, that is between Montreal and Quebec. About 70 miles have been dredged. The material is dumped into the river in the neighbourhood of the channel, and we have never yet been obliged to remove any of it the second time. Besides, we are sweeping the channel every year, and if it did happen that anything was carried back from the banks, it is removed by that process.

Mr. GANONG. What do you mean by sweeping the channel ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We employ a scow upon which we put an apparatus which gives the depth of the water, and shows us whether the channel is of the proper depth, or whether there is any obstruction. We have a boat for that purpose, the 'De Levis.'

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister tell us what are the plans of the department for the future with regard to dredging the St. Lawrence, and the probable cost ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The policy of the department which we are now carrying out is to obtain 30 feet depth of water at extreme low tide between La Traverse and Montreal, because below La Traverse the river does not need to be dredged. Below

Quebec the only part which requires to be dredged is at a place called Beaujeu Bank, opposite St. Thomas de Montmagny. That is the place where salt water and fresh water meet, and it is probably due to that circumstance that a bank has formed there which requires to be dredged out. We have now 30 feet at high water between Montreal and Quebec, but it is considered necessary to obtain 30 feet at extreme low water in order to accommodate vessels of the larger size which it may be desired to bring up to the port of Montreal and Quebec. When we have obtained 30 feet it will be a question whether we shall go further and obtain a still greater depth. We estimate it will cost about $700,000 to obtain 30 feet at low water between Montreal and La Traverse.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the minister considered, in building the Quebec bridge, whether it was high enough to allow vessels of the larger size to pass under it coming up to the port of Montreal? I brought up this matter a couple of years ago and showed that at the height at which the bridge was then placed the large ships which were being built at the present time would be unable to pass under it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I remember there was some discussion with regard to whether the Quebec bridge as proposed would be high enough to permit the larger vessels to pass underneath. Of course, if we were contemplating that vessels like the big ones which are now running between Liverpool and New York, such as the 'Mauretania,' were to undertake to navigate the St. Lawrence to Montreal it would be impossible for boats of this size to pass under the bridge, but I suppose it will take some time before we have such large boats as those going up the St. Lawrence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is there not sufficient water for these boats?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think there will be enough water but that is not the question that has to be solved; it is whether these big boats will be able to go up the St. Lawrence. As to the boats which are now running to Montreal and Quebec the height of the bridge does not interfere with vessels of that class.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would it not be wise to look ahead a few years? The boats that are being built are larger than they were previously and the Marconi system of wireless telegraphy has to be established on every boat of any account. Necessarily the masts cannot be interfered with or lowered.

Mr. DANIEL. Is there any rock dredged in the ship channel.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, at Cap à la Roche there is some shale rock and that is the worst place that we are now dredging. It is very hard material and that is the reason why the other night we voted an amount of money to purchase a spoon dredge so that we might be able to carry on the work more effectively.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. What was the original cost of the 'Galveston'?

Mr. BRODEUR. $145,000.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I see that there was a payment of interest in connection with this purchase to the High Commissioner. Why was that interest paid to the High Commissioner?

Mr. BRODEUR. The dredge was at Galveston but she was purchased from people in Great Britain and the payments were made through the High Commissioner. The reason we paid interest was that when the purchase was made we had no appropriation.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I understand the minister to say that $700,000 will complete the channel between Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will not say that it will complete it. It will complete it to 30 feet at extreme low water, but I will not say we will stop there.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The point that my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) brought up in regard to the height of the bridge is a very important one.

Mr. BRODEUR. Representations have been made by some associations and these representations have been referred to the Department of Railways and Canals which has to deal with that question.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Is there an investigation going on at Sorel in reference to some irregularities?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, in connection with the construction of piers in Lake St. Peter, it was represented to us that some people had been on the pay-roll who should not be there and I ordered an investigation to find out whether that statement was correct or not.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Has it been concluded?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not yet; we got an interim report from the commissioner stating that the man who is charged with having put these names on the roll has asked to have a witness examined for his defence. It appears that this man is very sick and the sworn certificate of the doctor has been filed before him stating that the man is too ill to give his evidence.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Will the minister lay a copy of the interim report on the table ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Salaries and allowances to light-keepers, $300,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the minister intend to increase the salaries of any of these lighthouse keepers ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman will see that in the amount which is asked in the estimates now under consideration there is an increase which is for that purpose.

Agencies, rents and contingencies, $32,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the same amount as last year except a small increase which is provided for the purpose of giving to the agents and the staff a slight increase in their salaries.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister tell us something about the rentals ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Quebec we have a place of our own but we are obliged to lease other property. In Montreal the property we occupy is under lease entirely.

Maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, $650,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This amount is the same as last year except that there is an increase of $1,500. This amount is to carry out the important service of the maintenance and repairs to the lighthouses throughout the country. During last year and the year before large additions had been made to the aids to navigation the maintenance of which now require to come out of the vote for maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, but it is expected that with economy the sum that is now asked for will be sufficient.

Repairs to lightships, $20,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for repairs to lightships 'Lurcher' and 'Anticosti.'

Maintenance and upkeep of dockyards, $40,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. By virtue of an arrangement we have with the Imperial government we have the use of the dockyard at Halifax and it is expected that the negotiations which are now going on between the Imperial and Canadian governments will result in our taking charge of the maintenance and upkeep of the dockyard at Esquimalt. The sum of $40,000 is for the maintenance of these two dock yards.

Construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, including apparatus, submarine signals, and providing suitable boats for carrying on construction work in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and elsewhere in the Dominion, $1,260,000.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister allow this item to stand? It is a large vote and I think the leader of the opposition wants to make some remarks on it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am ready to explain the item.

Mr. DANIEL. If the minister allows this item to stand we can take up the others.

Mr. BRODEUR. All right.

Item allowed to stand.

Construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation—further amount required for the construction or purchase of a lighthouse tender and buoy steamer for the great lakes and Georgian bay (revote), $150,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have been obliged in the past to charter boats for this service, and the government has come to the conclusion that it would be in the public interest to have a boat of our own. I might mention that the American government have eight boats engaged in this particular service. We are now asking for tenders for the construction of this boat.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will it cost $150,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is supposed it will cost that amount.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What has been expended in the past for chartering vessels for this service?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not the figures here but I am told we have paid $10,000 or $12,000 a year, not including the transportation of supplies.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will this boat be built in the Dominion?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am calling for tenders in Canada only.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the estimated cost of running this new boat for a season?

Mr. BROODEUR. I am told it will be between $16,000 and $18,000, but we will have the entire use of the boat.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. On that basis you would lose about $6,000 a year by having your own boat.

Mr. BRODEUR. In addition to the buoy service the transportation of supplies costs $7,000 a year.

Mr. GANONG. You will have to allow for depreciation on your new boat which will be about 10 per cent per annum. I am not complaining about it, but I would point out that the cost will be nearer $30,000 than $18,000 a year.

Mr. BRODEUR. We will have a boat built to suit our requirements and it is not always an easy thing to find a suitable boat to charter.

Mr. GANONG. Has it not been suggested by the St. John Board of Trade and other bodies that the boat at present in the bay of Fundy is not adequate for the service?

Mr. BRODEUR. Such representations have been made to the department and the government is considering the advisability of building a boat for the service there.

Mr. BLAIN. When will the new boat for the Georgian bay be completed?

Mr. BRODEUR. Inside of a year we expect.

To provide for breaking ice in Thunder bay and Lake Superior and other points deemed advisable for the good of navigation, $40,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This service is undertaken by the department for the purpose of keeping open till late in the fall and earlier in the spring the harbours of Fort William and Port Arthur, and some harbours on the Georgian bay. Duluth harbour is open much later in the fall than our ports, and the wheat from the west is taken there to the detriment of the Canadian route. The boards of trade of Winnipeg, Port Arthur and Fort William, and the Winnipeg Grain Exchange sent petitions to the government and two or three years ago it was decided to attempt to keep Port Arthur and Fort William harbours open so long as the canals should be open. I have this year added the following words to the vote:—'and other points seemed advisable for the good of navigation,' the purpose being to include some Georgian bay ports.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am glad the minister has taken into consideration the breaking of the ice in other portions of the great lakes to aid navigation. The other day the member for Kent (Mr. Clements) made an earnest plea for the opening of navigation on the Thames near Chatham, which would tend to prevent floods there, and I would ask the minister whether it would not be possible for him to send a boat from Sarnia for this purpose. I understand there is a boat there available and that it would not cost more than $1,000 to do this.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have no ice-breaker to do the work referred to. The idea of this boat is to keep navigation open for a longer period in order to enable the farmers of the Northwest to get their wheat to the market when it is first available in September, as it is very important for them to do so. Last year we were able to keep the harbour at Fort William open until December 17, with great benefit to the western exporters. I do not know whether this vote will cover such a request as that of the hon. gentleman, but I will look into the matter and see what can be done.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad that the hon. member has brought this up. I do not know whether it properly falls under the Marine or Public Works Department, but I think it should come under the Marine Department. The expenditure of $1,000 here may prevent damage of hundreds of thousands of dollars to these valuable farm lands, so that in addition to the aids to navigation this would be of great advantage to the people of that district.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether this would come under my department; I think that the flooding of private property would really come more under the provincial than under the Dominion authorities. The purpose of this vote is to aid navigation rather than to prevent floods as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Thames is a navigable river and it is not a question of preventing the floods, the aid to navigation being considered as important as the floods. Within fifteen miles of Chatham the river rises 18 or 20 feet, but at the lake front it does not rise 3 feet and the upper ice jamming into the lower ice causes the water to rise and flood the land. I believe a small amount of money would be sufficient and it would be a great aid to navigation as well as to the public.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister explain whether this comes under the Marine or the Public Works Department? The member for Kent (Mr. Gordon) who sits on the Liberal side, sees the necessity of this work being done without delay. He urged on the Minister of Public Works the other day the necessity of going on with this work without delay. I do not think we are unreasonable in asking the minister to define whether this comes under the Public Works Department or the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I must give the Minister of Public Works the credit of admitting that he did say he would send an engineer to the place at once and see that it was looked after. The reason I brought up the question before the Minister of Public Works was because the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) intended sending a boat up to break the ice, but could not get one. Does this come within the control of the minister's department or the Department of Public Works? As to its being a provincial or a Dominion work, I think there can be no question about it being a Dominion work. There is a precedent for it in the Nation river.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is for the improvement of navigation, and I could not use any of it for the purpose of preventing floods.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What I want to impress on the hon. minister is that if he is

not asking any vote for this purpose, he should ask for a certain amount to take care of that work from year to year.

Mr. GANONG. Is this money to be devoted to hiring vessels to break the ice ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We asked for tenders last year. I think there was only one tender, as there is only one boat on the great lakes which can carry on this work.

Mr. GANONG. It seems rather a large amount for ten or twelve days' work.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a month in the fall and a month in the spring. We paid more than that, I think, before we adopted the method of calling for tenders.

Mr. SPROULE. Who got this $40,000 last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Canadian Towing and Wrecking Company of Port Arthur. Mr. Whalen is the manager. Under the contract they are bound to break the ice up to the 17th December each year and also in the Spring of each year. They also have to remove the lighthouse keepers. There is a big ice-breaker and there are six or seven other boats kept busy keeping the channel open.

Mr. SPROULE. The statement was made by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) the other night, and the minister did not contradict it, that the work was done by one boat, and that only a small boat.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a big ice-breaker called the 'James Whalen'; length, 108 feet; breadth, 24 feet; depth, 13 feet; gross tonnage, 313.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not a big boat.

Mr. BRODEUR. She does the work very successfully. They have to furnish the necessary plant to keep the channel open.

Mr. SPROULE. In the first place, this seems to me to be a very large amount of money to pay for the work done. There is another element which may make it of very little use to keep the ice broken late in the fall or early in the spring in Lake Superior or in the Georgian bay, that is, whether navigation is open in the Sault canal. There is no use of bringing vessels down from Port Arthur or Fort William unless they can get through the canal, and my information is that the navigation of the canal is closed by ice very much earlier than it is at Port Arthur and Fort William.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by Mr. Fraser, who has been attending to this work for the last four or five years, that Sault Ste. Marie canal was open last year even after the 17th of December.

Mr. SPROULE. What time did it open in the spring ?



Mr. BRODEUR. It opens in the spring much earlier than the navigation at Fort William and Port Arthur, because these ports being surrounded by islands, the ice there forms earlier in the fall and remains later in the spring.

Mr. SPROULE. I have more than once heard it stated that in the spring of the year vessels laden with grain at Port Arthur were ready to start as soon as the ice was out of the Sault canal, and I have frequently heard vesselmen say that they could bring down a great deal more grain if it were not for ice forming in the canal, which they said was about the last place where navigation opened in the spring.

Mr. BRODEUR. The information given me by Mr. Fraser is that the ice remains at Port Arthur and Fort William very much later than in the canal.

Mr. SPROULE. The matter is capable of verification, for I assume that you have data which shows when navigation opened at these different points. What is being done in regard to breaking the ice in the Georgian bay ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Last year some vessel owners claimed that they had broken ice on Georgian bay, and they asked us to deal with them in the same way as we did with those who broke ice at Fort William and Port Arthur. We thought it was a fair claim, and this year I got Mr. Fraser to make contracts with vessel owners on the Georgian bay for breaking ice, if it became necessary to do so, in order to have continuous navigation from Fort William to Georgian Bay ports.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting to it because I think it is right, but I merely refer to the fact that these three elements have to be kept in mind and attended to in order to make the undertaking a success. Outside of that, even if there were no grain coming down, it would still be desirable to keep the Georgian bay ports opened, because there is navigation in the Georgian bay which does not extend to the Sault canal. I would like to know if any number of trips are to be made by this ice-breaking steamer or is it simply to keep the navigagian bay ports.

Mr. BRODEUR. The contract is made as wide as possible. There is no limit as to the number of trips. We simply require them to keep the channel open for the free passage of vessels till the 17th of December in the fall and as soon as the canal is open in the spring.

Mr. SPROULE. How long did they require last spring to keep the navigation open ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Last year it was a serious task, and I think they must have lost

some money, if we may judge from the repairs which they were obliged to make on their boats. It is true that last year was an exceptional year. They have filed a claim with the department which of course we do not recognize, because we claimed they had to break the ice, not only in the harbours of Port Arthur and Fort William proper, but even outside; they went many miles outside. In consequence of the use of this ice-breaker the harbour was kept open a little more than a month beyond the usual period.

Mr. SPROULE. I think this work is all right, but I thought that from the length of time I was told this boat was operating they were getting a large amount of money for the work they were doing. At best the tug is only of moderate size.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is no matter of ours whether the tug is large or small so long as she does the work properly. We have advertised in all the papers for a new contract.

Signal service, $9,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to pay the signal service at Halifax, St. John and Quebec. There is a reduction here, because last year we took an appropriation for a place called Point Grey near Vancouver, which this year we do not require the service to be performed by the wireless telegraph station at that place.

To provide for the building and maintenance of wireless stations, $131,550.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I think there was a dispute last spring in reference to the work of the wireless telegraph, and complaints were made by shippers at Montreal that the system was not in good working order in the Straits of Belle Isle and some other places along the coast and that delays took place.

Mr. BRODEUR. I remember the report which was published to the effect that some stations were not open earier. Those wireless stations were in the Straits of Belle Isle, and we are obliged by our contract with the Marconi Company to convey the operators to their various stations. Usually the boats make that trip on the 1st of July. We expected to use the 'Montcalm' to convey these operators to their stations. We had given instructions to the 'Montcalm' to go to Sydney in order to take the mails from the Atlantic mail boats to Sydney. The mails had to be transferred from the Atlantic steamers to the 'Montcalm,' which was to carry them to Sydney, whence they would be distributed. Unfortunately the 'Montcalm' was stranded there for a few days, and that prevented her from being sent to carry the operators in time to meet the first boats that came through the Straits of Belle Isle.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. What was the nature of the dispute between the government and the Marconi Company?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Marconi people took an action against the government, claiming that we had infringed upon their patents by the use of some apparatus in the province of British Columbia. This question is still pending.

To provide for the administration of pilotage and pensions and maintenance and repairs to the pilotage steamer 'Eureka,' $30,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is an increase of $3,000 in this vote and this is for the purpose of making repairs to the steamer 'Eureka.' The 'Eureka' is the boat that carries out the pilots from Father Point to the steamers coming up the St. Lawrence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. By allowing one of these items to remain I understand that we can discuss any of the items at a future time.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is all right. There is already an item which has been allowed to stand.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.25 a.m. Saturday.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 16, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### RAILWAY SURVEYS IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I desire to present a corrected reply to a question asked by Mr. Stanfield. The question reads:

1. Were government surveys ever made of proposed railways between (a) Truro and Parrsborough via Five Islands; (b) between Truro and Brulé; (c) between Truro and Upper Stewiacke, the first two named in Colchester and Cumberland counties, the last two in Colchester?
2. If so, at what date were the surveys made?
3. Were subsidies voted in connection with the same, and when?
4. Are all subsidies still valid or have they lapsed?

To this the corrected reply is as follows:

1. No Dominion government surveys were ever made of proposed railways between (a) Truro and Parrsborough via Five Islands; (b) between Truro and Brulé; (c) between Truro and Upper Stewiacke.
2. Answered by number one.

3. By chapter 57, 1903, a subsidy was voted for a railway from Truro to Brulé, (b) and revoted in 1906. No subsidies have been voted to the other lines (a) and (c) mentioned.

4. The subsidy is still available, from Truro to Brulé.

## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. SPROULE.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I desire to call the attention of the Houses to some remarks made by Senator Cloran in the Senate which refer to myself. I find in the Senate 'Hansard' that Senator Cloran is reported as reading from the 'Globe' as follows :—

Dr. Sproule in his reply did not refer to this remark, but immediately launched into a defence of the Orange order, claiming that it was the champion of free speech, a free press and of religious liberty.

And again :

He declared that Roman Catholics had received an undue share of appointments in the departments at Ottawa.

I was answering a question that is sometimes raised to the effect that as a body of Orangemen, we were not disposed to give the Roman Catholics the height of fair play in the distribution of offices, and I said that nothing could be further from our aim or our desire. I gave as an illustration the employees in the House of Commons and incidentally mentioned the Senate. The 'Globe' report proceeds :

The Roman Catholic population of Canada was only 40 per cent of the whole, yet in the Printing Bureau there were two years ago 388 Roman Catholics and 149 protestants. He was told that now the numbers were 525 and 75 respectively. Of the 78 pages and messengers of the House of Commons, 58 were Roman Catholics and 20 Protestants, and of the 67 pages and messengers in the Senate, 42 were Roman Catholics and 25 Protestants.

I have only to say that the report of my speech was an absurdity and if the gentleman who was sent there by the 'Globe' and who wrote that report had desired to be at all fair, he knew that I stood with a paper in my hand and that he could easily have verified the figures in his report before he sent it. I said nothing with regard to the numbers in the Senate, because, as I said at the time, I had not the papers in my hand. I said nothing but this, that from the information I had, the clerks, messengers, pages and servants in the House of Commons there numbered 78, of whom 58 were Roman Catholics and 20 Protestants, and I was informed that the proportion was about the same in the Senate, but I said nothing about the numbers. That was all I said about it, and there was no occasion for sending a report which was entirely inaccurate and untrue. I am quite willing to be held responsible for what I do say, and for that I have nothing to apologize, but I do not want to be held responsible for what I do not say.

## WHISKEY PERMIT AGENTS IN THE YUKON.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of Interior). On the 13th of January last the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked the following question :

Who are the whiskey permit agents for the various districts of the Yukon, and what is the salary attached in each case ?

As the commissioner of the Yukon Territory is empowered by ordinance to appoint, prescribe the duties of, and fix the salary of the chief preventive officer, and of such other officer and assistants as he considers necessary for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of the ordinance, Mr. Foster was informed that the commissioner of the Yukon Territory had been requested to furnish this information at an early date. The information asked for has now been received, and is as follows : The preventive officers, or whiskey permit agents, of the Yukon are : E. S. Ironsides, Dawson, salary, $600 per annum; Fred. McLennan, Whitehorse, salary, $250 per annum.

## PRIVILEGE—RETURNS TO THE HOUSE.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. When the question of the return of documents was before the House the other day, I had not seen the report on the subject, and did not know that my name was mentioned in connection with two sets of papers that were apparently out of the department for a long space of time. I find in the 'Globe' of March 12 an editorial which says among other things :

It was not a falsehood that Mr. Lefurgey had returned a document mutilated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that it is an absolute falsehood that I returned any document mutilated. I do not know how far you would extend the term mutilation of documents ; but if the party who published this statement in the 'Globe' had read the record of Mr. Polkinghorne in regard to the return, he would have found that there was no such word in it as mutilation. Mr. Polkinghorne stated in his marginal notes that the document was incomplete. When the newspapers have the facts before them, I do not think they have a right to garble the language of a report to such an extent as to mislead the public. I took occasion to go to Mr. Caldwell's office, to which the sessional papers are returned, and I found the two returns to which reference was made, Nos. 173 and 181, and

in neither case could Mr. Caldwell say that there was anything wrong or anything missing. I took the two same returns to Mr. Polkinghorne, and he also told me that he could not see anything wrong at the present time in those returns, although he intimated that there must have been something wrong when I returned them. I have here the two returns as brought down, and they ratify the statements of Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Polkinghorne. There is nothing wrong in these returns, to my absolute knowledge they are in the same condition as they were when I received them. I find that this statement of the 'Globe' was copied by one of our Prince Edward Island papers, the 'Watchman,' which said:

Mr. Lefurgey kept one return out 261 days, and then returned it with several pages missing.

This is a case of two black crows, for the story grows as each successive paper gets hold of it. I would suggest that the papers publishing these reports should be more careful of the language they use. I may say, in excuse for probably having had these papers a longer time than is usual, that the returns were not brought down until late in the session of 1906, and it was not until near the close of the session that I got them. Neither of them were original documents, and the department was in possession of the originals from which these copies were made up. I got the returns at the close of the session, and I returned them at the opening of the following session.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. LAKE. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Justice when I may expect the return called for on the 29th of January last in regard to certain cases against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for taxes, which were undertaken on behalf of this government in respect to the company's claim to exemption from taxation in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The return which the hon. gentleman asks for is perhaps ordered, so far as the Department of Justice is concerned, but if any such order has been made, it is without my knowledge. I will make inquiries with regard to it.

Mr. LAKE. I may say that last session I asked some questions in regard to this particular subject, and they were answered by the Minister of Justice, and I presumed that he would have the papers, because he then said he would bring them down if they were called for.

## PRIVATE BILLS.

### NIAGARA, ST. CATHARINES AND TORONTO RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 82) respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

On section 2,

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). In reference to this Bill I would like to make a few observations. It must be remembered that the Bill is for the renewal of a charter, not the granting of a new charter. It was renewed some two years since, just as it stands today. Possibly the conditions were a little different then from what they are now. The objections taken to this Bill in committee were two, if I remember correctly. One was that it did not provide protection for the cities of Hamilton and Toronto as regards crossings, and the other was that it made no provision to protect the centres of population against this road doing a street railway business as an electrical road. The position taken by me was that under the Railway Act the Board of Railway Commissioners had ample power to grant protection at crossings, not only in Toronto and Hamilton, but in every municipality through which this road might run. The powers given to the Railway Commission are wider than those given to any similar organization in the world and the provisions of the statute are very broad. The hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) questioned whether the board under the present Act had power to make the railway elevate its tracks. The provision is that the board has power to compel the raising or depression of a highway and a good many legal gentlemen were of opinion that was sufficiently wide, but in order, that there might be no dispute about that I consented to an amendment which made it absolutely clear that the Board of Railway Commissioners had power to compel the railway to elevate its tracks or to depress them at any crossing, as well as to elevate or depress a highway. In Toronto negotiations are now under way for the elevation of the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway in one part of the city and the depression of these tracks in another part of the city. An amendment was moved to this Bill to the effect that this line could not enter the city of Toronto except by elevating its tracks or depressing them as the case might be, unless by the consent of the municipality.

Mr. BRISTOL. I will hand you over the amendment I purpose moving.

Mr. GRAHAM. This amendment reads:

Except with the consent of the council of the city of Toronto expressed by by-law, the railway of the company shall not be constructed along any highway in the said city or across any highway therein except by a subway underneath or by a bridge over such highway.

Now, if the other railroads entering Toronto were elevated or depressed at the present time that might be proper, although

even then the Board of Railway Commissioners would have ample power, and I would hope ample common sense to make this road do as other roads had done. But the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway are not elevated, and if the negotiations did not culminate in the elevation of these roads then we would by this amendment give the city of Toronto power to for ever shut out the Canadian Northern entering the city of Toronto, because it would be an absurd proposition that one line should elevate its tracks while the other two are allowed to run on the level. If on the other hand these other railways do elevate their tracks, then there is not the slightest doubt in the world, but that the Board of Railway Commissioners possesses full power to make this line elevate its tracks, and the practical result would be in all probability that the Board of Railway Commissioners would compel these railroads to come in on the same line of elevated tracks. My contention is that the Board of Railway Commissioners has full power to protect any municipality in Canada in regard to crossings in cities or towns or villages or rural districts. I am free to confess that I have always taken the ground that no electrical railway should have the right to run on the streets of any municipality without getting the consent of that municipality, and for fear there might be some possibility that this line would be converted into an electric line and do a street railway business either in Hamilton or Toronto or any other municipality. I express the belief that some amendment should be made so as to protect the centres of population in this regard. With such an amendment I think the public interest would be properly safeguarded.

Mr. BRISTOL. Would the minister look at the fourth clause and see if that amendment is satisfactory?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will deal with that later, but from a reading of the first line it appears to me that it would be unsatisfactory as it only includes Toronto, while it should include other centres of population. We possibly forget this phase of it in discussing these Railway Bills we seem to have two things only in mind namely, the city or the cities interested, and the railway company, forgetting altogether that the object of granting charters is to afford facilities for the public generally. The people of Toronto or the people of Hamilton or the people of anywhere else have no right to put any impediment in the way of the people in the rural districts getting into or out of the centres of population. It is these people who support these centres of population, and if we were only giving charters to help the company or to help a particular municipality we should say so. But a railway charter is given to assist in the transportation of all the people and to carry the products of all the people. Of course the interests of these large centres must be protected, but I have outlined what I think is ample protection for them, and with that I think this Bill ought to pass, leaving the question of crossings to be dealt with by the Railway Commissioners who will no doubt make this railway conform to what is done by the other lines already in the city.

Mr. BRISTOL. It would facilitate matters so far as the city of Toronto is concerned if the minister could approve of the amendment, notice of which was given by Mr. Claude Macdonell and which I am moving. I am quite content to have the amendment cover the rights of places other than Toronto, and I shall leave that point for a moment to discuss the position of the minister with reference to Toronto and the subject of grade crossings. I cannot agree with the minister that this matter should be left to the Railway Commission in the shape suggested. I deny most emphatically that the city of Toronto, and, so far as I know, the city of Hamilton, desire to place any impediment in the way of the entrance into these cities of the Canadian Northern or any other railway. That would be an absurd position for any city to take in regard to such a matter. The city of Toronto is proud of the Canadian Northern; it is the first railway of a transcontinental character that has made its head office and established its chief quarters in the city of Toronto. The city of Toronto has got along in a most excellent fashion with the Canadian Northern; there never has been the slightest dispute with that railway; they have now an entrance into the city of Toronto and are running trains daily from the Union station. To say that the city of Toronto could or would by any possibility keep the Canadian Northern for all time from entering the city of Toronto is simply an absolute absurdity and contrary to existing facts, and if the minister were well informed he would know that the Canadian Northern does run into the city of Toronto to-day and is indeed a welcome visitor. Now, so far as this particular railway we are considering is concerned, we are not raising any contest over this railway as such, but we are taking the position that so far as Toronto is concerned the grade crossing has come to an end.

Mr. GRAHAM. I used the term Canadian Northern; that is not the name of this company. Ostensibly it is the Niagara and St. Catharines, but the same capital owns it.

Mr. BRISTOL. The hon. minister may have more information than I have on the subject, but I can only say that the Canadian Northern has to-day an entrance into

Toronto; has never had the slightest trouble with the council of the city of Toronto, and it is a most welcome railway in Toronto, as this railway or any other railway will be. We are glad to have these railways, and to say that we want to place an impediment against railways coming into Toronto is an absurdity. We are more anxious to have the railways come in than they can be, because it is the railways that bring trade to our cities; it is the people they bring in who contribute to our growth and prosperity. But when the people come to our cities we do not want them to walk on streets where they are liable to be run over and killed. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to quote one or two Liberal newspapers on this question. For instance, the Toronto 'Star' of last Saturday says:

The Senate of Canada is sometimes described as a useless body, but it has at least the mild virtue of being comparatively innocuous. It is doubtful whether that moderate praise can be ascribed to the Railway Committee of the House of Commons. There are cases in which this body seems to be eager for power, yet unwilling to do its duty. At least it contains a proportion of members whose chief desire is to get through the business somehow or anyhow with very little regard for public duty, for the important questions involved, or for the rights and interests of the people.

This disposition was shown in the case of the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company. The committee insists upon dealing with electric railways, although it is at least very doubtful whether they ought to have federal charters. But while it grasps at this power, it has a very poor sense of the responsibility that ought to accompany power. The city of Toronto, asking for fair and reasonable protection for human life, and for the right to control its own streets, is treated like an intruder, and its position most grotesquely misrepresented. Any member who understands the situation, knows that the sole object of the city is to prevent any radial railway company from obtaining a franchise for the use of our streets extending beyond the expiration of the charter of the Toronto Street Railway Company. There never was a time when the radial railways could not enter the city on fair terms, saving the right of the city to the control of its own streets.

Mr. CALVERT. Does the hon. gentleman remember the solicitor representing this company stating that this was a steam railway and not an electric railway ?

Mr. BRISTOL. I recollect that very well and I recollect also that in view of the fact that the company has power to operate three street railways, we wanted a provision put in the Bill that this was also such a railway. But for some reason or other my hon. friend and those associated with him did not put it in, it would have been a great help if they had. Then there is another newspaper that might be familiar to some of my hon. friends, known as the 'Globe.' On Saturday, March 14th, the 'Globe' had an article under the heading: 'Danger of level crossings.'

The debate in the Senate on Thursday brought into strong relief the danger to human life from the level intersections of railways and highways. Clearly those who use the highways have the prior claim to the free use of the crossing, but if they try to exercise their privilege at a wrong time they invite destruction and often incur it. Unfortunately it is not always possible to keep out of the way of passing trains. It is extremely difficult to do so at Sunnyside, for example, because the westbound trains come out of a cutting which obscures them till they are close upon the unfortunate victim. Passengers using the highway are not all so fortunate as the man whose horses were unable to take the loaded sleigh off the track, and who had time to save them and himself by sacrificing his property.

The number of level crossings in Canada and the United States is enormous, and though the process of separating the grades is going on, the list of such crossings is, owing to the construction of new lines, rapidly increasing. The number of people killed every year is so large as to be a serious blot on our civilization, more especially as it is not merely possible but feasible to greatly minimize the danger of collisions. Gates afford some protection, but the seperation of the grades by the use of subways or bridges is the only effective safeguard.

In Toronto the problem of separating the grades has come up in an acute form. The city and the railways have entered into a contest on this question which must be settled before the struggle is ended. It would be extremely impolitic and unjust to a great centre of population like this to have a new railway put into the advantageous position occupied already by those which now enjoy the use of the esplanade. Parliament should leave the city to fight its present battle to a conclusion before taking the side of another corporation against it. There would be no injustice or hardship in telling the Niagara and Toronto Railway Company to negotiate with the city for permission to cross its highways, subject to the authority of the Railway Commission. But to place a municipal corporation at such a disadvantage would be a piece of insufferable tyranny, apart from the legality of the legislation which would be clearly questionable and probably contested.

Now Mr. Chairman, this is not a new problem in the United States. I quote from a well known authority on that subject as follows :

We have on our steam railroads thousands of grade crossings (a very barbarous and stupid device), by means of which every year hundreds of persons needlessly lose their lives.

If there were no stock watering, there need be no grade crossings. The money that normally would have been used to abolish these death-traps has gone for dividends on the watered stock.

That has been the experience in the United States, why should we in Canada have to go ahead on any such lines ? So far as the city of Toronto is concerned, we say to

the minister that we recognize the rights of the municipalities to give protection to the people, we are prepared to go as far as the minister in that respect, and possibly further; but we say that where a city has the size of Toronto, or Montreal, or Hamilton, and a railroad comes in and kills a person nearly every week, sometimes oftener, by reason of the existence of these level crossings, the matter has become acute, it has become a matter of policy that the city should be absolutely mistress to say whether it is going to have trains come in on the level or not. That is the position in the city of Toronto. We think it is reasonable that this matter of policy should be decided here and now, and that this railway should not be put in the advantageous position of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway which, years ago, were given powers which ought never to have been given to them, or at least would never have been given to them under existing modern conditions. I want to point out another thing to the minister. We may have the spectacle later on of a railway commission ordering a level crossing in the city of Toronto; we may have the further spectacle of a railway commission ordering a subway or an elevated bridge and compelling the city to pay a portion of the costs. Now we contend that if the city has the right to say whether these railways shall cross on a level or not—it is the interest of the city to have these railways, the people and the city council of Toronto are not so insane as to want to shut out the railways—but they do want to abolish death traps, and they come and say to the minister: We want this done, and the minister says, I am not prepared to trust the intelligence of the city council of Toronto, I believe the Railway Commission have more intelligence to deal with this matter, in which however they are not so vitally interested, and therefore I will say that the streets of Toronto are to be subject to what the Railway Commission may decide. Now I protest strongly against any such outrage on the city of Toronto. I believe the Toronto city council are reasonable men, and will deal reasonably with this railway, as they have with other railways, because it is in the vital interests of the city that they should do so. How can Toronto expect to grow and become the great city that it hopes to become, unless it does get these roads? I must say to the minister that the city of Toronto as a rule gets very scant justice from this parliament. Toronto has worked hard to make it the city that it is. It has a population of nearly 350,000, it has about one-twentieth of the population of the Dominion, it pays $5,000,000 taxes, and very little of that $5,000,000 is returned to the city in the way of public works. They have come here and said: 'We want to protect the lives of our citizens by preventing railways from crossing on a level, and yet the Minister of Railways says: No you must go to the Railway Commission. Under this Act, assuming it is amended, it is not clear now whether the Railway Commission have power to order the railway to elevate or depress its tracks. But you are going to give this railway company the power to say: We have a charter allowing us to enter the city of Toronto, we are willing to build an overhead bridge or a subway, but the city must pay some portion of the costs. Now it is this railroad coming into Toronto for business purposes that occasion the danger. We are glad to have this railway, we are glad to have the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway which have received a great deal of public assistance wherewith to build them. And while they are causing this danger, and while they are making money out of the city, they say to the city, and the Railway Commission says to the city: You must pay a portion of the costs of protection of the lives of the general public, the city must pay its share of the elevation or depression of the tracks.

Mr. SPROULE. They are the ones that are doing the killing.

Mr. BRISTOL. Yes, the railways are doing the killing and they are making the money out of the transaction. Because the city of Toronto wishes not merely to protect its own people but to protect hundreds of thousands of people who come from everywhere every year, it is really going to be compelled to pay a portion of the cost to the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway of the protection of the lives of these people while the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railways which kill the people make all the money. We say that the city of Toronto should not be put in any such position as regards a new railway. We say that it should not be left to the Railway Commission to deal with a matter which is a matter of policy and especially where a city has arrived at a position such as Toronto or Montreal have arrived at with respect to level crossings it should have the say as to whether railways shall cross on the level or overhead. So I move an amendment to section 3 of this Bill as follows:

Except with the consent of the council of the city of Toronto expressed by by-law, the railway of the company shall not be constructed along any highway in the said city, nor across any highway therein, except by a subway underneath or by a bridge over such highway.

Mr. BARKER. The suggestion made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) would remove some of the difficulty in this case. That is that this company should be prohibited from operating its road as a street railway in a city without the consent by by-law of the city. It is quite true, as has been said here, that

the legal gentleman who is looking after the interests of the owner of this company did say that the company had no intention of operating this road otherwise than as a steam railway, but when an effort was made to get him to put that in black and white in the Bill there was a sudden withdrawal and we found a very great desire on the part of everybody promoting the Bill to keep any such declaration out of it. I think this is, especially to the city of Toronto and, to a large extent, to the city of Hamilton, a very important question and I wish to impress this more upon the Minister of Railways than has yet been done. Everybody knows that the gentlemen interested in this Bill are the same gentlemen who are interested in the Toronto Street Railway and if this Bill pass there will be nothing in the world to prevent an arrangement being made between the Toronto Street Railway Company and this company that may seriously interfere with the streets of Toronto, at all events, unless we distinctly declare in this Bill that they shall not operate their railway as a street railway. The same thing applies to the city of Hamilton. The city of Hamilton has a street railway and has suburban railways which have certain rights by contract. No one can tell but that within six months all these roads may be controlled by these same people and in the same way they may use their power of ownership of the other roads to practically conduct a street railway business in the city of Hamilton. Whatever may be said about the city of Hamilton or the city of Toronto obstructing this Bill, there is no the slightest truth in that, but I do not believe there is a gentleman representing any city, town or village in the Dominion who would concede such powers as these to be placed in the hands of any railway company. We simply say that every municipal corporation desires to protect its own highway. It is a perfectly reasonable thing and it is not reasonable to ask us to leave it to the commissioners sitting in Ottawa or anywhere else to exercise the control which the cities say ought to be exercised by themselves. That is the point upon which the cities of Toronto and Hamilton have interposed here. I would suggest, following out the proposal of the minister, that these words should be inserted in the clause.

Said company shall not operate its railway as a street railway in any city or town without the consent by by-law of the corporation of such city or town.

That would remove a great danger as regards Toronto and Hamilton. I submitted to the minister in committee a somewhat modified clause. I sympathize with the views of the city of Toronto on account of the enormous interests involved as to the question of level crossings, but if the House does not go as far as Toronto and Hamilton wish in that respect, I would say that, whatever may be said about the crossings of streets and about the power of the commission to regulate crossings, I think there can be no doubt that these cities are perfectly reasonable and within their rights in saying that no commission shall have power to allow a railway company to run its railway along the streets of a city or to cross such a place as a market, or a park or anything of that kind. I would submit this to the committee as a second proposal which is absolutely fair:

Said company shall not construct or operate its railway along any street or highway, or upon or along any public place in any city or town without the consent by by-law of the corporation of any such city or town.

I submit these to the consideration of the minister and I think that they ought both be passed.

Mr. GRAHAM. As I caught the hon. gentleman's first amendment I absolutely agree with him. May I ask the hon. gentleman what would be construed as the legal meaning of 'any public place.'

Mr. BARKER. It may be put in stricter words if you like. What I mean by it is such a place as a park, market place, public square, court house square, or any place that is owned by the public as distinguished from private ownership.

Mr. GRAHAM. We might say across or upon a park, market place, square or other public place.

Mr. BARKER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that is not unreasonable at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps you could say 'any public thoroughfare.'

Mr. GRAHAM. Well that raises the question again. I do not want to be misunderstood. I agree with the hon. gentleman in his argument about level crossings. I am just as strongly opposed to level crossings as he is but my way will protect the public against level crossings as thoroughly as his will.

Mr. BRISTOL. I wish I could see it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, it will all the same. I agree with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) too. I have been through this same fight for a number of years with the same company in the provincial legislature where I thought they were trying to get on the streets of Toronto by a back door. I always opposed that. I want to put something in the Bill that will preclude their doing that and to protect the cities of Toronto and Hamilton. This company has no right to go into such centres of population and do street railway business there, either

in competition with the companies there or in conjunction with them, to the detriment of the city, financially or otherwise. I think we should get this Bill into shape to suit us all if we work along these lines.

Mr. BRISTOL. In view of the attitude the hon. minister has assumed, there are two things that might be said on the grade crossing question not covered by the amendment of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). The first is that if the city of Toronto could have its way it would not have a grade crossing without the consent of the city council. That is one point. The second is that we feel that if the proposal of the present Bill is carried out, the Railway Commissioners, if they choose, can order the city to pay half the cost of crossing a highway, either by subway or overhead crossing. Now, if the minister would amend section 235 of the Act so that the Railway Commission could not give any consent to a crossing on the level without the consent of the municipality where any portion of the crossing was to be charged against any such municipality, that would be one point. So far as I am personally concerned, I cannot see why the city of Toronto should not be the one to say where the level crossing, if any, should be.

Mr. BLAIN. While I agree with the amendment of my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) and also with the amendment of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), I think neither of these amendments goes far enough. Every member of the House will agree that in a great centre of population such as Toronto, and in other centres such as Hamilton, no railway, at this time in Canada's history, should be permitted to cross the streets or construct its lines upon the streets without having the consent of the municipal council. But I cannot see why this should not apply also to rural municipalities. Take, for instance, the section between Toronto and Hamilton. It is thickly populated—in some places quite as thickly populated as some parts included within this population of 350,000 of which the hon. member for Centre Toronto has spoken. This section has become a network of railways. I pointed out the other evening, when this matter was under discussion, that the right of way on which this road will be constructed was first purchased from the owners with the distinct understanding that the line was to be an electric railway to carry the small products of the farm to these two cities. On this understanding the owners sold the right of way at very cheap rates, and also they allowed that right of way, in some cases, to run close to their residences or to their magnificent bank barns. These people thought that the line would use electricity, and that there would be no locomotives with their flying sparks to cause fire. Now, we are confronted with the fact that the road to be constructed on this right of way is to be a steam road, with all the danger and inconvenience to residents involved in such a road. Moreover, this will mean that the three leading railways of Canada will run through that section of my county within a distance of three miles. According to this Bill, without carrying it further, the railway would have the right to run rapid trains across the highways without being required first to obtain the consent of the municipality. I do not see why these municipalities, even though not so thickly settled, should not have the same opportunity of self-protection as we all agree should be given to the city. After all the discussion that we have had in recent years, in the Railway Committee and in this House, no Bill should pass granting privileges to railway companies without providing for the protection of the rights of municipalities.

As to the city of Toronto, there is some force in what the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) says, that it would not be quite fair that the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway, having their rights within the limits of the city and having no high level crossings, this new road should be compelled to provide high level crossings into the city. But I cannot believe that the Railway Commission would order the Canadian Northern to provide high level crossings without, at the same time, putting a similar condition upon the other lines.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) seems to be in a peculiar mood or frame of mind just now. He verbally concedes everything, but he is not willing to do much. It seems to be a case where the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak. I see that the minister is writing and consulting. Evidently a 'hustle' is on for some reason.

Mr. CALVERT. Trying to fix up Mr. Barker's amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. But the amendment of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is not the first amendment. I notice that these hon. gentlemen caught at that very quickly. It is only an alternative in case the good sense of the House does not give what we think ought to be given as asked for in the first amendment. What is the position of the Minister of Railways or of any member of this House with reference to level crossings and the separating of grades? Surely it should not be necessary to ask that question. With the history of railways and the growth of cities in mind, and with the constant dangers threatened and actually incurred at times by the loss of life at level crossings, surely every one must have come to the conclusion that, instead of adding to the number of level crossings, the number must be, as rapidly as possible, diminished. And, although in small communities the same principles ap-

ply, yet the danger is greater where the population is most numerous and the travel greatest, and so the principle applies with peculiar strength in a city like Toronto, the largest city in Ontario. I do not know whether the Minister of Railways knows just the depth of the feeling existing in Toronto upon this question. It did not originate in any feeling against railways or with any idea of keeping railways out of the city, or with any idea of curtailing the reasonable privileges of railways; it arose out of the idea, impressed upon the people by repeated killings of its citizens and of strangers within its borders, that these level crossings must be, so far as possible, done away with. The feeling among the citizens of Toronto is acute on this matter, and for the last few years no public question has been more thoroughly discussed in the city than how to protect the lives of the people at these level crossings. The minister believes, he says, that it would be a proper thing to have the grades separated and to have no level crossings in Toronto, and that being so, why is he adverse to putting such a provision in the Bill. He says that his belief is that the Railway Commission would not grant an entrance to a railway over level crossings. If that be so is it not a fair proposition that the city itself should say that it is the best judge of what it needs in that respect within its own borders? There is always the possibility that the Railway Commission will make some other arrangement than that the level crossings shall be abolished, and all the city of Toronto asks is that in this Bill which allows this railway entrance into the city, provision should be made in the first place to protect the lives and property of the citizens. It has been said that it would not be fair to allow the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway to have level crossings in the city and to compel a competing road to go to the expense of raising or depressing its line. But, suppose it is ultimately decided that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific are not to elevate or depress their tracks, then the Canadian Northern would have the argument before the Railway Commission that a disability should not be put upon them which is not put upon the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk which enter on level crossings. That argument no doubt would have a great deal of effect before the Railway Commission. It may take years—I hope it will not—before that question with reference to the elevation of the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway in Toronto is settled, and if in the meantime this road asks that it be given the same privileges as the others it will have a strong case before the Railway Commission. The city of Toronto wants to avoid that; it does not want further delay, litigation, and trouble, and why should you force it to. Here is a railway corporation knocking at its door asking for entrance to the city, and the city would like to have the right to say by what method it should enter the city. Why not settle the question here and now and get it off the list of unsettled questions.

Mr. CALVERT. Suppose a clause were inserted in this Bill saying that the tracks of this railway shall either be depressed or raised, and suppose the tracks of the other railways were not changed, would the Railway Commission have the power to say this railway shall come in on the level the same as the other roads?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. CALVERT. Of course not.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Calvert) takes my very argument and he shows the force of it. His argument is that you are to allow this railway to come in on the level and to accentuate the danger that already exists by two other roads entering the city on the level.

Mr. CALVERT. Suppose the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway should elevate their tracks before this road comes in, then when this railway submits its plans to the minister to enter the city of Toronto could not the minister or the Railway Commission say that this railway must elevate its tracks just the same as the others?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe the Railway Commission possibly could say that, but that is all dependent upon a contingency and the feeling is so acute in the city of Toronto that they do not want it left dependent upon such a contingency. If by any possibility the existing roads are allowed to continue with the level crossings there would probably be no disposition in the commission to compel this new incoming road to elevate or depress its tracks.

Mr. GRAHAM. The position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite in the committee inferred that if the other railways were not elevated they had no desire to compel this railway to be elevated. They wanted to get it in the hands of the municipality, always saying that if the other railways did not elevate they would not be so unreasonable as to make this railway elevate its tracks. That was their argument in the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Whether that was the argument or not the whole point was that you left it absolutely in the hands of the city which is the first interested party. I think my hon. friend said that if you allowed the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk to continue with level crossings it would be unfair to impose the condition that all new railways entering Toronto should elevate or depress their

tracks. I deny that proposition. I say that you have to take cognizance of the progress of the times and of the change in public opinion about these matters. It may be that the two old companies have certain vested rights to come in on the level and that they will be able to keep these rights in spite of anything that can be done. But the city of Toronto has the right to come to parliament and say that we should take note of the changed conditions, and that because the two existing roads have acquired certain rights, that is no reason why the city should be obliged to allow every other railroad to enter the city by a new route on level crossings and thus add to the danger. The argument is irresistible. That what you allowed years ago it may not be good policy to allow to-day. No city in the world would be progressive if it followed the doctrine that it must give to new comers what old comers got forty years ago in the way of privileges and franchises. Now, if the minister believes that the Railway Commission would not allow the new road to enter the city on the level, and if he believes that they should not be allowed to enter on level crossings what is his objection to have that provided for in the Act. If it is in the Act it makes the thing certain and it avoids all litigation, all contingencies, all deputations, and it settles the thing from the very start. After all the protection of human life is the great thing. The hon. minister gave prominence to the rights of the outside travelling public, and he said that it was not only the city of Toronto and the railway we had to consider, but that we should also consider the outside public who wanted to travel and to get their products into the city.

He was quite right in giving a certain prominence, but I do not think it ought to have the chief prominence. I think the chief prominence ought to be given to the city which is in question, which has the franchise to give, and which has the main part of the difficulty to make good. The road itself is a commercial undertaking, whose owners are just as anxious to get it into the city for the convenience and profit of its business as the city is to get the road in for its progress and development and convenience. The road comes to the entrance of the city, the city has its distinctive being, its own entity, and it has power within its own borders, and ought to have. Is it then not right, when the railway comes to the borders of the city and asks to be allowed to come in, that it should make the matter clear and plain to the city? The city says: We want you in, but the life and property of the city must be protected, and you must come in in a certain way; you must not cross on the level, twenty-seven or twenty-eight of our streets, which are crowded with people going to and fro; if you want to come in, you must come in overhead or underneath, and if you do that we welcome you. That is surely the right of a city or other municipality. I think my right hon. friend concedes that. There are, however, the other two questions. There is the possibility of this railway, when it once gets in, making its own arrangements with the street railway, and practically taking from the city its well-understood franchise and power over its streets in the operation of the street railway. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways says he is quite willing to guard that by putting something in the Bill. He says he would like to see it in the Bill. Has he used any influence with the promoter of the Bill to get him to put it in? These words sound well to the ear, but if they do not become embodied in the Bill they are of very little use. If the Minister says it is better that a new railway should come in on the level, he is consistent; but if he maintains that it should come in overhead or underneath, why should that not be put in the Bill? There is many a slip between the cup and the lip, and though the commission in nine cases out of ten might give good decisions, it might in the tenth case give a bad one. In the interests of the city of Toronto and the municipalities generally I press for the right of the municipality to protect the lives and properties of its citizens in having the say as to how these lines of railway shall come in.

Mr. CONMEE. This Bill has been discussed at considerable length by the Railway Committee, where the same ground was taken by the hon. members for the city of Toronto that they are taking here. I just rise to say that, for one, I cannot agree with them as to the absolute power they seek to vest in the city corporation. I quite understand the necessity of this House considering the very great interest that the city of Toronto or any other large city has in a question of this nature, and the very great difference that should be paid to so large a community. There is no doubt that the level crossing is a danger which, speaking generally, should be remedied; but there may be great difficulties in the way of bringing that about. It might operate against the interests of other communities or other people who are not citizens of the city. I think that the Mimico Railway was for a number of years refused a connection with the tracks of the street railway of the city of Toronto by the city corporation, not because they did not want a connection or because it would not accommodate both the citizens of Toronto and the citizens of towns and villages outside of Toronto, but because of a difference between the city corporation and the street railway company. Because of that standing altercation, that accommodation to the public was held up for more than ten years. Then the Mimico Railway passed into other

hands, and the city corporation were before the legislature urging with all their influence that the connection should be made; but the company was not then in the humour to make the connection. I have not been in touch with that question in the last few years, and I do not know that the connection is made yet. I am not blaming the city corporation; it has its own views; but I do say that in this way it imposed on its own citizens and on the community outside of the city great hardship and inconvenience. On this occasion I take the same ground that I did then with regard to that matter, that is, that while I believe the position of the city should be recognized and everything to safeguard its citizens and the interests of a great city, should be carefully considered and embodied in legislation, yet I do not believe that the paramount authority should vest in the city. It may be said that a city should have jurisdiction over its own streets. So it has, as a general rule, but it is in a sense a trustee. The streets are in a measure the property of the Crown, and the outside public who visit Toronto or any other city, and through their trade and purchasing power, have largely maintained and built up the city, have some rights on these streets. The hon. member for North Toronto says that the city does not want any third power to intervene. By that he puts the city over and above the parliament of Canada. It has clothed with authority a certain commission to deal with these matters, why should the city of Toronto be exempt from its operation. I do not agree with the argument that the commission would not have the power from time to time to make such an adjustment of that matter as would be in the public interest. The question is, which is the safer body to entrust this very important action to? Will the public be better protected, including the citizens of Toronto or of any other city, if the matter be left with the city authority than to the Railway Commission? I think the commission the safer body; it has better machinery to deal with the question, and can approach it with less bias than the city corporation. We all know that city alderman are somewhat influenced by their surroundings. The city corporation would no doubt wish to deal fairly with a matter of this kind.

But I have doubt of their good judgment in all cases and I have doubt of their being free to exercise even the judgment they might possess in some cases owing to influences which would act upon them but which cannot have an effect upon this railway board. The board can prevent any railway company from doing any act that it is not authorized to do either by the general Railway Act of Canada or by the special Act incorporating the railway company; and the board can compel the railway to carry out any requirement that is imposed upon it by its charter or by the General Railway Act of Canada. They can do that upon the application of any person or upon their own motion, without application. If they exercise these powers as fairly as is the general rule—and the people of Canada begun to have great confidence in that board—surely all the requirements of the case will be met. I do not want to argue that the board may not make a mistake nor do I think it is competent for hon. gentlemen to argue that the city of Toronto will not make a mistake. I have just pointed out a mistake and injustice to which the city of Toronto has been a party even against its own citizens and still more against those who are not its citizens. Taking the whole matter into consideration, viewing it from a disinterested standpoint, I believe the board is the safer authority in the public interest—and I would even go so far as to say even in the best interests of the citizens of Toronto, for it was not very long ago at the time the Union Station was built in Toronto that the railway companies obtained the privilege of building a portion of the building by an arch over the street at that point, and it was not very long until they obtained from the council absolute control of that street and power to exclude the public from it and still do so; they have the power to have their officers exclude any man from that particular area, which is a public highway, a public place, and which they acquired without the consent of the citizens of Toronto, through the corporation. Thus it will be seen that the corporation of any city is not always a safeguard to the best interests even of its own citizens. I believe the Board of Railway Commissioners are a safer body with whom to entrust that power.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I think the time has arrived when the authorities of municipalities, particularly of such municipalities as Hamilton and Toronto, should be recognized in all these bills and should have practically absolute power to control their own streets. That principle has been recognized within a few weeks in this parliament, when the promoters of the Hamilton Radial Bill, before approaching this House, made their arrangements as to their entry into both Hamilton and Toronto and I think, in view of the great difficulties that are daily arising in the United States, in all the large centres on this continent, on this very question, that we should take time by the forelock and pass a general Act giving the cities their rights as to their own streets and the entrance of railways into the cities.

Mr. BLAIN. What objection would there be to applying the same principle to rural municipalities?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The cities are altogether different. While I would be quite agreeable to have the same power given to the municipal council in the country as in

the city, yet I do not think, with the sparse population in the country, that the time has arrived when these restrictions should be placed on the railway company. I am sure there is not a municipality in this country that would stand in the way of the building of railways within its borders, but in the large centres I think the municipalities should have power to say how they shall enter a city, the route to be followed and whether the entrance shall be overhead or underground. In view of what has taken place in the United States, I fancy it would be in the interest of the railway companies themselves to have such restrictions placed on them. In every large city in the United States, Buffalo, Chicago, or any other, it is a burning question how the railway shall be got off the streets; millions of dollars are being spent in overcoming what should have been overcome by restrictions placed on the railways before they obtained the right to enter these cities. I would be prepared to support the amendment of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Macdonell). If the House will not accept that, I would be prepared to accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker). Of course the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) tells us that he is placing an amendment in the Railway Act which will cover it. That amendment will assist, but it does not go far enough; I think the power should be placed entirely in the hands of the municipalities.

Mr. SPROULE. With many of the amendments that have been proposed I heartily agree, but I think, in view of the explanation made by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) that we should have another amendment with regard to the running of a steam railway over a right of way purchased for an electric railway only. Mr. Blain said that originally this was the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway, which was intended to be an electric railway; and because of the advantage this would be to the farmers in the district they were induced to sell the right of way very cheaply and, owing to the absence of any danger of fire that there would be from a steam railway, they were not disinclined to allow the road to run close to their buildings, orchards or other property. While the advantage of an electric railway service for the transportation of his family and the products of his farm weighed greatly with the farmer, this absence of danger from fire was perhaps the most potent influence in inducing him to sell the right of way cheaply; he would not have acted in the same way if he had known that this would be a steam railway, because the steam railway might practically destroy his farm. No farmer would allow it to cross his farm if he could avoid it unless he was paid a very large compensation; many would fight it, no matter what compensation was offered, baceuse of the danger to his property by fire. There should be a clause in this Bill preventing the railroad from using the right of way for the purpose of a steam railroad unless it compensated the farmer for the disadvantage to him of having the right of way used for a steam railway.

We should not encourage this. It is getting property under false pretences, it is taking the property of people and giving them no adequate compensation. Looking up this Act of incorporation. I notice that there are other rights which this company will acquire, and which it was never contemplated they should enjoy. The first company has a right to carry on works for the transmission and distribution of electric power, not only for its own use but generally. That being so, if it enters the city of Toronto, as it desires to do, I do not see that there is anything to prevent them from selling electric power in the city, which clearly never was contemplated. They are authorized also to acquire and utilize water-powers and dispose of power either directly or in the form of electric energy. So, here is another right that this company is getting in this roundabout way. We have reached a stage when we should watch very carefully the railway companies that amalgamate with others. One railway gets the right to run an electric line. Another gets the right to run a steam railway. These two amalgamate intending to use whichever power best suits their purpose. The parties who sold the right of way to the electric railway would never have sold for the purposes of a steam railway, for the steam railway is exceedingly dangerous. Every summer we have barns, houses and crops destroyed by fire caused by sparks from passing locomotives. This habit—it seems to be becoming a habit—of steam railway corporations amalgamating with electric railways, thus acquiring widely extended powers, should be carefully watched by this parliament, and in every way we should guard the rights of the people interested.

Mr. BRISTOL. I wish to press the amendment that I have submitted for I am not able to see, after listening carefully to all the arguments why the city of Toronto should not, as a matter of policy be allowed to say whether or not there should be a level crossing at any particular place within the limits of the city. In such a matter, the intelligence of the city council should govern. I regard it as very unfortunate that a Bill of this kind should come before this parliament. It is just one of those cases where we are dealing with a local matter which should have been left to be dealt with locally. I can assure you that if it were being dealt with in the local legislature there would be no difficulty about it. The rights of the city would be safeguarded, because the representatives dealing with it could be got at by those whose rights are

most affected. It is another case of the difficulty arising out of this particular 'work for the general advantage of Canada' clause. Members from various parts of Canada are called upon to deal with local matters affecting particular municipalities. It is a most unfortunate thing. In view of that and in view of the sentiment in favour of protecting the rights of municipalities, I am sorry that the minister cannot see his way to protect the rights of the city of Toronto. I can assure him that we do not want to be unreasonable. Not only we, and not only the minister's Liberal friends, but all thinking people of the city have become so worked up by the number of murders that have been caused by railways at these level crossings that they have come to believe that no amount of money should be allowed to stand in the way of the public safety. For that is what it amounts to after all—it is a pure question of money. The minister says: If we put a restriction upon this road which did not exist in the case of other roads that came into Toronto from twenty to fifty years ago, it will cost this company much more money to enter the city than it cost the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway. But look at the changed conditions. When these other companies entered the city, Toronto was a hamlet. This company comes to a great centre containing 350,000 people to trade with and do business with. They can afford to pay more—if it is to come down to a basis of money, they can afford to pay more. To pass the Bill as it is, we practically have to say to the mayor and city council of Toronto: You are not ready to be fair about a matter of business which affects vitally the citizens of Toronto and all who visit the city. You tell us that we must go to the Railway Commission to decide as to forty or fifty railway crossings, whether they are to be level crossings or not. We are not compelling this railway to come into Toronto overhead or underground, but we say that, if there is to be a level crossing, it should be because the city council, by by-law, has consented to it. The representatives of the city are most vitally interested; they must look after the streets of the city and the protection of life and property of the inhabitants. They are directly responsible to the people of Toronto, while the Railway Commission is responsible to the people of all Canada. One can readily understand that the Railway commission may come to the conclusion, after hearing counsel, that the difficulty has been exaggerated. But the council of the city of Toronto is directly responsible to the people of the city. If they do wrong in preventing a railway entering which should be allowed to enter the city, their official life will not be very long. I say that the minister is placing this simply on the basis of money, and if you bring it down to that, these people may reasonably be asked to pay more money to enter the city of Toronto than was paid by other railways twenty or thirty years ago. But, at the same time, that is a very poor basis upon which to consider a question such as this, affecting the lives of the people in one of our greatest cities.

Mr. CALVERT. As one who happens to be opposed to the amendment of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol), I must take exception to his statement. We are just as anxious to protect life, not only in Toronto but elsewhere—for the railways extend throughout Canada—as is my hon. friend. This matter does not come before us for the first time this session. This is not a new charter. It has been before the House for ten years, and was renewed in 1906. We did not find these gentlemen taking exception at that time. This question of the depression of the tracks of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway has been before the city for many years. I do not think it is fair that we should place a clause in this Bill compelling this company to elevate or depress its tracks until such time as the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway have been dealt with. It may be two years before this company is actually ready to enter Toronto. They have to submit their plans and specifications to the minister and also to get the consent of the Railway Commission. I think that by the time that has been done, Toronto will have dealt with the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway so far as elevating or depressing their tracks is concerned. It would be unfair, in the meantime, to place a clause in this charter to compel this road to elevate or depress its tracks until satisfactory arrangement is made with the other roads. We do not know that they will want to build into the city of Toronto. They may wish to effect running rights with some other road. So far as the clause proposed by the minister is concerned, I was under the impression, and so, I am sure, were many other members of the committee, that section 235 of the Railway Act provided protection for the city so far as street railways are concerned.

Section 235 says:

> The railway may be carried upon, along or across an existing highway upon leave therefor having been first obtained from the board as hereinafter authorized; provided that the board shall not grant leave to any company to carry any street railway or tramway, or any railway operated or to be operated as a street railway or tramway, along any highway which is within the limits of any city or incorporated town, until the company has first obtained consent therefor by a by-law of the municipal authority of such city or incorporated town.

I was under the impression when this Bill was before the committee that that section afforded ample protection to the city

of Toronto or any other city, if this was a street railway. But in reading the Act further, I find that clause 3 states:

Nothing in this section shall deprive any such company of any rights conferred upon it by any special Act of the parliament of Canada, or amendment thereof, passed prior to the 12th day of March, 1903.

Now it is just possible that that saving clause might prevent municipalities from exercising their right under this Bill; consequently I agree with the minister when he suggests that a new clause should be placed in the Bill, so that there shall be no doubt that when a street railway comes into Toronto or Hamilton the citizens of both those municipalities shall have ample control. But I must object to, and will vote against the amendment of my hon. friend to compel this road to elevate or depress their tracks under the present charter.

Mr. CONMEE. In respect to the remarks of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) as to the right of way acquired by this company when it was represented to be an electric road, does he say that right of way was acquired through towns or villages?

Mr. BLAIN. So far as my county is concerned, the same objection would apply, whether it passes through the towns or villages, or through a thickly settled portion of the township.

Mr. CONMEE. If the Railway Act does not now provide any protection to a municipality against a railway company operating a steam railway through the streets of cities, towns or villges, I am quite in favour of such an amendment as would provide protection.

Mr. BLAIN. Why should you not go further, and include thickly settled portions of rural municipalities, such as the one I have referred to?

Mr. CONMEE. There is not the same reasons nor the same interest. I cannot see that there would be much difference between the operation of a steam road running through a farming settlement and the operation of an electric road. If the company in any way causes damage, the law says they are responsible. I do not see that the motive power by which the road is operated could make much difference to a rural community. But certainly there might be strong objection to a steam railway taking certain kinds of traffic through a village street.

Mr. BLAIN. Though my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee) may not be able to see what difference it would make in a rural municipality, if he will consult such a municipality he will find that they have great objections. I repeat that the farmers were induced to sell their property with the understanding that this would be an electric road, and would pick up their smaller produce such as strawberries, potatoes, celery and other like vegetables which are grown to a great extent in that section. The farmers already have two steam railways in that section within a mile of some of the most important seats of this industry, and they were induced to allow another company to purchase another right of way with the understanding that when it was in operation they would be able to send their small produce to Toronto and Hamilton, because the other roads were devoting their attention to the large passenger traffic that is carried between Toronto, Hamilton and Niagara Falls. I have myself witnessed railway trains running past the stations in that county and refusing to pick up boxes of strawberries that were lying there, the railway authorities contending that they could not stop to pick up strawberries because they were running rapid trains between these two cities. Therefore the Minister of Railways can easily understand that the people up there will have three steam railways within a radius of three miles, and they are now confronted with the prospect that this road that was bought for an electric road to carry their small products, is to be converted into a steam road. That is a point that should receive the attention of the committee, and especially of the Minister of Railways. Surely the rights of the people of that section should be protected. We do not wish to interfere with the rights of the people of the city of Toronto or Hamilton. But it is one thing for the farmer to have a steam railway running within a few rods of his farm buildings, and an entirely different thing to have an electric road running close by them. The government should not compel the farmers in that section of the country to part with their rights. They sold the right of way for a small compensation, with the understanding that an electric road would be constructed; that is to be changed, and one of the great steam railways is to use that right of way.

Mr. CONMEE. With all deference to my hon. friend, I cannot yet see what difference it would make to the farmer whether the road is operated by steam or electricity so long as it picks up the freight that is waiting at certain stations. The company will still be liable for any neglect to carry this freight, and they do not escape because we pass this Bill. The municipality still has power to compel them to carry out their obligations.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the question of fire?

Mr. CONMEE. I will admit that there is a little danger there ; but if there is there is a remedy. While it is contended that this is to be a steam road, the promoters have said that it is likely to be an electric road. They do not admit that it is going to be a steam road. I am willing to concede the

point that the municipalities should be protected but not put beyond the authority of this parliament.

Mr. BLAIN. Some of the insurance companies doing business in the province of Ontario refuse absolutely to take a risk upon any building that is placed close to a steam railway. That is one of the reasons why I have taken the position that I have on this point. In answer to the question as to whether it should be a steam railway, picking up these products, or an electric railway, I admit that there is no difference, provided the steam railway will do the work. But they have already two railways running there which refuse to do the work. The owners sold them the right of way for the express purpose of getting an electric railway that would pick up this kind of business and let the steam railways take the more general traffic.

Mr. BRISTOL. I am not discussing the portion of the amendment which relates to the question of the operation of this road with respect to it being an electric road, because I understand that has been agreed upon. But my hon. friend from East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has proposed a further amendment, which is to the effect that this railway should not be permitted to run along a highway or public park or place without the consent of the municipality. I would say, in so far as the city of Toronto is concerned, in the first place, that danger to life from that cause does not arise, and there is no expectation of anything of the kind happening, because no existing railway comes into the city of Toronto along an existing highway, and we have not the slightest conception that any board of commissioners would permit any railway to come into the city of Toronto along a highway. The point in regard to which we have been asking protection has reference to the crossing of highways in Toronto, and this amendment does not affect that position at all. As far as Toronto is concerned, it would not help us in the slightest. I do not propose to reiterate the arguments that have been already stated, but what I want to say to my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Calvert) that there seem to be two points that are clearly against his contention. First, he says that it would be unfair to put this railway in a different position from that of the existing railways already in Toronto—the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway. When the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway entered Toronto the conditions were entirely different. There was not the enormous population that there is to-day. The effect of that population is that this new railway wants to come in and do business.

Mr. CALVERT. But my hon. friend will admit that they have to submit plans and specifications to the minister and to the board before they will be passed.

Mr. BRISTOL. The conditions are entirely different. There is a larger population with which to do business and to make money out of. The other point is that the fact that the two existing railways years ago got in on the level is no reason why we should let in another railway now, when the danger to life has been demonstrated, and I have been trying to argue with the Minister of Railways and Canals that it is bad enough to have these two railways crossing on the street level and trying to come to an arrangement with them without having a second problem handed to us. So we say that if they want to come to Toronto we are glad to have them, but let them come in a way that protects the public. We say that we believe the council of Toronto is much more anxious than the Railway Commission can be to welcome this railway to Toronto, and that it will be most reasonable with this company on the question of crossings. All it asks is that this principle should be laid down, not merely for this railway that wants to enter Toronto, but for any railway that wants to enter any large city, that the city shall have control of its own streets as regards where railways are to cross, whether they should cross beneath, above or on the level.

Mr. GRAHAM. That the committee may clearly understand the amendments of the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker), I want to read them. In reference to railways, our ideas are all the same. My contention is that the Railway Commission will absolutely protect the people of Toronto or Hamilton, or any one else, as far as crossings are concerned. May I say to the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol), who argues so strongly that Toronto should have the absolute power to protect its own streets, that I have always contended that, but does he not know that the city practically agreed to give the present street railway company a perpetual franchise, that the agreement was typewritten and handed to every member of a certain legislative committee with the request that it be put through, and that had it not been for one or two country members who saw the poison in the draught that would have gone through, Toronto consenting and requesting? But when it was pointed out that they had consented to something that would absolutely give a perpetual franchise the agreement was torn up in fifteen minutes and the Bill was withdrawn. That is one case even in which Toronto was protected against itself by a legislative committee. I assisted a little in that philanthropic movement. I believe that the Railway Commission has been selected and given power to do this very work. Had we only one city to look after, perhaps I might be able to put in special provisions, but I am trying to adhere to some line of action that will be defensible and will be applicable to all like conditions that may arise. Perhaps

I may be wrong, but that is what I am honestly trying to do. I am trying to get this down to a certain point that will be applicable to any condition that may arise. I say that the commission have such power, I have confidence that the commission will exercise it wisely, and if I did not believe that Toronto would be protected as other places have to be protected by the commission, I would feel differently upon this question. I am absolutely convinced that the board will deal with the different conditions that arise. I am free to say this—perhaps I am almost too brutally frank—that if the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway do not elevate their tracks, but are allowed to continue the level crossings, I do not believe Toronto would make one individual road elevate its tracks. It would not be practicable. I believe that the commission probably would not allow them to do it, but would make them come in on the same line as the others. Our objects are the same, but on that point I think it is best to leave it in the hands of the commission owing to the unsettled condition that now exists in Toronto with respect to other railways. The hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) proposes another amendment to meet another condition, as follows :

The said company shall not operate its railwas as a street railway in any city or town without the consent by by-law of the said corporation of such city or town.

The second clause of the amendment amply protects the city. It is as follows :

The said company shall not construct or operate its railway along any street or highway or upon or along any public park, market square, or any such public place in any municipality without the consent of the said municipality expressed by by-law.

If we put in that amendment the city's interests are thoroughly guarded.

Mr. BLAIN. Would that cover the right of way that has already been purchased ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It would not cover the right of way because my hon. friend will see the difficulty ; it is a question of fact whether the right of way was purchased on certain conditions making it legally binding on them to run an electric road. That is a matter that we could not very well deal with in the charter. Half of the amendments are directed against this as a steam railway and the other half are directed against it as an electric railway. It cannot be both. By leaving it as a steam railway to the commission so far as the entrance is concerned and placing these clauses in the Bill to protect the cities against any encroachment on their rights as to its operation as a street railway, I think we will come as near getting this Bill right as it is possible to get it.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Are the regulations different for streets in cities and large towns, from what they are in rural municipalities ?

Mr. GRAHAM. My amendment is that they cannot run along a highway of any municipality without the consent of the municipality.

Mr. W. JACKSON. There is more objection to these roads running on the public highway in rural districts than there is in towns and cities, because in towns and cities there is legislation restricting their speed, but when they get to the rural districts a forty mile an hour clip is not an unusual thing and therefore the rural municipalities need more protection than the populated centres.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The only amendment I have before me is that proposed by the member for Toronto (Mr. Bristol) ; no notice has been given of the motion proposed by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker).

Mr. HENDERSON. This is an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is an important amendment to the Bill and cannot be moved without notice.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member for Hamilton could not possibly have known how to draft an amendment until he had seen the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Toronto. I understand the rule to be with reference to an amendment to a Bill and not as regards an amendment to that amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is an important amendment affecting the whole Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. It may but the promoter of the Bill must look out for that.

Mr. CALVERT. Can it not be done with the consent of the committee ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It can be done with the unanimous consent of the committee. Does the hon. member (Mr. Bristol), withdraw his amendment ?

Mr. BRISTOL. I insist upon my amendment but I am not going to oppose any amendment which helps me to the extent that this amendment does.

Mr. GRAHAM. It would save confusion to vote on the amendments separately.

Amendment (Mr. Bristol) negatived.

On amendment (Mr. Barker) :

1. The said company shall not operate its railway as a street railway in any city or town without the consent by by-law of the said corporation of such city or town.

2. The said company shall not construct or operate its railway along any street or high-

way or upon or along any public park, market square, or any such public place in any municipality without the consent of the said municipality expressed by by-law.

Amendment (Mr. Barker) agreed to.

Bill as amended reported ; read the third time and passed.

## CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 7) to incorporate the Northern Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Adamson.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Travellers Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Gervais.

Bill (No. 56) to incorporate the Bank of Hamilton Pension Fund.—Mr. Barker.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Monk.

## CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 37) to incorporate the Canada Weather Insurance Company—Mr. Schell (Oxford).

## PRIVILEGE—MR. TURRIFF.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, before you proceed to this order I wish to speak on a question of privilege. I notice in the Toronto 'News' of Saturday an article headed 'Timber Berth Inquiry,' and among other things it states:

Berth No. 1048, north of Prince Albert, was taken by Perkins, Fraser & Burbidge for $5,000. No amount is stated in the tender and the form is endorsed by Mr. J. G. Turriff, '$5,000.' The further surcharge showing that the cheque was received is dated two days after the opening of the tenders.

I think the reporter in reporting this has evidently misunderstood what took place in the committee. There was nothing stated to the effect that the cheque had been received two days later. What was said was that the cheque had been received in the accountant's office two days after the date for the receiving of tenders, but the cheques go from the commissioner's office to the timber and mines branch and sometimes take a couple of days to get down to the accountant's office. This article would leave the impression that the cheque was first received in the department two days after the date fixed for the receiving of the tenders, which is altogether erroneous. Nothing of that kind occurred and I would state here that neither in this case nor in any other case was a tender or cheque for a tender received at any time after the closing hour fixed for the receiving of tenders.

## QUESTIONS.

### EMPLOYMENT OF KENNETH FALCONER BY RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

Mr FOSTER asked :

What departments other than that of Marine and Fisheries have employed Kenneth Falconer, or his firm, in connection with their accounting business, and what has been paid by such departments, if any?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Kenneth Falconer and his associates were engaged to reorganize the entire accounting system of the Intercolonial Railway and of the Prince Edward Island Railway in February, 1906. The work before being completed included every detail incident to the business transactions, not only at the head office; but at every station along the line; and the members of the staff visited every point of importance on the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railways. They not only reorganized the system but they spent about a year and a half instructing and assisting the railway staff in the proper carrying out of the system, so that the results expected might be obtained. The chief adviser in this reorganization was Mr. W. W. Stevenson, at that time comptroller of the Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, and at present comptroller of the Mutual Life Assurance Company of New York. The work was performed according to schedule prices, and totalled when completed $43,084.23. In addition to the work of reorganization proper, the department has been furnished with several expert reports which are almost invaluable. The results obtained have already much more than compensated for the outlay for this purpose.

### EXPENDITURE ON WHARFS, PIERS AND HARBOURS.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

What amount has been expended on wharfs, piers and harbours each year since 1895, showing the amount expended in each province?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I think that my hon. friend (Mr. Blain), on reflection, will see that that should be a subject of return. I ask that it be allowed to stand accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for a return.

### INDIAN LANDS—ISLANDS OWNED BY INDIANS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What is the total number of acres of Indian lands not disposed of in the Dominion?
2. What is the total number of islands owned by the Indians and not sold in Canada?
3. What is the total number of islands owned by the Indians and sold by this government since they came into office?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. On the 31st of March, 1907, there were 229,923:65 acres of Indian lands not disposed of.

2. 2,309 islands, not including those contiguous to the Manitoulin Island, which have not been surveyed.

3. 956.

JAMESTOWN EXHIBITION.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. Did the government make any exhibit at the Jamestown exhibition? If not, what reason does the government give for not taking part in said exhibition?

2. Was any person or corporation given permission to make an exhibit on behalf of Canada at the Jamestown exhibition? If so, what is the name of the person or corporation and the nature of the exhibit?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. No. Canada having so recently participated in the Louisiana Purchase Exposition at St. Louis, and in an exhibition held at Pittsburg, and also as she was participating at that time in the exhibition held at Milan, Italy, and at another in Christchurch, New Zealand, it was not deemed advisable to participate in the Jamestown exhibition.

2. The Grand Trunk Railway system having represented to the Minister of Agriculture that it proposed to make an exhibit there in a building on which the words 'Grand Trunk Railway System' were to appear, asked permission to use the word 'Canada' in connection therewith, and such permission was granted. The government is not aware of the nature of the exhibit.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND SUBSIDY.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. Clements—asked:

1. When was the first instalment of the subsidy payable to Prince Edward Island under the amendment to the British North America Act, 1907, paid to the province?

2. Has any and what part of the provincial subsidy been deducted in respect of the Hillsborough Bridge? If so, what amount?

3. Was the subsidy remitted direct to the provincial government, or through the agency of a bank? If through a bank, what bank, and why was the change made in the mode of remitting?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. 30th November, 1907.

2. Yes. $19,500.

3. Direct to the provincial government. No change was made in the mode of remitting.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATED PRESS.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What amounts have been paid by the government to the Canadian Associated Press since the subsidy was first granted?

2. How many Canadian newspapers are now taking this service, and what proportion of the cost of it is being paid by the government and the subscribing newspapers, respectively?

3. When will the subsidy expire?

4. Has any request been preferred to the government for a renewal of the subvention for a further term of years? If so, what is the nature of such request?

5. Has any proposal been made to the government for a subsidy to a domestic, Canadian, news service?

6. Is the government aware that in the event of a further bonus to the Canadian Associated Press being granted, it is proposed to confine the use of this service to newspapers which will undertake to subscribe also to the domestic service?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. For the year ending 30th June, 1904, $12,500; for the year ending 30th June, 1905, $11,592.81; for the year ending 30th June, 1906, $10,765.76; for the year ending 30th June, 1907, $10,000; for seven months ending 31st January, 1908, $2,916.66.

2. We deal with the association and have no record of the number of papers interested.

3. 30th June, 1908.

4. Yes, for a renewal for a further term.

5 and 6. No.

DEPORTATION OF IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. URIAH WILSON—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. Are immigrants who are deported always so deported at the expense of the transportation companies who have brought such immigrants to Canada?

2. What amount has the government paid for the deportation of refused immigrants since July 1, 1906, up to March 1, 1908?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Not always. Each case is dealt with separately, according to the facts disclosed in the evidence connected therewith.

2. The cost of returning immigrants, refused at Canadian ocean ports, is borne entirely by the transportation companies.

EXPENDITURE FOR IMMIGRATION.

Mr. HERRON asked:

1. What was the total amount expended for immigration from March 1, 1907, to July 1, 1907?

2. What is the total expenditure of the government for immigration purposes for the eight months ending March 1, 1908?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. $274,550.
2. $447,500.

Mr. HERRON asked:

1. What was the total amount paid by the government in immigration bonuses from March 1, 1907, to July 1, 1907?
2. What is the total amount paid by the government in immigration bonuses from July 1, 1907, to March 1, 1908?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. $36,147.98.
2. $91,095.51.

MONOGRAPH ON GRAPHITE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What was the total cost of the publication brought out by the Department of Mines called 'Graphite, its properties, occurrence, refining and uses'?
2. How much was paid Mr. Fritz Cirkel for its preparation?
3. What was the value of the time of the clerks and officials of the department editing and revising it?
4. What was the value of the time of the Dominion geographer and his staff preparing maps, &c., for it?
5. What was the cost of engraving the cuts and plans in it?
6. What was the cost of printing and binding it?
7. What was the total value of the graphite produced in Canada during 1906 and 1907?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. $3,467.51.
2. Contract price for monograph on graphite, complete with drawings and photographs, $1,300.
3. Edited by private party in Montreal at expense of author. Carried through press by member of staff, who made additional changes and corrections. His work was done a few hours at a time. Probably seven full days' work would cover this item, $35.
4. $50.
5. $269.92.
6. $1,123.37. Printing maps, $689.22.
7. 1906, production, $18,300; 1907, production, $16,000.

IMMIGRANT DETENTION HOSPITALS—EXPENDITURE.

Mr. URIAH WILSON—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. What was the total amount expended by the government on immigrant detention hospitals, construction and maintenance, for the eight years ending July 1, 1907?
2. What amount has been expended by the government on the above objects from July 1 to March 1, 1907?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. $175,987.04.
2. $32,433.59.

LA COMPAGNIE DE PUBLICATION DU CANADA.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What amount has the government paid to the 'Canada Publication Company' (La Compagnie de Publication du Canada), of Montreal, from the 1st January, 1907, to the 1st March, 1908, for advertisements, printing and other work?
2. Has the government an advertising contract with the Canada Newspaper of Montreal? If so, what is the date of such contract, and what is the tariff fixed for the advertisements, and by whom is the contract signed?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). So far as the Department of the Interior is concerned:

1. $300.
2. Yes; 9th August, 1907, and 6th February, 1908; the tariff is $60 per month for the insertion of Homestead and Mining Regulations, long form, in the daily; and $20 per month for the insertion of Homestead Regulations, short form, in the weekly. The contracts are signed by the King's Printer.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). So far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries is concerned:

1. $599.15.
2. No contract made in this department.

IMMIGRATION FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked:

1. What was the total amount expended by the government in connection with immigration from the United States from the 1st March, 1907, to the 1st of July following?
2. What is the total amount expended by the government in connection with the same branch of immigration during the eight months ending 1st March, 1908?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. $60,000 approximately.
2. $130,000 approximately.

IMMIGRANTS FROM EUROPE ENTERING UNITED STATES FROM CANADA.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked:

1. Does the government receive regularly from the American authorities a list of immigrants from Europe entering the United States from Canada?
2. Who furnishes said list, and at what intervals is it handed in?
3. Why is not the data contained in said lists given in the annual report on immigration laid before parliament?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.

2. Mr. John H. Clark, United States Commissioner of Immigration, Montreal; monthly.

3. Because it is emigration.

MUSKODAY INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. LAKE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Have any negotiations been commenced or arrangements made for the sale of any portion of the Muskoday Indian reserve No. 99?

2. Has any sale of land included in this reserve been made? If so, when, to whom, at what price, and what were the terms of the sales?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. No.

2. No.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN LANDS.

Mr. LAKE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the government disposed of any of the following lands? If so, when and to whom, and have patents been issued: sections 2, 10, 14, 22 and 24, township 28, range 29, west second meridian; northeast quarter-section 26, township 28, range 29, west second meridian; northwest quarter-section 2, north half-section 10, and northwest quarter-section 14, township 26, range 2, west third meridian?

2. Are any of these lands open to homestead entry? If so, which?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes, as follows:—

Sections 2, 10, 14, 22 and W. ½ of 24, in township 28, range 29, west 2nd meridian, sold 24th April, 1907, to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, Limited. Patent not issued.

N.E. ¼ 24, homesteaded 7th September, 1905, E. H. Boon. Patent not issued.

S.E. ¼ of 24, homesteaded 26th July, 1905, R. J. Willis. Patent not issued.

N.E. ¼ section 26, township 28, range 29, west 2nd, sold 24th April, 1907, to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, Limited. Patent not issued.

N.W. ¼ section 2, N. ½ of 10 and N.W. ¼ of 14, in township 26, range 2, west 3rd meridian, sold 24th April, 1907, to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, Limited. Patent not issued.

2. No.

PAYMENTS TO C. BOONE OR THE BOONE COMPANY.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

How much has been paid to C. Boone or the Boone Company since 1896, and what was the amount paid for work in each year at each point where same was performed by said party, firm or company?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). As this covers the figures for a number of years, I would suggest that it be allowed to stand as notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for return.

IMMIGRATION—EXPENDITURE FOR MAINTENANCE.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked:

What has been the expenditure of the government for food, clothing and other maintenance for immigrants after landing in Canada for the years 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, to March 1?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would ask that that be allowed to stand as notice of motion for return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for return.

HON. MR. JUSTICE DRYSDALE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. On what date did the government first communicate to the Hon. Arthur Drysdale its desire or intention to appoint him a Justice of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia?

2. Was such intimation communicated to him orally or by letter or by telegram, and on what date?

3. At what date did the said Hon. Arthur Drysdale communicate to the government or to any member of the government, either directly or indirectly, his willingness to accept said appointment?

4. Was such willingness communicated orally by letter, by telegram or how otherwise?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. When forwarding him his commission as such judge on 21st March, 1907.

2. By letter forwarding such commission.

3 and 4. No such communication was made at any time.

THE DOKESE INDIANS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. What is the name of the government agent for the Dokese or Dokis Indians, where does he reside and what is his salary?

2. Is any percentage allowed the Indian agent in connection with the surrender of the timber on the Dokese or Dokis Indian reserve?

3. If so, what is that percentage?

4. On what is the percentage based, is it on the valuation already made or on the sales as timber is sold?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. The name of the agent for the Dokis Indians is George P. Cockburn, who resides at Sturgeon Falls, Ontario. His salary is $450 per annum, and he is allowed $100 per month extra during the negotiations with Indians for surrender of timber.

2. No.

3. Answered by No. 2.
4. Answered by No. 2.

WM. M. SMITH, FRUIT INSPECTOR.

Mr. SPROULE asked:

1. Is the government aware that William Maxwell Smith, fruit inspector, is said to be engaged in the business of dealing in real estate?
2. If the government is not so aware, does it propose to make inquiries with respect thereto?
3. Is Mr. Smith paid for his entire time during the whole year? If not, for what portion of the year is he paid?
4. When officials of the government make payment on behalf of the government, is it the custom to fill in or sign the vouchers, or must such vouchers be filled in and signed by the person to whom the payment is made?
5. What steps does the government take to check the accuracy of such vouchers?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. The government is not aware that William Maxwell Smith, fruit inspector, is said to be engaged in the business of dealing in real estate.
2. Inquiry will be made in respect thereto.
3. Mr. Smith is paid for his entire time during the whole of the year.
4. It is the custom for the party to whom payment is made to fill in and sign the voucher, but it is not considered material who fills in the voucher so long as it is signed by the proper party.
5. The usual steps in accordance with the executive regulations, sub-vouchers being required when they can be furnished.

WHARF AT GRAND BEND.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. When was the contract for the wharf at Grand Bend accepted, and at what date was work commenced?
2. Is the wharf at Grand Bend completed? If so, when was the work finished and has the contractor been paid in full?
3. Did the said contract include dredging the mouth of the River Sable near the above-named pier?
4. If it did, has the government completed the dredging? If not, why not?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (for Minister of Public Works):

1. (a) 26th March, 1904. (b) 15th April, 1904.
2. (a) Yes. (b) 6th October, 1905. (c) Yes.
3. No.
4. No dredging has been done.

PAYMENTS TO E. A. WALLBERG.

Mr. BOYCE asked:

1. What moneys, if any, have been paid during the years 1905-6, 1906-7, and 1907-8 by the Department of Public Works to Emile A. Wallberg and the Steel Concrete Company, or either of them, and in respect of what work or service?
2. Have the works in respect of which such payments were made been completed? If not, what works remain uncompleted?
3. What was the contract price in each case?
4. Was the contract let by public advertisement and tender?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (for Minister of Public Works). I am advised by the Public Works Department that these firms are not known to this department.

APPOINTMENTS TO TITLE OF GENERAL.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Cockshutt—asked:

1. How many officers of the permanent force in Canada have received the rank and title of general?
2. What are their names and respective qualifications for the title and rank?
3. Have the imperial authorities been consulted in regard to this matter, and is it with their approval and sanction that such titles have been conferred?
4. If not, when was the Militia Act amended so as to make provision for the granting of this rank?
5. What are the qualifications necessary to enable officers of the permanent force to obtain this honour?
6. Is it the intention of the government to make further promotions of a similar character?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for the Minister of Militia and Defence). There are no officers of the permanent force in Canada who have received the rank and title of general.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Stanfield) wished to make some change in that question if the minister would allow it to stand.

Mr. FISHER. I give the answer to the question as it stands.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all tenders, contracts, specifications and plans for the construction of machine shops, freight sheds and other buildings, other than railway station, for the use of the Prince Edward Island Railway at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, and of all correspondence between the government or the Department of Railways, and the inspector of the works, or the contractor or contractors, respecting the contracts and the construction of the works, including orders for changes in plans and specifications, and the construction of the work; and all other correspondence, statements and information in possession of the government, relating to the works, with a statement of all moneys paid to the contractor and inspectors of the works to date.—Mr. McLean (Queens).

For a copy of all Orders in Council, letters, telegrams, correspondence and papers of every description and nature relating to the appointment of the Hon. Arthur Drysdale as Justice of the Supreme Court of Nova

Scotia, and especially all such documents as relate to the date of his acceptance of said appointment or the date of his declaration of intention to accept the same.—Mr. Taylor.

For a copy of all Orders in Councin, reports, memoranda, agreements, contracts and other documents and papers of every kind, nature and description, from the 1st day of January, 1900, up to the present time, relating to or touching the Dokese or Dokis Indian reserve, or touching the surrender thereof of the timber thereon, and especially all such documents as aforesaid as relate to any proposals or arrangements for the surrender of any rights by the Indians in the said reserve or in the timber thereon, or to the sale or disposal of the said timber or any part thereof. —Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a return showing the cost, outside of the indemnity of the Senate, for the sessions of 1905 and 1906-7.—Mr. Foster, by Mr. Taylor.

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, petitions, &c., in possession of the government or any member or official thereof, respecting the dismissal of Archibald McDonald as postmaster at Whim Road Cross, Prince Edward Island, and the appointment of William McKinnon as his successor.—Mr. Martin (Queens).

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and petitions in the possession of the government or any member or official thereof, respecting the dismissal of Alex. McLeod in 1905, as postmaster at Valleyfield East, Prince Edward Island, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. McLean (Queens).

For a return showing: 1. What leases for coal lands in the Northwest Territories were granted by the Government in the years 1903 and 1904.

2. To whom, and on what dates the same were granted, and the amounts paid therefor.

3. Whether the person to whom the lease was granted was the original applicant.

4. Whether any assignment of such leases has been made, when, and to whom.

5. Who the present holders are of said leases.—Mr. Boyce.

For a return showing all lands acquired from the government by the Grand Trunk Pacific Town and Development Company, together with the area, location, purchase price of each tract, and a copy of all correspondence between the government and the company or any individuals interested therein or connected therewith, as to the general terms and conditions under which the government land should be granted to the said company.—Mr. Ames, by Mr. Taylor.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

### MANUFACTURE AND SALE OF CIGARETTES.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel) moved:

That the object of good government is to promote the general welfare of the people by a careful encouragement and protection of whatever makes for the public good; and by an equally careful discouragement and suppression of whatever tends to the public disadvantage.

Mr. FISHER.

That the smoking of cigarettes has been proved by overwhelming testimony to be productive of serious physical and moral injury to young people; impairing health, arresting development, weakening intellectual power and thus constituting a social and national evil.

That the legislation, licensing and restricting the sale of cigarettes has not proven sufficient to prevent these evils, which will continue while the public sale of the cause of the mischief is permitted to go on.

That this House is of the opinion, for the reasons heretofore set forth, that the right and most effectual remedy for these evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes; and that it is expedient to bring in a Bill at this session to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the question that I have the honour of presenting to the House to-night is a very important one. I do not think that a greater question could receive the attention and consideration of this House than that of the advisability of prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes. I may say that I have been expecting that the government themselves would deal with this question. I realize at once that it requires a government to deal with the question in an effective way. I only regret that it has been left to an humble member of the opposition to introduce this resolution and to bring the government's attention to this important question, so that we may have the matter thoroughly before us and that the country may understand fully that the government have received ample and timely warning upon this question and have, at the same time, behind them a large majority of the representatives of the people in this House, I propose to briefly review the history of this question both in this parliament and in the parliament preceding it. In 1903 the hon. member for St. Lawrence division, Montreal, (Mr. Bickerdike) introduced a resolution similar to the one I have just read. That resolution was very fully discussed. Gentlemen on the government side and many representatives on the opposition side expressed their views and while there was some difference of opinion as to the best method of reaching this evil it was declared on every hand that it was a great and growing evil and one that ought to be dealt with by the parliament of Canada. Those who wish to look into this question more fully at their leisure may turn to the debate on the resolution which will be found at page 820 of 'Hansard,' 1903. It was discussed very fully and on a division being called 103 representatives of the people voted in favour of the resolution introduced by the hon. member for St. Lawrence division, Montreal, and 48 against, giving the splendid majority of 55 in favour of the total abolition of the sale, importation and manu-

facture of cigarettes in Canada, there being 151 present and voting out of a representation of 214. This was a fair average vote. I take this, and I am sure the people of Canada take it as an expression of opinion of the representatives of the people in this House. Those who are particularly interested in this question thought that when that resolution had carried they would only have to wait a short time until this government would introduce a measure embodying the principles of that resolution. Following the adoption of that resolution the hon. gentleman introduced a Bill, on April 29, 1903, page 2014 of 'Hansard,' embodying the principles of the resolution which was carried by the majority to which I have referred. The government allowed that Bill to be introduced giving another indication to the people who are interested in the question that the government and opposition were unanimously in favour of the principles of the resolution. On May 18, of the same session, page 3286 'Hansard,' the hon. gentleman moved a second reading of his Bill and at that time the objection was taken in the House, that the resolution itself should have originated in the Committee of the Whole rather than it should have been introduced by a private member. In the discussion on the second reading the Speaker ruled the question out of order and the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill withdrew it and nothing more was heard of it during the session of 1903. In the session of 1904 the then member for Huntingdon, Mr. Maclaren, moved in Committee of the Whole for leave to introduce a resolution similar to that which had been discussed the previous session. The following resolution was then moved by Mr. W. S. Maclaren of Huntingdon, adopted in Committee of the Whole, read a second time and agreed to on division: ('Hansard,' 1904, page 3978):

That it is expedient to bring in a Bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes.

This resolution was agreed to unanimously by the House, and those representing the different organizations who were pressing on the government the introduction of a Bill to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of cigarettes, of course thought that the resolution would be given effect to and that such a Bill would be enacted. On June the 2nd, 1904, 'Hansard,' page 4052, Mr. W. S. Maclaren, of Huntingdon, moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 128) to prohibit the importation, sale and manufacture of cigarettes. Mr. Maclaren was granted leave to introduce his Bill and it was read a first time unanimously. On June 14, 1904, 'Hansard,' page 4724, Mr. W. S. Maclaren moved the second reading of Bill (No. 128) to prohibit the importation, sale and manufacture of cigarettes, and the House divided on the question for the second reading and by a vote of 52 for and 28 against, the Bill was read a second time. Now as this question had received the approval of parliament some times unanimously and at other times on division, the vote being always in its favour, the people expected that the government would introduce legislation to give effect to the wish of parliament. On June the 20th, 'Hansard,' page 5129, Mr. Maclaren's Bill was considered in Committee of the Whole, and a pretty general discussion took place upon the principle of the Bill; a great many opinions were expressed, a great deal of information was placed upon 'Hansard' and the representatives of the people seemed very much interested in the success of the measure. At the close of the discussion in the committee a vote was taken on the preamble of the Bill and the preamble was carried, Yeas, 41; Nays, 32, 'Hansard,' page 5156; and the Bill was reported. As a representative of the people I thought the government would aid their supporter, Mr. Maclaren, in having the Bill passed and placed upon the statute-books so that the expressed wishes of the people through their representatives would be given effect to. But the session of 1904 closed without any further action on the part of the government. Nothing then happened with regard to it until the session of 1907, the session of last year, when I asked a question. I was of opinion that the government, having been able to give the matter due consideration, would carry out the wishes of the people and pass a Bill embodying the principles which the House of Commons had so often pronounced in favour of. On March 4 of last year, 'Hansard,' page 4055, the question and answer is reported:

Will the government at this session introduce legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes as expressed by resolution of this House on April 1, 1903?

The Prime Minister answered:

The government has not come to the conclusion that they should introduce any legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes as expressed by resolution of this House on April 1, 1903. But I need not tell my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) that it is quite open to him to introduce such legislation if he sees fit.

I took the note of warning given by the Prime Minister, and realizing that the government was forgetting its duty, on the 4th of March, 1907, 'Hansard,' page 4053, I introduced a resolution similar to the resolution I have the honour to introduce to-night. The matter was discussed and a large number of representatives of the people expressed themselves in favour of this resolution, and it was my intention to introduce a Bill embodying the principle of the resolution so that the people of Canada would have a legislative enactment that their represen-

tatives had so often pronounced in favour of. But that discussion was headed off, if I may use the expression, the members supporting the government talking out the resolution until six o'clock; and therefore it was impossible for me as a humble representative—not impossible for the government, of course—to ventilate this matter further in that session. But I may remind the House that my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), whom I am glad to see present giving his attention to this question, expressed himself at that time as very much in favour of the principle of the resolution. I have always had a high opinion of the hon. gentleman upon these moral questions; and so I expected after that discussion, and after he had rather chastised members for not leaving the measure over to this session, that at the opening of this session my hon. friend would have had a Bill ready and would have asked the approval of this House of legislation of the kind he had expressed himself in favour of in the session of 1907. But to my surprise nothing was found in the speech from the Throne. My hon. friend has been active in the House and out of the House in dealing with other important questions, but he has not said a word upon the cigarette question. So it was left again to myself to place among the notices of motion the resolution which I have the honour of moving to-night. During the discussion last year, my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture uttered a pretty strong condemnation of the people of Canada, at page 4074 of 'Hansard,' the hon. gentleman spoke thus:

I feel, however, that perhaps there has not been that fair effort on the part of the inferior powers in this country to accomplish the end which we might reasonably demand and expect. One speaker this afternoon referred to the influence of the home, the school and the church in this country. These are most potent influences in this land, and yet, as far as I can see, looking abroad in the land, the influence of the home, the school and the church is lessening in Canada to-day in regard to the bringing up of our youth.

Mr. FISHER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend expresses his assent to this statement again to-night. If that be true, surely that is an all-important reason why the government should see that legislation of this kind is placed upon the statute-book. My hon. friend calls upon the people of Canada to listen to the statement that the fathers and mothers of Canada are less influential with their children now, and are not able to control them as they were in years gone by. Of course, my hon. friend is not a very good judge on these points; but nevertheless I supposed that he was speaking his mind upon the question. For myself I wish to say that I differ entirely from the statement of my hon. friend, and I point to the fact that at no time in the history of Canada have the boys and the girls been able to take such important positions as they are taking to-day in every part of Canada and in every branch of life. That I think is an answer to the statement of my hon. friend. There is another point to which I wish to direct his attention: if the thoughts expressed by him to the House on March 4, 1907, are true, then it behooves this government, and my hon. friend in particular, to see to it that legislation of this kind is not neglected any longer, and I am sure that my hon. friend will not allow this session to go by without introducing a Bill for the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes in Canada.

Let me point out the rapid increase in the consumption of cigarettes in this country. During the debate of last session I pointed out that in 1896 in Canada there were manufactured 85,994,400 cigarettes and consumed 87,507,840. For the year ending the 30th June, 1906, the number consumed in Canada had increased to 277,420,850. During the nine months ending March 31, 1907, there were manufactured in Canada 266,903,760 cigarettes. A small portion of these were exported, but there were entered for consumption 266,377,710 and there were imported 9,000,000, making a total consumption of cigarettes in Canada in those nine months of 275,377,710, almost as many as there were consumed in the previous twelve months; showing that a rapid increase of consumption is going on, and I believe a large part of it is among the youth of our country, particularly boys under fifteen or sixteen years of age.

When this matter was being discussed last year there was no difference of opinion as to the evil effects of the use of cigarettes. There was some slight difference of opinion as to how the evil should be remedied. Some expressed the view that it should be remedied by the legislatures of the different provinces. In the province of Ontario, we have legislation dealing with this subject. A law was passed by the local legislature in 1892, which reads, in part, as follows:

1. Any person who either directly or indirectly sells or gives or furnishes to a minor under eighteen years of age, cigarettes, cigars or tobacco in any form, shall on summary conviction thereof before a justice of the peace be subject to a penalty of not less than $10, or more than $50, with or without costs of prosecution, or to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for any term not exceeding thirty days, or to both fine or without cost and imprisonment to the said amount and for the said term, in the discretion of the convicting magistrate. And in case of a fine, or a fine and costs being awarded, and of the same not being upon conviction forthwith paid, the justice may commit the offender to the common gaol, there to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding thirty days, unless the fine and costs are sooner paid.

2. This Act shall not apply to a sale to the minor for his parent or guardian under a

written request or order of the parent or guardian.

3. A person who shall appear to the magistrate to be under eighteen years of age, shall be presumed to be under that age unless it is shown by evidence that he is in fact over that age.

Though that has been the law of the province of Ontario since 1892, as I have stated, yet, I regret to say, it does not reach the object aimed at. Somewhat similar statutes have been passed in other provinces of Canada, but, notwithstanding these laws, the evil goes on and the consumption of cigarettes is greater than at any time in its history. As my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) pointed out last year, in the main, this provincial legislation is a dead letter—it does not reach the evil at which it is aimed. Why not? I believe that the reason is that the provincial legislature has not power to prohibit the manufacture or importation of cigarettes into the province, and so long as cigarettes may be imported into the province, or manufactured within the province, it is not possible for legislation to stop, or even diminish to any great extent, the consumption of cigarettes within that province.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) would permit, I would like to ask whether any proceedings have been taken in accord with that statute—any action to enforce it ?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes. The provincial government has given power to the municipalities in Ontario to pass municipal legislation governing this matter ; and in many towns and villages in the province, with some of which I am myself familiar, legislation of this kind has been placed upon the municipal statute-book by by-law. I am quite sure that the provincial government under which this statute was passed were strongly in favour of its enforcement and, I suppose, lent their aid to that end. The great religious denominations in the province have given it their support. Almost every municipal council has had the matter up for discussion. The primary schools and colleges of the province, the reformatories, and almost every public institution have dealt with the subject. The Sabbath school, with all its vast influence in the province, has been united in the effort to enforce this legislation.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the legislation had any effect in restricting the sale?

Mr. BLAIN. The only answer I can give is to refer to the large increasing consumption of cigarettes in Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. That means an increase by all the people. Has there been an increase among the minors?

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) is suggesting that, perhaps, the men are smoking more cigarettes than before.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know the facts. I am asking for information.

Mr. BLAIN. My own opinion is that there is an increasing consumption by the boys in the province, particularly in the cities and towns, and in the rural districts as well.

Mr. BRODEUR. Have any proceedings been taken to enforce the municipal by-laws that have been passed on this subject?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes. The municipalities, as a rule, when they have placed such legislation upon their statute-book have put the enforcement of those laws in the hands of officers. They certainly have made efforts to enforce the laws. I do not suppose that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) would suggest that any municipal council sufficiently interested in this subject to pass legislation dealing with it would fail to appoint some one to enforce that legislation. That would be merely idle on the part of the municipal council, and it would be carelessness which would not be permitted by those whom these municipal councils represent. I do not wish to minimize the efforts of the local legislatures and municipalities to put down this evil. But I repeat that, in my opinion, they are unable to cope with the evil; and, will never be able to cope with it satisfactorily until this parliament passes legislation to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sales of cigarettes, if not entirely, then at least to boys and girls under sixteen or eighteen years of age. I would not wish to press the government unduly. I have my own opinions upon this question, which are pretty well expressed by the resolution. It may be that some members of the government, and some members of this House, have a different opinion upon this question. But I contend that, with all the information before us, with the expression by the representatives of the people in this House, with the provincial enactments which have been passed, with the many petitions that have been presented to this House, we cannot but believe that the government of Canada would have a large majority of the people behind them if they were to lead in placing legislation of this kind upon the statute-book. When this matter was up for discussion last year one hon. gentleman, as reported at page 4087 of 'Hansard,' moved :

That it is the duty of the government to introduce legislation at the present session of parliament prohibiting the sale of cigarettes to and the use of cigarettes by persons under eighteen years of age.

That received some attention at the hands of the members of this House. In 'Hansard,' page 4085 during the same discussion another gentleman moved this :

That it is the duty of the government to introduce legislation at the next session of parliament prohibiting the sale of cigarettes to

and the use of cigarettes by persons under sixteen years of age.

Other motions were moved during that discussion, none of which were carried, and the resolution itself was not carried.

I think I have given a sufficient history of this question to influence the members, if influence be necessary, to vote unanimously for this resolution.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from St. Lawrence division of Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) endorses the principle.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. I hope my hon. friend will use his influence with the hon. gentlemen from his own province.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. All in favour of it.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend says they are all in favour of it. If that be true, I am quite sure it will pass this House because it will receive splendid support from this side of the House. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he take this matter a little more seriously and not be so easily influenced by the government he is supporting. He is a strong representative of the people. I have heard him on the floor of the House upon other important questions, even going so far as to condemn the government and the party to which he belongs.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAIN. I think so, on the transportation question. If he had used the strong language he at that time used towards this government upon this great moral question no doubt his voice would be heard, the government would listen to my hon. friend as they would not, of course, listen to me in the presentation of his case.

I wish to quote an extract from 'Le Canada' of Monday, January 22, 1907, headed: 'Let Us Save Our Children.'

Ask, in our city, of the directors of our great public schools (I can cite names and testimonials if wanted) and all will say that the number of young smokers increases daily, that it can be proven by the state of stupor and brutishness that prevails amongst those who are addicted to this dangerous pastime.

A mother, upon this subject, was relating that her son who was twelve years of age was entirely unhappy and utterly incapable of applying himself to anything if he were prevented from purchasing cigarettes, and that he fell into a fuddled state as soon as he would smoke a few.

I wish to quote from a gentleman whom I am informed by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has had a very wide experience in the province of Quebec, His Honour Judge Choquette, to whom I find this reference:

Judge Choquette, before whom appear so many young offenders, interviewed upon this subject, declared that all the children that he was obliged to condemn to gaol or the reformatory school had their fingers stained by the smoking of so many cigarettes.

Owing to Judge Choquette's wide experience in the city of Montreal, I regard his testimony as very important and I am sure it will be listened to by this House with a great deal of attention.

I could, of course, quote as was done when this matter was up last year and on other occasions, a great many testimonials from representative people in Canada, the United States and Great Britain, but at this stage of the discussion this in my opinion would be altogether superfluous. The great fundamental principle for which we have been fighting has been conceded by the people of Canada and by their representatives in this House. Therefore it would be idle for me to support what I have said by the testimony of representative people who have had great experience in connection with this great moral question. I may, however, say that when the Provincial Sabbath School Association, representing the thousands of children of every denomination in the Sabbath schools of the province of Ontario, met in Brampton in 1907, they unanimously passed a resolution in favour of the principle of this resolution. If necessary, I could quote those who represent us in connection with the Boys' Reformatory and the opinions of the leading men of every religious denomination of Canada. Indeed I could quote if necessary, the opinions of some hon. members of the government when they were discussing this question—not very seriously in my opinion, yet I suppose their opinions were expressed honestly and were really the opinions of hon. gentlemen who are in the government at the present time.

Mr. CLARKE. Could my hon. friend tell what section of the Municipal Act relates to it?

Mr. BLAIN. Section 52 of the statutes of Ontario for 1892.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman said there was something also in the Municipal Act?

Mr. BLAIN. No, my hon. friend misunderstood me. What I said was that powers were given to the municipal councils to deal with this question.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is that?

Mr. BLAIN. I have not it under my hand, but my hon. friend knows that to be the case.

Mr. CLARKE. I cannot locate it.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend is conversant with the fact.

Mr. BRODEUR. The statute of 1892 does not refer to that.

Mr. BLAIN. No. I was pointing out that many of the municipal councils of towns and villages in the province of Ontario have adopted by-laws embodying the principles of the statute of Ontario of 1892, going as far as it is possible for them to go, realizing of course that they have no power to prohibit the importation and manufacture of cigarettes within that province.

Mr. CONMEE. Does the hon. member contend that the province has no power to prohibit the sale? And if a province can prohibit the sale, would not that meet the point ?

Mr. BLAIN. What I said was that the provincial governments had power to restrict the sale of cigarettes within the province, but I said further that the provincial governments had no power to prohibit the importation or manufacture within the province. My hon. friend will not disagree with that.

Mr. CONMEE. I understood the hon. member to make that statement, but I wanted to learn if he had made the further statement that the provincial governments had not power to prohibit. I think they have full power to prohibit the sale.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not make any reference to that, I am rather inviting my hon. friend's attention to the resolution, which I am sure will receive his support. I do not wish to continue my remarks further, except to invite the co-operation of the government and representatives on both sides of the House in this important matter. I am pleading particularly for the boys of Canada. It is agreed on every hand that the smoking of cigarettes is very harmful to boys. It arrests the development of both mind and body. Some of the larger manufacturing institutions in the United States, when advertising for boys to work in their establishments, mention in the advertisement that no boys who smoke cigarettes need apply. Indeed I know myself that there are many large institutions in Canada where, when boys make application for employment, one of the first questions asked them is : Do you use cigarettes? If they answer that they do use cigarettes, they are rejected, because the manufacturers desire to employ only those boys who do not use cigarettes. Therefore at the present time this parliament is legislating against the welfare of our boys so long as we allow this enormous sale, this enormous importation and this enormous manufacture of cigarettes. I invite the attention of the government to this matter. It will not do for my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to say that at an earlier part of this session a deputation waited upon the government suggesting that possibly greater powers might be given to provincial governments to deal with this question. That has been discussed years ago, and it is too late to bring up the proposition again. For my part I would rather see a government boldly face an issue like this, than try to shoulder it off on the provincial legislatures. The government know full well that the legislatures have no power to deal with this question in an effective manner. The government will not satisfy the people by saying that they have discussed this question with the representatives of these organizations, and that they have decided now, or at some future day, to give more power to the legislatures to enable them to deal with this question. The people of Canada will not be satisfied with this answer. The people of Canada are knocking at the doors of this parliament, and they expect to get justice at the hands of this government, a government that talked so much about moral reform when its members were in opposition, particularly the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Fisher) who was prominent in advocating the prohibition of the liquor traffic, and who took so much interest in great moral questions generally. The people of Canada desire to see a government carry out the reforms they advocated when in opposition. I feel I have discharged my duty, and I hope the government will discharge theirs by taking this question up and dealing with it effectively. While I have no authority to make any promise, I can safely say, knowing the opinions of my hon. friends on this side of the House, that the government will receive a very strong support on this side if they conclude to deal with this question ; indeed I think I will venture to say that a large majority of the representatives on this side of the House will support a Bill, if the government will bring one down, to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of cigarettes throughout Canada.

Mr. PETER ELSON (East Middlesex). I feel that the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) deserves a great deal of credit for introducing this motion; and I sincerely hope the House will accept it, and that the government will carry it into effect. The motion explains itself. It is entirely true, as the motion states,—

> That the smoking of cigarettes has been proved by overwhelming testimony to be productive of serious physical and moral injury to young people; impairing health, arresting development, weakening intellectual power, and thus constituting a social and national evil.

Now, Sir, that statement is true, and I think every hon. gentleman in this House will concur in it. It is certainly the duty of the government to legislate for the benefit of the people in every way they can, and it seems to me they can do nothing more useful than to remove the temptation from

the rising generation. What more valuable asset has Canada than our growing boys? And how important it is that we should so legislate as to allow them freely to develop their physical and intellectual powers, and grow up healthy and moral citizens. It is well known that boys who drift into the use of cigarettes are apt, as this motion says, to dwindle physically and intellectually. The mover of this motion has referred to the position of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) last year. I remember distinctly, when a motion similar to this was being discussed that the Minister of Agriculture said: Let us lay it over until next session of parliament—which of course is the present session. He felt then very much inclined to introduce a Bill that would have the desired effect. Now I have no doubt that the Minister of Agriculture is of the same mind yet, and no doubt he will introduce a Bill to give effect to the recommendations in this resolution. We believe that the only way to remove the temptation from these boys is to prevent the manufacure, importation and sale of cigarettes. Therefore, without occupying the time of the House further, I have great pleasure in seconding the motion.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with the mover and seconder of this resolution in expressing my entire sympathy with the object that it is designed to accomplish. I listened with a great deal of pleasure to both speakers and especially to the few pithy words which have been uttered by my hon. friend in front of Mr. (Mr. Elson). As a rule I do not advocate the curtailment of the liberty of the subject, but there are instances where the liberty of the subject is curtailed. While we may not be of one mind with regard to curtailing the liberty of the subject we must certainly agree that it is time to take another step in regard to the protection of minors. There are certain drugs on the druggists' shelves which may not be obtained except under certain restrictions because these drugs are injurious and these restrictions are placed against the full grown subject as well as the minor. I do not know of anything—and I have read medical opinions upon it gathered from one end of this country to the other—that is more injurious to young people than the smoking of cigarettes. We have had societies of men and women all over this country which have the best interests of our young people at heart and which have given this question serious consideration. They all agree as to the pernicious effects of cigarette smoking. The medical fraternity agree upon the question. We have, in my province, the League of the Cross both pledged in regard to cigarette smoking and the consumption of liquor, and there is the C.M.B.A. in regard to liquor. There are temperance societies all over the country. However, we see that this government have not come to their support in any tangible way although those societies are working in the best interest of the rising generation. I am not going to make a speech, but I simply wish to place on record my entire sympathy with the resolution. I do not think that any one who has given the subject the least attention can come to any other conclusion than that at which I have arrived in regard to this question. I am sure that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who has done such great work for the promotion of temperance will now take the arena and record his vote in favour of this resolution. Cigarette smoking, in my opinion and in the opinion of others, has done much to undermine the health of young people, both boys and girls. I think it is most lamentable. It is bad enough to see boys smoking cigarettes, but when we see young girls indulging in this habit, when cigarette making is growing and becoming fashionable in the upper circles, I think it is time that we should do something and I am sure that it has been well said that the Dominion government have the remedy in their own hands. Let them now show that they are just as sincere in their desire to promote the welfare of the young and rising generation as they were previous to 1896. If they will, I for one will say that there is one part of their policy that I approve of if they will only carry it out. I only got up to say a few words and to express my sympathy with the resolution.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin). Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that we would have heard from the government a statement of their policy on this all important question, and I was surprised that after three hon. members on this side of the House had expressed their opinion we did not hear from the other side in regard to this question. Last session the subject came up and on that occasion we had an expression from the government benches that this was a question which they were considering, that it was a question that they considered of the utmost importance and one which, whilst they did not desire to legislate in a hurried way, would have then consideration and that in the future they would be prepared to take it up and would do so, as I understood, during the present parliament. We have reason to suspect that this is probably the last session of this parliament and that the members of the House must go before their constituents before another parliament is assembled and give an account of their stewardship. That being the case, surely it is the duty of the government and of the representatives of the people in this House to declare themselves upon this question before they go back to their constituents. This has been a burning question during the last decade. During the last ten years I venture to say there is no question that has attracted the attention

of the free and independent electors to a greater extent than this question has. Yet during all these years the government have failed on every occasion to pronounce themselves upon it. They have told us that it was a burning question. They have admitted that this is a question of vast importance to the electors of this country and to the young and rising generation, and yet at the close of this parliament, as we believe, they have declined so far to declare their policy upon this all absorbing question. I say that for the last ten years it has been a burning question and during the present parliament it has been brought prominently to the attention of the people. I cannot speak authoritatively as to the other provinces, although I know that the subject has been much discussed in the other provinces, but in so far as the province of Ontario is concerned I venture to say that there is no representative in this House or defeated candidate in that province who was not approached on that question and who, if he was not afraid to give his opinion, did not do so. I venture to say that there was not one that was not asked how he stood upon this question, and I also venture to say that nine out of ten of the candidates placed before the people expressed themselves as being in favour of this proposition and as being prepared to support a law that would reduce the terrible evil that we have here in connection with the smoking of cigarettes. I think that my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) deserves the thanks not only of this House but of the Dominion of Canada for persistently bringing this question up session after session. It has been proved beyond a doubt by the figures that he has given that in so far as cigarette smoking is concerned it is largely on the increase and I am sorry, on examining these figures, to find that it is increasing much more rapidly than the increase in the population of the Dominion. There can be little doubt that the evil is increasing year by year. It is an evil which we must strenuously combat in the near future. Like all other moral defects, this question of cigarette smoking has attracted the attention of the ladies of this fair country and they have time and again petitioned parliament to preserve our youth from its ill effects. I believe that these ladies feel that great though be the evil of intemperance greater still is the evil of cigarette smoking.

Mr. MILLER. What about cigars?

Mr. BARR. Cigars come next. Throughout the length and breadth of the land the churches and the different other organizations, whose object is to promote the welfare of the people, have endeavoured to cope with this evil of cigarette smoking. The legislature of Ontario has done all in its power to stop this evil, which is spreading day after day and month after month. In 1902 I was in the legislature when they passed the anti-cigarette law, and although it undoubtedly has accomplished a great deal of good, still the smoking of cigarettes has increased. The municipalities were given power to take measures to prevent the use of cigarettes, and they have been endeavouring to overcome the evil as far as possible. Medical health officers have been instructed to stamp it out, and the caretakers of the public schools have been asked to report whenever they detect cigarette smoking amongst the pupils. But all these measures have proved futile so long as cigarettes are imported and manufactured and exposed for sale so generally as they are. Cigarette smoking, whilst it may not have such ill effects on older people, it undoubtedly is most injurious to the youth of our country. In the common schools it is found that nine-tenths of those who lag behind are cigarette smokers, and many of these are brilliant youths who otherwise would be ahead in their classes. In our high schools it is even worse, and the boys who make the failures there are most certainly those who are addicted to the use of cigarettes. Careful examination in the colleges has shown that 99 per cent of those who fail year after year in their examinations are cigarette smokers. We know that the nicotine poison affects the nerves, weakens the brain and undermines the whole system, so that the young people who indulge in the pernicious habit often become moral and physical wrecks. The time has come when this government should take the question seriously into consideration and stamp out the evil. It is utterly impossible for the provincial government to succeed without the assistance of the federal government, for so long as cigarettes are imported and manufactured the boys will get hold of them. We are paying over $1,000,000 a year to bring immigrants to this country, many of whom have proven failures, and is it not well known that we should take care of the young and rising generation of our native land, who are the real wealth of the country? We were told by the government last year that they would give this matter due consideration, and as this is probably the last session of this parliament, I trust the government will at once take action.

Mr. WILLIAM P. TELFORD (North Grey). In discussing a question of this kind it is perhaps too much to expect that the members of this House would be guided by the principle laid down by St. Paul:

> If meat make my brother to offend I will eat no meat while the world standeth.

If that principle were adopted, it would settle, not only this question, but a great many moral questions. But that is perhaps too high a standard for ordinary mortals such as we are to adopt. It is very evident from the delicate compliments we

pay one another across the floor of this House that we are not by any means an assembly of saints. Still I think we could go this far in adopting the principle; we can say to the man who smokes cigarettes: We will allow you to make your own, but we will prevent you from manufacturing cigarettes and selling them to others, and we will prevent any person from selling cigarettes to you or selling them to any other person in this country. There is no great hardship in adopting a principle of this kind, for if a cigarette smoker does not wish to make his own cigarettes, he has tobacco, cigars and snuff, in all of which there is the nicotine which his soul craves, and therefore there is no hardship about it.

I do not believe that any reasonable man who gives the subject one moment's careful consideration, even if he smokes cigarettes himself, would object to make this small sacrifice, if it is a sacrifice at all, in view of the fact that this habit of cigarette smoking is demoralizing and degrading a great many of the boys of this country. There is scarcely a town or city in Canada where you will not find boys, the sons of respectable parents, who have dwarfed their bodies, ruined their intellects and damaged their moral perceptions to such an extent that they do not know the difference between right and wrong, and consequently many of them have had to be sent to reformatories. The medical profession almost to a man affirm the same thing with regard to this insidious habit; and I believe a majority of the members of this House will admit that it is an unmitigated curse to the boys of this country without a single redeeming feature. Therefore something ought to be done, more than has been done in the past, to lessen this growing evil. I do not believe that any country on the face of the globe produces finer animals than Canada. Although our climate is severe, it is bracing and healthy. But we do not depend wholly on the climate to give us this result. We have adopted strong regulations in order to preserve the health of animals and we have adopted most drastic measures for stamping out disease when it has made its appearance. And surely, when we do so much for animals, we should do as much for the boys of this country. They are the most valuable asset we possess. In a few years they will be the men to take charge of the future of this great country, and if they are not sound in body and mind, what will they make of it? Surely it ought to be the object of every well-wisher of his kind, the object especially of every member of this House, to do all he possibly can to leave this splendid heritage in the hands of capable men, who will make the most of the unrivalled and inexhaustible resources of this country and place Canada at the head of the nations of the earth. We know that material wealth alone will not effect this result. It was not poverty that caused the downfall of Rome or Greece or Babylon; it was luxury, effeminacy and debauchery. A few centuries ago Spain stood at the head of the nations of the earth, with greater possessions than any other country in Europe; but although she had great wealth and possessions, luxury, debauchery and degeneracy have reduced her to the ghost of her former self.

A high authority, which I generally regard as an end of all controversy, has recommended a good spanking as the proper remedy for boys who indulge in cigarette smoking. I believe in a good spanking for certain kinds of bad behaviour among boys. I have had experience of that remedy myself, and I know its beneficial effects. I know of no remedy so effectual in correcting bad conduct in boys, such as imprudence, as that of a good spanking, and I sometimes think that the education of some of the members of this House in that respect has been neglected. But when you consider that nine-tenths of the fathers of the boys in this country are smokers themselves, of what benefit would a spanking from one of these fathers be to his boy? I have discovered in my experience that if a father or a teacher spanks a boy for a vice to which he himself is addicted, he produces two results. The boy will not repeat the offence in his father's or teacher's presence, but will do it behind his back, and he goes into training for a sneek. It has a most damaging effect upon a boys' character to do in private what he will not do before his superior. It has also this effect, that the boy looks upon his father or his teacher as a hypocrite. Boys are like young animals—they have to be broken in; but they are more than animals—they have reason; and they have grave suspicions of the father or the teacher who tells them, you must do as I tell you on pain of punishment, but you are not to follow my example. Now, that is not the way to train boys, if you expect to make good boys of them; and that is the reason that whipping or any kind of punishment by such a father or teacher would be of no earthly use to break a boy off the habit of cigarette smoking; there must be also the power of example. I hope the government will devise something to take the place of the proposal made in this resolution, if they are not satisfied to take it as a whole.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, as far as the use of tobacco generally is concerned, I think I am not a fanatic. While I do not use tobacco myself, because I prefer not to do so, yet I realize that there are many men, who are just as wise and as moral as I am, who do use tobacco, and with a great deal of apparent pleasure and comfort to themselves. I remember reading a lecture, either by Bill Nye or Bod Burdette, I forget which, to young

men on the use of tobacco. The humorist was very much opposed to the use of tobacco, but he said: Young man, I will not argue with you, as you have sometimes been argued with, that if you will abandon the use of tobacco, if you will refrain from using the two cigars a day which cost you a nickel or a dime apiece, and put the money out at interest, after a term of years it will amount to a considerable sum of money; I will not use that argument, because while I am opposed to your using tobacco, I would sooner see you become a confirmed user of tobacco than a confirmed miser. I quite agree with that: I consider that there are greater evils than the use of tobacco in a general way. I rather like to see an elderly man indulging in his pipe and taking from it the comfort he appears to receive. But it does appear to me that some special evil accompanies the use of the cigarette. I have sometimes wondered what peculiarity there is in the use of tobacco in the form of a cigarette that produces results worse than those that come from the use of tobacco in other forms. That there is some peculiar evil attending the use of cigarettes was impressed upon me very forcibly by the case of a young man approaching the age of twenty whom I knew in my own town. The constant use of the cigarette had made him a physical wreck and mentally an imbecile. He was physically unfitted for performing a day's manual labour and was in every respect a wreck. I decided that while I do not know what the peculiar evil attending the use of cigarettes is, the evil result as exhibited in that young man was something far beyond what would be induced by the use of the pipe or cigar.

I remember some years ago talking to a young man of 25 or 26 years of age, who was himself a user of the cigarette and who was smoking a cigarette as he talked to me. I asked him his opinion as to the effect of the use of the cigarette. He said that it was injurious to the health, and I said: Why do you think it is more injurious than the pipe or the cigar? He said that in his opinion this was due to the peculiar manner of inhaling the cigarette smoke.

In conversation with some ladies of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, a few months ago, I asked them to be kind enough to give me some literature upon the subject in order that I might have an opportunity of reading it. They left me a quantity of literature, some of which I would not make use of because it gave the opinions of authorities whose names were not given, and to such opinions I would not attach any importance. However, amongst this literature were the opinions of persons to whose judgment I should think considerable weight should be given by any person desiring to form an unprejudiced and unbiased opinion and to arrive at a proper conclusion.

I shall take the liberty of reading two or three short extracts in order to give to the House the opinions of men to whose judgment they will attach weight; I shall quote particularly the opinions of men in the medical profession. The first is the opinion of Isaac Wood, M.D., of Kingston, Ont., who said:

I have carefully studied the effects of tobacco and its alkaloids upon the human system, and am convinced that when used by the young, especially in the form of cigarettes, it delays and limits the developments of the great nerve centres and leads to serious impairments of the physical and mental powers.

Other medical opinions are thus given:

W. O. Lambly, M.D., Cookshire, province of Quebec.—The effect of cigarette smoking on the young and undeveloped system is certainly most injurious, not only affecting the mucous membranes of the nose, throat and lungs, but also having its most injurious effect on the nerve centres.

James Stuart, M.D., Prescott, Ontario.—There are not two sides to this subject. Cigarette smoking is a pernicious habit, injurious to body, mind and soul.

C. F. McPherson, M.D., C.M., Prescott, Ontario.—I regard cigarette smoking as the worst form of the tobacco habit, and especially destructive to the young.

Sir William Hingston, M.D., of Montreal, on being asked his opinion, said: To youth generally, hurtful, sometimes disastrous, never beneficial.' When asked in what way or on what organs, replied, 'The digestive, nervous and circulatory chiefly.'

I wish to quote also the opinions of some educationists as given in this literature:

F. L. Mitchell, M.A., Public School Inspector, Lanark county, Perth, Ontario.—The cigarette is the bane of our youth, and has, to my knowledge, done immense evil by sapping the vitality of our boys, beclouding their minds and making them totally incapable of exercising their natural energy.

S. P. Wells, M.A., Principal Model School, Guelph.—I cannot too strongly condemn the use by the young of the cigarette, or, in fact, tobacco in any form. It weakens the appetite, causes headache, and weakens the body, giving a peculiarly sallow look to the countenance—it is a great foe to digestion, and predisposes to mental as well as bodily disease.

I attach particular weight to the figures cited by Hon. George Torrence, formerly superintendent of the Illinois State Reformatory, who says:

Of two hundred and seventy-eight boys between the ages of ten and fifteen in the Illinois State Reformatory, when the investigation was made in 1899, ninety-two per cent were found in the habit of smoking cigarettes at the time they were committed. Even more astonishing is the fact that eighty-five per cent had become so addicted to their use as to be classed at the time as 'cigarette fiends.'

Speaking of the opinions of medical men, I find by reference to a newspaper published in my own town that a short time ago one of the medical practitioners of that town, an able physician, addressed the pupils of the public school on the subject of cigarette smoking. I shall quote this article, which is as follows :—

At the request of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, Dr. Taylor gave a very instructive address to the boys of the public school, Hanover, on Friday afternoon last. The subject was 'The Cigarette, its composition, and the evil effects resulting from its use.' A few members of the union also availed themselves of the privilege of hearing this address. By permission of the principal, the boys from the higher departments of the school were congregated in one room to the number of about 75. After listening to the description of the material which enters into the make-up of the cheap cigarette particularly, surely no boy who prizes manliness and cleanliness will want to defile his body and weaken his intellect by indulging in this degrading practice.

What I wish to call attention to is not so much the doctor's opinion as the facts that he states in giving his opinion. The report continues :

The cheap cigarette manufactured from the stumps of old cigars gathered from the streets and sweepings of hotel floors and then handled in the dirty hands of hundreds of workmen and boys are then wrapped in paper and then sealed with saliva from their mouths. These are flooding our Canadian markets in millions to-day. Even the machine-made cigarette, which is at least more cleanly, contains four different kinds of poisons besides narcotic poison in the tobacco itself, the innocent looking wrapper being prepared in a solution of poisons to make it attractive to the taste and the use of which creates a constant desire for more.

The doctor explained the effects of the cigarette on the heart, debilitating its action, dulling the eye causing diseases of various kinds, often leading to insanity and death. The doctor received from the boys a hearty clapping of the hands as a vote of thanks for his painstaking address.—'Hanover Post.'

I think, as the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Telford) has said, that, in this country of wonderful resources, our greatest asset is our Canadian boys and girls. And if I speak about our girls, let me point out to the members of this House that, in Great Britain and the United States, smoking is becoming altogether too common among the ladies. I do not think any of us would desire to see Canadian ladies addicted to the habit of smoking. Nor do I think there is any danger that Canadian young ladies and girls will acquire the habit of smoking by the use of either the pipe or the cigar; if our young ladies and girls do learn to smoke, it will be by the use of the cigarette. I think that, beyond any manner of doubt, cigarette smoking has done and is doing a great deal of harm to young men and boys of Canada, as witness the testimony of physicians, teachers, keepers and superintendents of reformatories and men of all classes who come into intimate contact with the youth of our country. Now, as I have said, if this were a resolution to do away with smoking if it were a resolution tyrannically to cut out the use of tobacco in all forms and deny to men the enjoyment they now receive from the use of tobacco in cigar or pipe, I would oppose it as being unreasonable and uncalled for by the circumstances existing. But, as we are all patriots, I trust, and as we desire to see Canadian men able to hold their own with the men of any other nation and even to surpass in every way possible, I think we shall be unselfish enough, while we are permitted the use of pipe or cigar, to abandon willingly and unselfishly the use of the cigarette, in order to prevent evil that may come to our youth, and to our ladies if there is danger in that direction, and that we will not object to the passing of any law that this government or this parliament in its wisdom sees fit to pass for the protection of its people.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT (Muskoka). It is not my intention to speak at any length, I simply rise to express my hearty sympathy with the resolution of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain). I think we need not discuss the evil effects of cigarette smoking. The fact that its effects are evil is admitted by all the members of this House. As a rule, I am not much in favour of attempting to cure all the evils of the body politic by means of legislation, but, inasmuch as, in this case, the undesirable habit aimed at gets in its deadly work at a period when the victim is a mere child, before he has arrived at years of maturity and discretion, I think there is every reason why the protection which legislation of this parliament can afford should be extended. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Telford) has discussed the efficacy of spanking in this connection. I heartily agree with him as to the inadvisability of attempting that course of procedure. There is not much use in spanking a boy for following his father's example. If any spanking is to be done, I should advise that we tackle the old man. If we could induce the grown-up people of this country to quit smoking, this evil would die out very speedily, because it arises simply from the boy trying to be a man before he has arrived at years of maturity. Now, I think that, everything considered, the government would be justified in introducing legislation designed to do away with this very great evil. I may point out that we have not yet realized the evil effect of cigarette smoking. Probably there is not a man of middle age in this House who was addicted, in his earlier years, to this practice. But in ten or

fifteen years from now, this evil will be more patent in the faces of the adult population than it is to-day. It is pitiful to see these mere children with their pallid faces and wan looks as you meet them on the street from time to time. I believe an effort should be made to save them from their folly. I would be prepared to give my hearty endorsation to any move that the government may make designed to do away with, or lessen to some appreciable extent, the evil effects of cigarette smoking. It was pointed out, I think by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), that probably some of the evil effects of this habit come not so much from the tobacco, as from the wrapper in which the tobacco is filled. I have frequently heard it stated that this paper is dipped in a solution of which a very dangerous drug forms an important part, and that the evil effect of cigarette smoking is, to some extent, attributable to this. I have also heard it stated that the method used by some of the largest manufacturers in this country for the production of certain kinds of tobacco includes a process of steeping in a solution of the same or a similar drug which has the effect of creating a great appetite in the user of that form of tobacco. I have in mind one particular kind of tobacco sold in this country in the preparation of which, many of those engaged in the tobacco trade distinctly state, a very deadly drug is used. If that be the case, I think there are probably other ways in which we might legislate which would materially reduce the evil resulting from the use of tobacco in this country. At any rate it will not be amiss to draw the attention of the government to this matter. If they do not see their way to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of cigarettes, they might, at least, direct attention to the stamping out of the use of harmful drugs in the manufacture of these articles.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I see very plainly that now, as always, this is not a party question and should not be treated from a party standpoint. No doubt there are those on both sides of the House, with different party affiliations, who view the cigarette evil with the greatest abhorrence, and there may be on both sides those who are not prepared to go so far as some of us would like to go in the way of repressive measures. I accept the compliments of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) extended to me, I hope, in all sincerity, with regard to this matter, and I will say at once that I am heartily in sympathy with anything in the way of legislation or education which may minimize the harm which, I have no doubt, cigarette smoking is doing in this Dominion of ours. I note that my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) seemed to lay upon the government the duty of taking hold of this question. The hon. gentleman last session introduced a resolution, I think in exactly the same words as the one now before the House. As my hon. friend stated, at the late date in the session when he introduced that resolution, I took it upon myself to point out that it was practically impossible for us to discuss and thrash it out thoroughly, and to put a law upon the statute-book during that session. My hon. friend is proceeding earlier this session, and I am glad he has made so much progress as that. But I venture to suggest that it was quite as competent for him as for myself to introduce a Bill.

Mr. BLAIN. I have not as much influence.

Mr. FISHER. That is a compliment that my hon. friend gave a few minutes ago. He pointed ou that I was no doubt engaged in very important work. I am and have been. My hon. friend has not been so busily engaged as I have, he is not weighed down with the charge of so many important public interests as I have been; and yet he is just as competent to introduce a Bill on this matter as I am. He could have taken a step in advance, and proceeded by resolution, and brought this matter up in concrete form so as to put a law upon the statute-book, had he chosen to do so. I am not complaining that he has not done so; he has taken his own course, as he is at liberty to do. But I do not think it lies in his mouth to cast reproaches upon me, or upon any other member of the government or of the House, for not doing what he himself has failed to do. It is true that in the session, I think of 1903, my hon. friend from St. Lawrence division, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), did move a Bill. But he did not take the right course of procedure. He should have proceeded first by resolution, and then introduced a Bill founded upon it, which then could have been adopted by the House. But exception was taken to his form of procedure, and the Speaker ruled against my hon. friend. With that example and that warning before him, my hon. friend from Peel could have proceeded by resolution in the proper form and introduced a Bill founded upon it, which could have passed the House if the majority had supported it.

Mr. BLAIN. That was done by the hon. gentleman representing the county of Huntingdon in the following session of 1904.

Mr. FISHER. And what was the result?

Mr. BLAIN. The result was that the government did not assist him to place it upon the statute-book.

Mr. FISHER. I am not saying anything about the action of the government; my hon. friend might be successful without the assistance of the government. He shakes his head; sometimes he does not think the government has as much influence as he

now credits it with. But my hon. friend is quite right in saying that so far no effective step has been taken by this parliament. I regret that, I say it frankly, speaking for myself alone, not for the government; the government does not take any position upon this question to-day. So far as I am personally concerned, I would go as far as my hon. friend. Other members of the House, perhaps other members of the government, would not go so far. It is a question on which there is a difference of opinion on both sides of the House, and I cannot force my opinion on my colleagues or on my fellow-members.

My hon. friend also quoted me as having reproached the home, the school and the pulpit, for not having done their full duty in this respect. I do not think the hon. gentleman fairly quoted what I said, or meant to say. What I said, and what I say now, is that the home, the school and the pulpit have not been successful in accomplishing what I would like to see them accomplish. My hon. friend seems to think that it is the duty of the government to undertake to do what the home, the shcool and the pulpit have failed to do. Now, the government can only do what the people will support them in doing; and if the home, the school and the pulpit have failed to induce the fathers and mothers in Canada to exercise their influence to restrict the smoking of cigarettes, I fear the government will not be able to succeed, and I doubt even if parliament can succeed. This is to a certain extent a moral question, I grant; but it is a question of habits, a question of practices, and I fear that law can hardly overcome the tendencies to bad habits and bad practices. My hon. friend referred to the provincial Act of Ontario, assented to in 1892, nineteen years ago. That Act says distinctly:

> Any person who, either directly or indirectly, sells, or gives or furnishes to a minor under eighteen years of age, cigarettes, cigars or tobacco in any form, shall be convicted.

Now, that that law has been on the statute-book of Ontario for sixteen years, and yet during all that time, my hon. friend says himself, the cigarette smoking evil has increased terribly in the province of Ontario. Now, I grant that that Act does not go as far as an Act of this parliament might go; at the same time, it does go very far. My hon. friend says that it has been adopted by a number of municipalities by way of municipal by-law, and he says that of course they would have appointed an officer specially to enforce it. I do not know whether that has been done. I am inclined to think that my hon. friend exaggerates the action of the municipal bodies. He shakes his head; I must accept his judgment, because he is more familiar with the province of Ontario than I am. Now, I would invite him, or somebody else who is familiar with the province of Ontario, to state whether they are aware that a large number of actions and prosecutions have been taken out under that statute and been successfully carried out. There are a number of lawyers in this House representing Ontario constituencies, and I would like any one of them to get up and say whether he knows any cases where that statute has been enforced, if there have been prosecutions against people who sell cigarettes, cigars and tobacco in the province of Ontario, prosecutions to any appreciable extent. I do not believe there have been, but of course, as I say, I am not very familiar with that province. If there had been prosecutions, the people of Ontario who are agitating against cigarettes would have been able to point to action in that province, and would have been able to show that they were going as far as the law allowed them to go.

Mr. MILLER. I think the law in Ontario is practically a dead letter.

Mr. FISHER. Well, that has been my own idea but I am not prepared to give an opinion, because I am not very familiar with the province of Ontario. But, I do think that the Women's Christian Temperance Union and other organized bodies in Ontario who are fighting to put down the cigarette evil, if they had been making use of this law would, in their meetings and publications in regard to it, have given us a statement that this law has been effective as far as it goes. I have not seen anything of the kind in their publications. I have not seen any reference to its enforcement in the report of their meetings, their gatherings and their speeches and therefore I am disposed to think that the law has not been effective. This leads me to say again what I said a few minutes ago that the regulation of the habits of the people by law is very difficult indeed and if it is not supported will lead to no great success. Personally I am willing to pass the statute; personally I think that it is better to have a good law, even if it is not altogether effective and try and get the people to put it into force, than to have no law at all, but I know a great many men who do not take that view. I know eminent men, I know a great many men in the legal profession who say that it is worse in any community to have a law which is a dead letter than to have no law at all. I have never, myself, taken that view. I think that the burden of the responsibility rests upon the legislature and that it is their duty at all events to do their duty. But, I venture to think that if they have not behind them the full and strong feeling of the people the law will be a dead letter and will be ineffective, and I am not prepared under such circumstances to advocate the passing of such a law. The figures which have been given by one or two hon. gentlemen to-night are appalling. I am not

going to discuss the question of the use of tobacco or the use of cigarettes. I personally have never used tobacco. I have not done so in the first place, because I think it is injurious, and in the second place because I do not like it—two very sufficient reasons, I think, and I rather think that these people who do like it have very bad taste and that they are foolish to use it, but they are grown men and are at liberty to use it as long as the law allows them to. It may be that I am not a good judge. One hon. gentleman said that I am not a good judge in regard to the home and the family because I am an old bachelor. But, I would say to my hon. friend that the lookers on see most of the game and perhaps I can see more even than the parents of the children because my eyes are not so prejudiced as the eyes of the parents are.

Mr. BLAIN. I was referring more to the experience of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FISHER. I do believe most emphatically what I have already said that the use of cigarettes amongst our youth to-day is doing to the individual who uses them more harm than drink. I do not say that the use of cigarettes is as much an evil in the country as the immoderate use of drink because a person who drinks immoderately becomes irresponsible and brings evil upon his family, his friends and the community perhaps to a greater extent than a person who uses tobacco moderately, but I do believe that a lad who uses cigarettes to any considerable extent is doing more to stunt his own growth and to prevent his development morally, mentally and physically than does a person who uses a very considerable amount of liquor in his youth. Physiologically and from my own observation I think that is true. It was only the other day that I was reading an article in a publication on this question of cigarette smoking in which a long list was given of corporations and employers of labour who had distinctly declared that they would not employ any youth who used cigarettes. That is pretty good evidence from the business man's standpoint of the evil of the habit. When it comes to the point that large employers of labour, whether they be private corporations or individuals, find the evil so great that they say they will not employ a youth or young man who uses cigarettes, it is evident that the case has gone very far and that the evil is terrible. These people do not move in this way unless they are convinced. They do not from any fad, or any idea take this ground, but from a purely business standpoint and for the benefit of the corporation or the work which they are doing they say they cannot afford to employ a youth or a lad who uses cigarettes. It is evidence of what I said a few minutes ago that the use of them to any considerable extent at all dwarfs the intellect and prevents young men from growing up into good citizens. I think therefore that it would be a very good thing indeed to do if we could stop it and I am prepared myself to advocate and support any motion in regard to the matter which will stop the use of cigarettes in this country. I do not wish to say anything more. The question came up last session and was talked out, I am sure, without any design or desire to do so but in consequence of the late period of the session. I think it would be much more effective for some member to move in the way of a resolution and by the introduction of an effective Bill rather than in a general resolution of this kind and I would be glad if the hon. member for Peel would take that step. Personally I am prepared to support any such Bill.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I am glad that at last one member of the government has the moral courage to give expression to his views upon this important question, but I must take exception to the conclusion which he reaches in regard to it. In the first place, he asks; Why does not a private member introduce this Bill ? Now, there are various reasons why a private member could not properly introduce such a Bill. In the first place, it is a Bill that affects the revenue; therefore properly speaking, it can only be introduced by a member of the government.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, I say that the usual custom of parliament is that the government is responsible for what affects the revenue or expenditure of public money.

Mr. FISHER. There is absolutely no rule of parliament to prevent any member from introducing such a Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Introducing, but the government always controls money Bills and expenditure and they have the rule of parliament behind them. It is not the practice either in the British parliament or in this parliament for private members to be allowed to introduce or carry through money Bills. This responsibility rests upon the cabinet and the cabinet should do it. But the minister says : I am in favour of it and I agree with the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) in the conclusion he reaches, but I think he ought to go further and if he will introduce such a Bill I will help him. The minister has the majority of this House at his back. My hon. friend from Peel has not. The minister is one of the cabinet that control the majority of this House and if he desires this House to pass any such measure and he introduces it as a member of the government I will guarantee that it will pass without any difficulty. The very fact that four times in succession a majority of this House have expressed their opinion in

favour of such legislation is an evidence to the government that they may take it up and pass it with every hope of getting a very large majority of this House in support of it. What more do they want? The Minister of Agriculture admits that the evil is a great one, admits that some remedy is necessary, admits that the remedies which have been provided up to the present are a failure and he thinks that a Bill may be effective. Then I ask: Why does he not make an effort? Why does he not initiate action and try to introduce such legislation and bring about whatever good legislation upon this subject would bring about? I think he ought to do it. Yet, he says: I am only one of the administration.

Mr. FISHER. Why should you not take it up?

Mr. SPROULE. Because I have not the majority of this House at my back. I would have no chance of carrying any Bill through this House, for if the Minister of Agriculture would hold up his hand to his followers they would vote any Bill I introduced down even it it was the best Bill ever submitted to parliament.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman is correct in his statement that the majority of this House is in favour of such a measure, surely he would pass his Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Independently they are in favour of it, but if a member of the government says: we don't desire it to pass, that ends it.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend must not cast such a reflection on the members of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. The government has many ways of burking the action of parliament and they can so control this House that it will be a hopeless task for any private member to introduce such a Bill. The hon. member said that the home, the school, and the pulpit have not been successful, and if that be so all the more does it indicate the wisdom of parliament devising some means to prevent this evil. The only effective means we know of is the legislation which it is in the hands of this government to pass, and I submit that in the interests of the country they should take that means to prevent this evil. Now with regard to the use of cigarettes, the Minister of Agriculture agrees, and I think every member of this House agrees, that it is a pernicious habit, and so I need not argue it.

Mr. MILLER. I would like for my own information to have the opinion of some medical man as to what is the peculiar evil that I believe there is in connection with cigarette smoking.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to deal with that later on, but perhaps I might as well deal with it now. There is the same effect following cigarette smoking as follows the use of any narcotics, and narcotics are simply slow poisons; some are more virulent than others, some are more injurious than others, but all are injurious, and all are dangerous when used immoderately. The nicotine is the narcotic poison of tobacco, and it may be found in cigars or pipe tobacco, but the cigarette differs from these in that it is adulterated with other poisons that make it more intensely injurious than cigar tobacco or pipe tobacco. Cigarettes are mixed with stramoniuni which is another of the deadly narcotic poisons; they are saturated with belladona, and I believe this originated in France. It is said that the people of that country, especially the ladies who desired to make themselves bright, brilliant and attractive indulge in the use of certain drugs.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking from a professional standpoint and I know whereof I speak. At their social gatherings they used belladona because it dilates the pupil of the eye; it gives a more attractive, sprightly appearance and it has some of the soothing effects of a narcotic. The tobacco that is used in cigarettes is saturated with belladona for that purpose. It is one of the narcotic poisons that for the time being quiets the irascible nervous condition of human nature. It is for these reasons that cigarettes are more injurious than even cigars or tobacco. It is because of the other narcotic poisons that are mixed with the narcotics in the tobacco. Then, I believe there is something also to be attributed to the wrapper and the nature of the parafine mixture in which the paper is steeped. I have sometimes thought as well, that this prevents the admixture of the atmosphere with the smoke to the same extent as it does using either a cigar or a pipe. These are my opinions with regard to the more injurious nature of cigarette smoking than either cigar or pipe smoking.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). Do not the medical faculty prescribe belladona and stramonium for asthma and throat affections?

Mr. SPROULE. Oh, yes, they prescribe almost every poison: strychnine and hydrocyanic acid, and digitalis and almost all the poisons. But they prescribe them only in certain specific diseases where they have a specific action in affording relief for the time being, but not as curatives. I say that the immoderate use of cigarettes produces physical, moral and mental degeneracy, and I think that will be admitted by every medical man in the House and most of those outside of it. Now, anything that tends to produce moral, physical and mental degeneracy must tend to the degeneracy of the human race. That being so, surely it is the part of wisdom for us in this parlia-

ment to take measures to stop the rapidly growing consumption of cigarettes in this country. The figures given by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain)—and by the way I think he is entitled to the thanks of the House and of the country for the persistent effort he is making year after year to educate parliamentary sentiment up to that desirable standard which will induce it to pass legislation to control this evil—the figures the hon. gentleman has given the House are the strongest possible evidence that the pernicious habit is increasing. In 1896, Canadians made use of 87,000,000 cigarettes, and in 1906, ten years later, they used 277,000,000, and during the past nine months of this year they have used 275,000,000 which, taking the same proportion for the balance of the year, would mean a consumption of 344,000,000 cigarettes for the twelve months. Do not these figures indicate the rapidity with which this baneful habit is growing? Why this rapid growth? It is because of the natural tendency to cultivate the bad habits of those with whom we associate. The American people are a nation of smokers, and the cigarette is their most luxurious device, and as we mix more and more with them we imbibe their habits. Then, the foreigners who are coming to our shores in countless thousands are cigarette smokers and as they go amongst our people the young boys catch the habit and often they regard it as a manly thing to smoke a cigarette. If, in the future the consumption of cigarettes should increase as in the past two years, what effect must it not have on the degeneracy of the people in the future. The hon. member for Peel in his resolution says the object of good government is to help people in every way and even to control people so that they may not do what injures themselves. We are obliged, for the benefit of our people, to surround them with restrictions and curtail their liberty in many directions. We make a law that druggists shall not sell strychnine, opium and other poisons except under certain regulations and restrictions, because they are dangerous; we prevent people drinking liquor immoderately, partly for the same reason; we control and restrain people in a thousand ways in what they regard as their natural and free rights as citizens. If that is the aim of good government, I would hope our government would be as desirous to accomplish by legislation what can be accomplished in this direction, as they would in any other. Therefore I would expect from them early action. The responsibility of legislating on this question rests with the government. It is within the jurisdiction of this parliament. It is constitutionally one of the subjects on which we can properly legislate, because it affects trade and commerce. We can prevent the importation and manufacture. The provinces cannot do that. It is true, they may make laws to restrict the sale; but as long as you allow the unrestrained importation and manufacture, it is practically useless to make a law to restrict the sale. The Minister of Agriculture asks what has been the effect of the law we have had in force in Ontario? Have any complaints or prosecutions taken place under that law? Yes, I know several that have taken place; but I frankly confess that I regard that law as a failure, because of the ease with which boys can get cigarettes. For instance, half a dozen boys will get together and hand their money over to a boy who is over the prohibited age, who will go to a store and buy the cigarettes and distribute them to the other boys in some shed or out-of-the way place. This I have seen done. Therefore I regard that law as a failure, and we must look to some other source to accomplish what it does not. Now, a vote of this House in favour of a certain kind of legislation is equivalent to a command to the government. Whenever this House, by a large majority, says that it desires legislation along any line, that is an intimation to the government that it is the wish of the House that the government shall introduce such a measure and that a majority of this House will support them in doing so. Why do the government delay? They know that a majority of the members of this House and a majority of the people desire this legislation, and they know that the legislation will be effective. Then, why do they not act? Is it for want of moral courage? It must be surely, or else they would act. What are they afraid of? Do they desire to go down in history as a good government? If so, will they not legislate along the lines which a good government is expected to legislate? The power rests with them and with them alone; will they do their duty? I am afraid that so far they have not done their duty, and the time may come when the voice of the electors of this country will speak to them in louder tones than we are speaking to-night, and remind them that before they came to power they declared, with regard to the temperance question, that they would submit a plebiscite and that if a majority of the people pronounced in favour of prohibition, they would follow it up by legislating along that line. The plebiscite was submitted, and a majority of the people pronounced themselves in favour of prohibition; but from that day to this the government have not introduced that legislation. The same reasoning will apply to this question, and yet they have refused to act. The Women's Christian Temperance Union have called upon them over and over again to act, and this House has told them that it is prepared by a majority to support them, yet they will not act. Therefore I say they must be regarded as doing less than their duty in failing to introduce such a measure.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to detain the House more than a minute or two. I desire to leave the House, for reasons of my own, and possibly may not be here when the vote is taken. I therefore wish to declare myself on this resolution, so that my constituents may know where I stand. I heartily endorse the resolution, as I have voted before for resolutions of the same character. I confess that I was surprised at the statement of the Minister of Agriculture that the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) could introduce a Bill on this subject just as readily as a member of the government. If that doctrine is correct, I have been labouring under a grievous error for the last twenty years, for I never so understood it. In fact, it is the universal practice that when an hon. member of the government brings down a Bill that affects the revenue, he has to declare to the House that he has the consent of His Excellency to bring down the measure. Now, we know very well that the hon. member for Peel has not the ear of His Excellency.

Mr. FISHER. This is not such a Bill as that.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is certainly a Bill that would affect the revenue of the country, and I have no doubt that if a member on this side of the House presumed to introduce a Bill of that character, he would very soon be told that he must have the assent of His Excellency.

Mr. FISHER. No, no.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Why don't you try it ?

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister signifies his dissent from that; but I say that has been the practice of this House ever since I have been a member of it. I do not recall a single instance to the contrary. Therefore I say the Minister of Agriculture should not charge the hon. member for Peel with neglect in not bringing in a Bill on this question.

Mr. CLARKE. Was not a Bill brought down before by a private member on this very question ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not aware of it.

Mr. CLARKE. I am told there was.

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly it was brought down by a member supporting the government, who had the ear of the minister, and was able to get him to obtain His Excellency's assent. I do not say that that was the case. I say that an hon. member on that side of the House would have a privilege that we on this side would not. I do not remember, in fact, that a Bill affecting the revenue of the country was ever introduced by a private member. I may be wrong, but I believe the constitutional practice of this parliament to be that no member outside of the government can introduce a Bill affecting the revenue of this country without having the assent of His Excellency. What right have we on this side of the House, what right has any private member, to introduce a measure and to practically take away the revenues of the government which they require for carrying on the affairs of the country? It does not seem reasonable and I am quite sure that this has not been the practice of the House and that it would not be constitutional. I regret that I am unable to remain until the resolution is voted upon. Were I to remain I would support the resolution.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex). Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have had the pleasure of listening to a debate in this House on this much-debated question. It seems to me that from the outset there has been a feeling on the part of hon. members who have spoken that this resolution will not be passed, or if passed, that it will not be consummated by an Act of parliament at this session ; and there seems to be a disposition on the part of the mover and those who have supported him to make it the basis of an attack upon the government for not bringing in a measure to give effect to the resolutions which have been passed at previous sessions. It has been said that such a Bill can only be introduced by a member of the government. The debate in 1903, which has been referred to by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), was followed up by a Bill introduced by a private member of the House. At page 2014 of 'Hansard' of 1903, I see that Mr. Bickerdike (Montreal, St. Lawrence) :

> Moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 133) to prohibit the importation, manufacture or sale of cigarettes.

He was called on for an explanation, and the same objection was then taken by Mr. Taylor, that it was a Bill which could only be introduced by a member of the government. But the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said :

> My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is somewhat in error when he wants to minimize the powers of members of this House. A member of this House cannot introduce a measure which would put any burdens upon the people, but a member of this House can always introduce a measure which will decrease the taxation and take burdens off the people and as I understand it, in this case the objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) does not apply.

Rightly or wrongly, that was the opinion of the Prime Minister at that time—and it was given effect to—that any member of this House had a full right to introduce a Bill similar to the one now sought to be introduced by the resolution under discussion.

With a good deal of what is in the present resolution I heartily concur. There are

some things that it seems to me may be improved on, and before I sit down I intend to move an amendment to the resolution. It is a very easy thing for grown-up people who smoke to pass laws affecting boys who want to smoke. It would perhaps be more manly if we said to the boys: Follow my example, I will cut out the weed myself, than to say we will go on smoking and will punish the boy if he attempts to do what his father does. I do not think the legislation which we are now discussing is very manly or courageous. But the matter has been discussed and is of so much importance that it must be dealt with. It reminds one of the man who was willing to sacrifice his wife's relations in case of war. The first part of the resolution is most commendable, and it is a pleasure for members of this parliament, or any other parliament, to be able to give expression to such noble sentiments. We are unanimous with regard to the first part of this resolution.

The conclusion to be drawn from the second part is not quite logical. It is:

That the smoking of cigarettes has been proved by overwhelming testimony to be productive of serious physical and moral injur. to young people.

It is confined to young people, but the effect of the resolution is to prevent, not only young people, but all people from using cigarettes. If it is not injurious to older people to use cigarettes, the House is being asked to go a long way for the sake of preventing children from using cigarettes. When it is asked to deprive persons of mature judgment who desire to use them of the opportunity of doing so. If we are going to justify that, we should say that it is injurious to all, and that no one shall be allowed to use cigarettes.

The third part is perhaps right:

That the legislation, licensing and restricting the sale of cigarettes has not proven sufficient to prevent these evils.

There is nothing more deplorable than to see young boys smoking cigarettes or, for that matter, pipes and cigars. I have seen boys using pipes and cigars, apparently confirmed smokers, fully as often as I have seen them using cigarettes, and I have never been able to understand why the proposed legislation in regard to minors should be confined to cigarettes. Since I have been in public life this matter has been repeatedly brought to my attention by the good women, who are always perhaps more unselfish than the men are in looking after the welfare of the children. I have always said: Why confine it to cigarettes? Let us stop them, as far as we can, from using tobacco in any form. That is the correct position, and I do not think that this talk about cigarettes only is going to accomplish the object sought to be accomplished by this resolution.



Mr. BLAIN. Does not my hon. friend believe that the larger number of boys who learn to smoke commence with cigarettes?

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know that; it may be; I do not dispute it. Whether they commence with cigarettes or not, I do not think the prevention of the use of cigarettes will stop the evil practice of boys using tobacco.

I have had occasion to observe the working of the Ontario law, which is a pretty strong law, that is the Act of 1892. It is not confined to cigarettes, it prevents, with the sanction of penalties, the sale to minors, under eighteen years of age, of cigarettes, cigars or tobacco in any form. I think most of the provinces have similar legislation. I believe that in Nova Scotia the limit is sixteen years of age; in Ontario it is eighteen. I have lived in a border town, I have been engaged in the capacity of Crown Attorney for quite a considerable number of years, and I cannot say that I remember a single prosecution for violation of that Act. I do not say there has never been such a prosecution, because I would not be called upon for a summary offence of that sort, but I have had a pretty good idea of what was going on, and I cannot at present recollect a single case of a prosecution under that Act. I do not say there were none.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend lives in a tobacco-growing section?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes, in a tobacco-growing section and a tobacco-smoking section, and a section where boys smoke. I have seen them smoking in the streets, but public sentiment apparently is not strong enough to enforce the law we already have, or it may be for the reason given by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), that it is difficult to enforce the law because you are not able to discover who makes the sale. I think the weakness of the law is that you seek to punish the man you cannot find—the man who sells the tobacco—whereas the one on whom you find it—the boy himself—is not subject to any penalty. The purpose of my amendment is to get right after the boy himself, to impose penalties so that you will not have to hunt up the man who sells to the boy, but if you catch the boy in the act with the tobacco on him you put a stop to it immediately; this seems to be the only effectual way to put a stop to smoking by boys. I do not in any case think that this resolution, if carried into effect, would prevent smoking. I do not know if by the use of the word 'manufacture' you would prevent a boy or a man from rolling up his own tobacco. But many of the cigarettes used are not bought in cigarette form. The boys buy the fine-cut tobacco and the tissue paper and roll their own cigarettes and smoke them. If that is 'manufacture,' this resolution would meet it; but I take it that that is not what is intended. The mere fact of preventing a boy from buying cigarettes

already made will go but a little distance to cure the evil if you allow him to buy the tissue paper and tobacco and make his own cigarettes. I think it would be well if the Ontario Act went further and provided a penalty for the boy who violates the Act as well as for the seller. But I do not know that this House is without jurisdiction. It seems to me that we could amend the criminal law. Unfortunately, in these matters, there seems to be a tendency to shift responsibility. The tendency on the part of my hon. friend opposite is to shift responsibility upon the government. If this House does not do anything, it might be said that we were trying to shift responsibility upon the provincial legislature. We could amend the criminal law to prevent boys, as effectively as possible, from using tobacco in any form. With that view I move the following amendment:

That all the words after the word 'disadvantage' in the fourth line of the proposed resolution be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

That the smoking and use of tobacco in any form has been proved to be injurious to the physical and intellectual development of the youth of the country besides encouraging habits of idleness.

That the legislation now in force restricting the sale of cigarettes, cigars or tobacco has been ineffective to wholly prevent these evils.

That this House is of the opinion that the most effective remedy for the existing evil is to amend the Criminal Code so as to make it an offence for persons under eighteen years of age to use tobacco in any form for smoking or chewing, or to have possession of tobacco for either of such purposes, and also for the sale or gift of tobacco in any form to persons under eighteen years of age.

That it is expedient to bring in a Bill at this session to give effect to this resolution.

Mr. MELZAR AVERY (Frontenac). I do not know that that amendment reaches the point, though, in one way it goes a step beyond the original motion. In fact, I doubt that it is properly an amendment at all. In any case, I think the original resolution is much nearer the point. If cigarette smoking is an evil, let us deal with that; and, if we are successful, we can go further. We are particularly bound to deal with this matter of cigarettes, because as has been shown, the injury is to the young people, pupils in our schools and others. If the Minister or Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is honest, he will have a Bill brought in by the government to deal with this matter. The question has been raised whether this amendment affects the revenue. If it affects the revenue, it is clearly a matter for the government. Well, let us see how far the government will go. Let them bring in a Bill in accordance with the resolution of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) and I think they will find that both sides of the House will support it. But if the Minister of Agriculture intends to leave it to a private member of this House to introduce the Bill, it will simply mean that the government is trying to get out of the responsibility. I think that the government is properly responsible for the measure, and if the Minister of Agriculture will bring in a Bill in accordance with the resolution of the hon. member for Peel, he will find that this side of the House will give it hearty support. For my part, I am ready to support it, because I think the use of cigarettes by our young people is an evil, and if we can stop this practice we shall benefit our boys. The government should introduce a measure to deal with the evil of cigarettes. Then, if it wants to go a step further and try to stop the use of tobacco in any form by young people. I hope they will take the matter up and make it a government measure, so that the country may see on what side the government stands.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I am sure we all appreciate the efforts made by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) in bringing forward this measure year after year and the splendid support of facts and figures that he has given it this evening. I am glad to see the hon. members take the position they do. I think it is the desire on both sides of the House to see legislation introduced that will effectually curtail the smoking, and possibly the manufacture and sale of cigarettes in our country. The hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke) does not go so far as the hon. member for Peel, yet I will not say that I will not support his motion if no legislation is brought in at this time. But I should like to see him go further than he has gone. I cannot agree with the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) when he says that, so far as bringing in legislation is concerned, it is important for the opposition to take a position on the subject. I am satisfied that it is the duty of the government to bring in this legislation and give it their hearty and undivided support. As has been stated, the youth of this country are our best assets, and we are proud to see the general advancement made in our schools and colleges in advising young men to curtail smoking and drinking habits. I am sure that, as legislators, we cannot take too much time debating this subject and placing it before the country in the most emphatic manner, to show the young men that, so far as we are concerned, we are determined to bring about legislation that will be for the benefit of the youth of our country. I rose mainly to express my appreciation of the efforts of the hon. member for Peel. That hon. gentleman is deserving of the hearty sympathy of both sides for bringing this measure before us from time to time. I am glad that both sides regard it from a non-partisan standpoint and are decided that, so far as we are con-

cerned, we are going to bring in legislation that will tend in the direction of reform.

Mr. ROBERT STEWART (Ottawa). The amendment moved by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke) has merit in it. I should be very glad to support that resolution if it were proposed at some other time, or if it did not set aside the motion moved by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). But I fear very much that that is the effect it would have. If the amendment is so intended or will have that effect I shall be reluctantly compelled to vote against it at this time. I am in thorough sympathy with the motion of the hon. member for Peel and with all that has been said concerning the injurious effects of cigarettes upon the youth of our country and in opposition to the use of cigarettes by the young.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I am in hearty sympathy with the motion of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), and I entirely approve the manner in which he has presented the motion. I supported, five years ago, I think, a motion of a similar character presented by my hon. friend and esteemed friend, the member for St. Lawrence division, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), and I have seen nothing since then to alter my opinion as to the great evil with which this motion deals. At the time the former motion was under consideration, members of this House who were then members will remember that we had the advantage of the medical opinion of a gentleman who holds a very high position in the medical fraternity. Dr. Roddick was at that time the member for St. Antoine division, and if I remember rightly what he said, he was of the opinion that although cigarettes in themselves were not more injurious than tobacco in other forms when used by the young, they were especially liable to be used to excess, in which case they caused very serious injury. A grown man smoking a cigarette not otherwise vitiated by obnoxious ingredients, would probably not suffer more than a man smoking a pipe. The difficulty pointed out then was that excessive cigarette smoking by young men and boys was attended with very harmful results. My own experience, after being connected for more than twenty-five years with educational institutions and with young men in the university, is that cigarette smoking is a great evil and produces extremely deplorable results. There is this peculiarity about it, that young men and boys seem to contract an immoderate desire for cigarettes, some of them smoking as many as sixty or seventy, or even a hundred cigarettes a day. It is therefore easy to understand that under these circumstances, cigarette smoking has become a very great evil in this country. Recognizing the evil as I do, I also recognize the desirability of applying a remedy.

My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture does not seem to be logical when speaking on behalf of the government, he separates his responsibility from that of his colleagues. He agrees with what has been alleged as to the existence of the evil, and would be prepared for himself to support a remedy, but he has not the concurrence of his colleagues, or at least of all of them, as I understood him. I do not think it is possible for a minister speaking on behalf of the government on a question of that kind, to take up such a position. If there is an admitted evil it is for the government to introduce a remedy, and it is impossible for a minister to isolate himself from his colleagues on that matter. Neither do I agree with the Minister of Agriculture when he says that it is competent for any member of this House to introduce a Bill, as called for by the resolution. The hon. gentleman knows perfecly well that no private member of this House could attempt to carry through legislation of this scope and importance, it would be absurd to make the attempt. In England no private member would dream of introducing legislation of this nature, because it is well known there that no private member could carry it through the House. When a crying evil is brought to the notice of the government, as this has been for many years, it is for the government, placed in their responsible position, to bring in a remedy for the evil. Of course I admit that it is possible for a member to introduce a measure involving a reduction of taxation without the consent of the Crown; but as my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said, that is very unusual. It is not at all according to the customs of parliament. We know that ever since the date in the seventeenth century when the English House of Commons passed the memorable resolution by which it divested itself of the right of imposing taxation without the initiative of the Crown, the custom has been that no law affecting the public revenue in any way could be introduced by a private member. This is essentially a government measure. This evil has been brought to the notice of the government for a number of years now, and we have members of the government rising in the House, as the Minister of Agriculture has done this evening, and disclaiming responsibility. Now that is very unsatisfactory, even to those who do not agree on all points with what has been said in favour of this resolution. As a rule the discussion of this matter has led to what? It has led to the government making such declarations as the Minister of Agriculture has made this evening, and it has led to the resolution being talked out, or else to the introduction of amendments with the object of escaping the issue, which has been put very frankly before the House by my hon. friend from Peel to-night. It is possible that the remedy suggested by the

amendment may be open to some objection. But the object of introducing an amendment is, as a rule, to escape the issue. Now it seems to me that at this stage, the issue having been brought fairly before the government, it is the duty of the government to declare its policy. Usually, when the government has recognized the existence of the evil and has promised to introduce a remedy, those who have introduced the motion are prepared to withdraw it. But under these circumstances, with our experience of what has happened in the past, I do not think that step would be warranted. For my part I am cordially in sympathy with the resolution, and am prepared to support it.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). I am strongly in favour of the motion of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), and I cannot support the amendment; nor do I think there is a member in the House that can agree with this language of the amendment :—

This House is of the opinion that the most effectual remedy for the existing evil is to amend the Criminal Code so as to make it an offence for persons under eighteen years of age to use tobacco in any form for smoking or chewing, or to have possession of tobacco for either of such purposes.

Now that would not be half as effectual a remedy as to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale. If this amendment carries, the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes can go on as heretofore; whereas if we prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale, boys of eighteen years of age, or older persons, cannot use cigarettes. It is to be remembered that the whole agitation in the country is against cigarettes, but the amendment does not deal with cigarettes at all, it only makes it a criminal offence for persons under eighteen years of age to use tobacco in any form. In my opinion the most effective action would be to do away with the manufacture, importation and sale of cigarettes. Therefore, I could not support the amendment because as my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier says, I believe it is only intended to side track the motion made by my hon. friend from Peel.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to detain the House as on this question I made myself very clear in 1903. I do not think that any amount of talk on the subject will change one vote here this evening. I think that every hon. member has made up his mind just how he is going to vote on this question. In 1903, I introduced a resolution something on the lines of that which has been introduced by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). It was not quite in the same language but it had the same purpose in view. My hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Clarke) has moved an amendment which may have just as good an effect as the resolution of the hon. member for Peel, but it does not go quite far enough. I do not think we should confine ourselves entirely to chastising a boy. I think the very object would be defeated if we stop there. If the hon. gentleman would go a little further with his amendment and move to punish the manufacturer, or the man who sells cigarettes to the boy as well as the boy he would be doing something to stop the evil.

Mr. CLARKE. The reason I did not put that in was that most of the provinces already have such a provision, but I am quite willing to have that go in if it is desirable.

Mr. TAYLOR. Stop the manufacture and sale.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Stop the manufacture as well as punish the boy. I do not like to punish the boy at all because he is hardly responsible at that age for what he does. It is very dangerous sometimes to make criminals of boys if we can avoid it. However, I introduced that resolution in 1903, and I have no doubt that almost all members of this House will remember that it was carried by a very large majority. The resolution was adopted by a majority of 103 against 48 and a great many members on the other side of the House, I am pleased to say, voted with me on that occasion although they seldom do. I afterwards introduced a Bill and got the second reading some time later. I then moved for the House to go into committee for the consideration of the Bill. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) who was then Speaker of the House ruled me out. He just discovered it at that late moment, at least he looked serious as if he had discovered it and then it was ruled out and dropped for the session. It was brought up some time afterwards by the then member for Huntingdon, again last session by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) and now an amendment is moved by the hon. member for Essex. What I want to say is that any effective measure that is brought up in the House and that has any chance of carrying, will have my hearty support.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Kootenay). Mr. Speaker, I do not want to give a silent vote on this resolution. I am one of those who believe that the practice of smoking cigarettes by young people is certainly injurious. On the other hand I think there are other things that have to be considered in connection with the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) which, of course, is very far reaching in its character. We have for many years had cigarettes imported, manufactured and consumed in Canada. People have entered into the business and there has been nothing unlawful in carrying it on. They have invested probably large sums of money in the business.

Now, there is another feature. I am not very much in favour of what may be termed paternal legislation. I am quite willing to support any measure whether brought in by a private member or not—although I have some doubt as to whether he is at liberty to bring in such a measure—to make it an offence to either sell or give cigarettes to any one under the age of 18 years. Further than that I do not think I am prepared to go. The amendment of my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Clarke) does not go far enough.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) how far legislation in his own province goes ?

Mr. GALLIHER. That is a point that I was just going to mention. Our province is one in which a man who would sell to a boy would not be punished as a result of the adoption of the amendment of the hon. member for Essex.

Mr. CLARKE. Well, I will amend it in order to meet that point.

Mr. GALLIHER. If we introduce legislation here that will prohibit the sale or gift to a boy under 18 years of age and impose a good heavy penalty for the infraction of that law, I am prepared to support such a Bill. But, to go to the extent of saying that a grown man, who, after all should be capable of judging for himself, shall be subjected to a penalty or should not be permitted if he so desires to smoke cigarettes, is to adopt a form of legislation that I for one do not agree with. I believe it is to a certain extent interfering with the liberty of the subject. If we can not prevent the wholesale smoking of cigarettes by young boys in any other way then I am prepared to go to that extent. At all events I think we should make a trial and see if we cannot stamp out the evil by the method which I suggest. I look upon it as an evil. I would be sorry indeed to see my own boy who is 15 years of age, smoking cigarettes. In fact, I do not like to see the child of any parent smoking cigarettes because I believe they are injurious to him both bodily and mentally. When a man comes to mature years I do not think that we should legislate to restrict him in regard to what he should smoke, whether he should smoke tobacco in a pipe or a cigar or a cigarette. If we cannot by intermediate legislation, if I may so term it stamp out this evil, as it affects our young people, then, as a last resort, I will be prepared to go as far as the resolution of my hon. friend from Peel. I think we might safely in the first place confine it to boys up to 18 years of age instead of 16, because a boy will have become a little more mature in his mind and developed in his body as well, and if we find that such an Act strictly enforced and providing good heavy penalties for either the sale or gift of cigarettes to boys does not reach the end that I believe everybody in the House desires to see reachd in so far as young people are concerned we can take the matter up again and go to a greater extent.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say that I am not in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke). I do not believe that it is the most effectual remedy. I do not believe that very many members of this House will agree with the hon. member that it is more effectual to fine the boy who is found smoking or with tobacco in his possession up to 18 years of age than it is to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale. If you take the temptation out of the way there are fewer who will be likely to fall into it. We allow a boy 18 years old to take up his homestead and we treat him as being responsible for his conduct, and yet when a yougn man approaching the age of 18, following the example of older people smokes a cigarette I think it would be regarded as an outrage that you should punish him and let the older heads go scott free. The hon. member for Montreal objects to the motion because it does not go far enough, and he says that if you allow the importation and manufacture you cannot stop the evil, and in answer to that the mover of the amendment says he is willing to go further and to amend the criminal law so as to make it a criminal offence.

Mr. CLARKE. I did not say that.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that.

Mr. CLARKE. That was in answer to what was said, that in some of the provinces they had no law to punish the sale. I suppose all the provinces had the same law as the province of Ontario which punishes the sale to minors, but it seems British Columbia has not. I propose with the consent of the House to make the sale an offence as well as the use by the boy.

Mr. SPROULE. It was in answer to the question of the member for Montreal who said: what is the use of this law if you still allow the sale and manufacture, that my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) says you could go further.

Mr. CLARKE. If I said that I did not mean it.

Mr. SPROULE. That proposal was an unreasonable one to say the least. I do not think the amendment would be as effectual as the motion would be and hence I will vote against it.

Mr. GILBERT H. McINTYRE (South Perth). There appears to be no argument necessary as to the evil of the cigarette habit. We are offered a couple of remedies. Remedies by law are seldom all we desire and they do not work out to the

full extent we would wish them to. But that is no reason why we should not attempt as far as possible to remedy the evil. We are offered two remedies. One is the total prevention by law of the manufacture or importation or sale of cigarettes. That has its weakness in this, that while you are endeavouring by that to prevent the use of cigarettes by minors you are also preventing their use by older people, and we cannot very well say that their use by older people is so serious a matter that we should prevent it by law. We at least should have very strong reason indeed before we would go that far. On the other hand the amendment does endeavour to reach the particular person affected, but unfortunately it is accompanied by an Act of legislation that makes the offence a criminal one apparently, and one would hesitate very much to punish a child under 18 who is not responsible and who is tempted by the example of his elders. As between the two, if we are only to have these two remedies to choose from, we must do so recognizing that neither one will fully answer all we require, but of the two I would prefer, if there is no change in the amendment, the motion of the member for Peel.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (South Renfrew). I am heartily in accord with the resolution of the member for Peel. It seems to me that the amendment which has been introduced is nothing more or less than an attempt to draw a red herring across the track of the resolution. Now, I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, how you are going to provide a remedy for this case which I will bring to your notice and which came to my notice about six months ago. In coming from my home I saw four little tots about five years old—two of them were girls and the others boys—and one of them had a cigarette and he started to smoke it and then he passed it around, each one taking a draught and so on from one to the other until the cigarette was finished. I asked the little boy where he got the cigarette and he told me he 'got it out of papa's pocket.' Now, how is this legislation to meet such a case as that. It seems to me that the only way to remedy this evil, and evil it is—and no one denies it is an evil—the only effectual way to remedy the evil is to put in force the resolution introduced by the member for Peel. I can assure you that in my own town this evil is growing with terrible rapidity. The teachers in our schools are not able to cope with it, the mothers in our homes are not able to cope with it, the clergymen in our pulpits are not able to cope with it, and will we not do all we can in this parliament to assist these three great forces of the land in the cause of mortality? Will we not strengthen their hands if it is possible for us to do so. So far as I am concerned I am heartily in accord with the resolution of the member for Peel and shall vote for it, and if we pass this resolution or one similar to it half a dozen times in this House and yet there is no effectual law put into force, I shall still vote for this resolution until we get a government that will do something for us.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver). I think possibly no other subject calls for more self restraint on the part of the majority of men who speak on it, than the subject of smoking. I smoke myself and I think nine-tenths of the men of this country smoke.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend says no, but I will say that nine-tenths of the people of my province smoke, and still we have this fact staring us in the face, that we do not want our sons to smoke. My good friend from East Grey said a few moments ago that you must keep temptation out of the small boy's way, but you simply cannot keep temptation out of his way, because if he walks along the street he finds that the majority of men he meets are smoking cigars or pipes, if not cigarettes. The small boy is simply following in the footsteps of his father in that respect. Do you intend to go further, and say that a boy cannot smoke a cigar or a pipe any more than he can smoke a cigarette? That must be the logical conclusion if smoking does such immense harm. And, if the boy cannot smoke cigarettes or a pipe or cigars, are you going to pursue the logical course further, and say that a man shall not smoke cigarettes or a cigar or a pipe? There is much to be said pro and con on this question. The liberty of the individual is concerned, the revenue is concerned, the tobacco growing industry is concerned and the cigarette making industry is concerned. I therefore do not think that even the wise men who are in this chamber to-night can, with all their wisdom, devise a solution of the difficulty. The other day I read a bill advertising a political meeting to be held by our good friends opposite and many distinguished Conservatives were announced to speak and young men were invited to be present. Mr. Speaker, what do you suppose this bill said? That a smoking concert was to be held, and that there would be cigarettes, cigars and pipes. I do not think the hon. member for Peel smokes; I will do him that justice. I think he is one man who is in earnest in this matter. I believe he feels the responsibility placed upon him; so I would omit him from this category. But when we have parties in this country, whether Liberal or Conservative, advertising smoking concerts, and especially inviting young men to them, where they will see the wise men of our country gathered together and sitting up on the platform smoking their long clay pipes or good fat Havana cigars, or rolling cigarettes in their nimble fingers and smoking them, what will they say? They will say: These men cannot be as

sincere as they try to make us believe. These people do not read 'Hansard,' and therefore will not know what has been said here to-night, because, after all, the papers will not publish much of it beyond the fact that the hon. member for Peel moved such a resolution and certain members spoke upon it, so that they will not know how we feel about this matter. Is there any hon. member of this House who, when he has ranged around him 400 or 500 of the electors of this country, gets on the platform and says to them: Are you gentlemen teaching your boys and girls not to smoke cigarettes? Not a solitary man will preach that doctrine when he has the chance; at least, I never heard it. I do not do it myself, and yet I believe cigarette smoking is a bad thing for small boys. I would never hire a boy who smokes cigarettes. But when you cut a tree down, you do not begin at the top. I would not say: Stop the manufacture and sale of cigarettes by prohibiting it; but I say that if hon. gentlemen themselves are in earnest about this matter, they will themselves show the first example by saying: We will not smoke tobacco in any shape or form. That is the only logical conclusion they can come to. There is so much to be said on this question, Mr. Speaker, and I have further remarks to make that would delight hon. gentlemen around me, but I have not time to make them to-night at this late hour-, and therefore I will move the adjournment of the debate.

House divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Macpherson).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adamson,
Archambault,
Beauparlant,
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Carney,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Copp,
Crawford,
Delisle,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Dubeau,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gladu,
Johnston,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Law,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Lovell,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McColl,
McCool,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Wellington),
Parmelee,
Pickup,
Ratz,
Savoie,
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Turcotte,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Jackson (Selkirk),
Turgeon,
Turriff.—61.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barr,
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Boyce,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clarke,
Clements,
Crocket,
Elson,
Fowler,
Ganong,
Graham,
Herron,
Jackson (Elgin),
Lake,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
McIntyre (Perth),
McKenzie,
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
McLean (York, C.),
Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Miller,
Monk,
Morin,
Pardee,
Paquet,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Halifax),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Schell (Oxford),
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor,
Tolmie,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Watson,
White,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka),
Wright (Renfrew)—51.

Amendment to the amendment agreed to, and debate adjourned.

## FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FIELDING presented a message from the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:

GREY:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending on the 31st March, 1908, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, March 16, 1908.

On motion of Mr. FIELDING the message, together with the estimates, were referred to Committee of Supply.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. The Budget.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 17, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### THE ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the secretary of His Excellency the Governor General the following communication :—

Ottawa, March 17, 1908.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. the Chief Justice of Canada, acting as Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber this afternoon at 3.15 o'clock, for the purpose of assenting to such Bills as have passed the Senate and the House of Commons.

I have the honour to be, sir.
Your obedient servant,
J. HANBURY WILLIAMS,
Colonel,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Hon.
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That from this date to the end of the session, government orders have precedence immediately after questions to be put by members on Wednesday.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is of course a pretty long list of public Bills and orders, as the Prime Minister has no doubt observed. Of these some at least are of an important public nature. It may possibly be practicable to take a day for some of them that are of more vital importance than others.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In this matter the government are anxious to meet the wishes of the House. If it would be more convenient to take to-morrow for public Bills and orders, I have no objection to that course being followed. In that case, the motion would apply to Wednesdays beginning to-morrow week. I would move accordingly.

Amendment agreed to, and motion as amended agreed to.

### THE ROYAL ASSENT.

A message was received from His Excellency the Governor General by the gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows :—

Mr. Speaker,—His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable Senate.

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

Mr. FIELDING.

And having returned.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that his honour the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :—

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Niagara, Grand Island Bridge Company.
An Act respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.
An Act respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Tobique Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to 'Fraser Lumber Company, Limited.'
An Act respecting a patent of Eugene François Giraud.
An Act respecting patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Company, Limited.
An Act to incorporate the Women's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.
An Act respecting patents of the Goodwin Car Company.
An Act respecting patents of Montague Moore and Thomas James Heskett.
An Act to amend the Copyright Act.
An Act respecting the Surveys of the public lands of the Dominion and the surveyors entitled to make such surveys.
An Act respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.
An Act respecting the Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada.
An Act to incorporate the Alberta and Brazeau River Railway Company.
An Act respecting the British Yukon Railway Company.
An Act respecting the National Battlefields of Quebec.
An Act respecting the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company.

### MAILS TO YUKON.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON (Yukon). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) a question relating to the Yukon mails. I have under my hand a letter from the 'Engineering and Mining Journal,' of Toronto, stating that a copy of that journal addressed to a subscriber in Yukon had been returned marked 'non-transmissible during the cold season.' I called the attention of the Postmaster General to this matter on January 27 last. I would be glad if he could give an explanation now.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I am aware that some packages were detained at Whitehorse. In order to make the matter clear, I think I should give my hon. friend the regulation which has been in existence in the department for some years respecting mail matter to the Yukon territory during the winter months. My hon. friend is aware that only correspondence limited to a certain class can be forwarded if addressed to places beyond Whitehorse, as follows :

Letters (in their usual and ordinary form); post cards ; singly wrapped newspapers and periodicals from the office of publication, addressed to public libraries, to newspaper publishers and to individual subscribers; transient newspapers and third-class matter of all kinds except books, trade catalogues, circulars and patterns and samples of merchandise.

The following articles are not transmitted from places north of Whitehorse during the season of closed navigation :

Newspapers and periodicals sent to dealers for purposes of trade (in bulk or otherwise), sample copies of newspapers and periodicals, books, trade catalogues, circulars and patterns and samples of merchandise and fourth-class matter (merchandise).

The term 'package' as used does not enable the department to say with certainty whether what has been detained in the post office mentioned by my hon. friend should have been detained under the regulations or not. As to that, we will have an inquiry made at once, and my hon. friend will be made aware of the result as soon as possible.

## WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty. He said : Mr. Speaker, the last volume of Public Accounts in the possession of the House is for the fiscal period of nine months ended 31st March last. Perhaps it is worthy of note—though we here generally understand it—that the broken period was made necessary by the change in our fiscal year. Of course, it is difficult to make comparisons between a period of nine months and a period of twelve months ; but, after the passing of the present year, we shall come to conditions under which comparisons may be made as usual.

The outturn of the financial period to which I have referred proved somewhat more favourable than the anticipations which I ventured to present to the House in the budget speech of the previous November. I had estimated a revenue of $65,000,000 ; the actual revenue for the nine months was $67,969,328.29, an excess over the estimate of $2,969,328.29. I estimated an expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Fund of $52,000,000 ; the expenditure proved to be $51,542,161.09, which was less than the estimate to the extent of $457,838.91. I estimated a surplus of $13,000,000 ; the actual surplus for the nine months was $16,427,167.20. That is, the surplus for the nine months was larger than the surplus of any fiscal year in the history of confederation. It may be well to note, in passing, though the figures are in the possession of the House already, that the main sources of our revenue were as follows :

| | |
|---|---|
| Customs.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $39,760,172 53 |
| Excise.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 11,805,413 21 |
| Post Office.. .. .. .. .. .. | 5,061,728 45 |
| Dominion Lands.. .. .. .. | 1,443,632 03 |
| Railways.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 6,509,099 78 |
| Miscellaneous.. .. .. .. .. | 3,389,282 29 |
| | $67,969,328 29 |

The customs revenue during the nine months proved very buoyant, showing a very large proportionate increase over that of 1905-6. The same may be said of excise.

The post office revenue continues to increase and that service may now be regarded as being firmly established on a paying basis. In the nine months of the financial period 1907, we received from this source $5,061,728.45. The expenditure for that period was $3,979,557.34, leaving a surplus of $1,082,171.11. The operations of the Post Office Department up to and including 1902 resulted in deficits year by year. In 1903 we had a small surplus of $292,654. Each succeeding year has shown a surplus and so well has the administration of this branch of the service prospered that in the nine months of 1907 we actually netted a surplus of $1,082,171.11.

The statement of post office revenue and expenditure for a series of years is so interesting that the House will pardon me if I spend a moment in calling attention to it. The statement from 1896 to 1907 is as follows :

| Year. | Revenue. | Expenditure | Deficit. | Surplus. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $ | $ | $ | $ |
| 1896.. | 2,964,014 | 3,665,011 | 700,997 | |
| 1897.. | 3,202,938 | 3,789,478 | 586,540 | |
| 1898.. | 3,527,809 | 3,575,411 | 47,602 | |
| 1899.. | 3,193,777 | 3,603,799 | 410,022 | |
| 1900.. | 3,205,535 | 3,758,014 | 552,479 | |
| 1901.. | 3,441,504 | 3,931,446 | 489,942 | |
| 1902.. | 3,918,415 | 4,023,636 | 105,221 | |
| 1903.. | 4,397,832 | 4,105,178 | ..... | 292,654 |
| 1904.. | 4,652,324 | 4,347,540 | ..... | 304,784 |
| 1905.. | 5,125,372 | 4,634,527 | ... ... | 490,845 |
| 1906.. | 5,933,342 | 4,921,577 | .... .. | 1,011,765 |
| 1907.. | 5,061,728 | 3,979,557 | ..... | 1,082,171 |

It is of course to be remembered that this great change from a period of deficits to a period of surpluses is coincident with a

very material reduction in the most important postal rates of the country. We have not only had a greater revenue with a lower rate of postal taxation, but from year to year a continued expansion in the service. Taking only the last period of nine months, it is found that there have been the following increases in that service:

| Class of office. | Increase for nine months. |
|---|---|
| Post offices.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 236 |
| Postal note offices.. .. .. .. .. .. | 355 |
| Money order offices.. .. .. .. .. .. | 115 |
| Savings banks.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 32 |

This is in addition to the large increase in the mileage of mail service as compared with previous years.

The Intercolonial account to which attention has already been called by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. G. P. Graham) showed that there was a revenue for the nine months of $6,248,251.45, while the working expenses were $6,030,171.83, showing an excess of revenue over working expenses, for the nine months, of $218,079.62.

The Prince Edward Island Railway was treated separately; there the balance is the other way, there is an excess of expenses over revenue of $67,713.55.

For convenience of reference I have put in summary form the expenditure of all kinds, the revenue, and the net debt statement for the period of nine months. That is set out in the following table:

Summary of revenue, expenditure of all kinds, and net debt for fiscal period of 9 months ended March 31, 1907.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Fund .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | | $51,542,161 09 |
| Capital expenditure— | | |
| National Transcontinental Railway .. | $5,537,867 50 | |
| Railways.. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,603,701 07 | |
| Canals.. .. .. .. .. .. | 887,838 61 | |
| Public works.. .. .. .. | 1,797,871 16 | |
| Dominion lands .. .. .. | 526,582 61 | |
| Militia.. .. .. .. .. .. | 975,282 87 | |
| | | 11,329,143 82 |
| Special expenditure— | | |
| Railway subsidies .. | $1,324,889 30 | |
| Bounties.. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,581,944 36 | |
| | | 2,906,833 66 |
| Total expenditure.. .. .. .. .. | | 65,778,138 57 |
| Total revenue.. .. .. .. .. .. | | 67,972,109 65 |
| Excess of total revenue over total expenditure.. .. .. .. .. | | 2,193,971 08 |
| Add sinking funds.. .. .. .. .. | | 1,177,146 71 |
| Decrease of net debt.. .. .. .. | | 3,371,117 79 |

It will be observed that there is an excess of total revenue over total expenditure of $2,193,971.08. Adding to that the sinking funds, which are simply taken from one side of the account and placed on the other, and which amounted to $1,177,146.71, we see that as a result of the year's operations there was a decrease in the net debt of Canada of $3,371,117.79. This question of the public debt is at all times one of much interest. Occasionally we have had the happy privilege of calling attention to a reduction of the public debt, but on every occasion when I have had to speak of that I have taken the precaution to warn the House and the country that it would not be reasonable to expect, in a country like Canada, that we should have frequent reductions of the public debt. Indeed, it may surprise some hon. gentlemen who are not familiar with our affairs to be told that in the whole history of confederation there have been only six years during which there have been reductions in the public debt. One of these reductions stands to the credit of Sir Francis Hincks, away back in 1871. Another stands to the credit of Sir Leonard Tilley in 1882. The remaining four have occurred in recent years and can be claimed by the present administration. A moderate increase in the public debt from time to time is to be expected and would be quite defensible. I think it must be a cause of surprise to many persons, and even to our critics, to know that after the lapse of 10¾ years of the present administration there has been such a very small addition to the public debt. During that period we have carried on large operations. We have provided very liberally for that portion of our public expenditure which is 'chargeable to consolidated fund.' We have provided generously for the public service—perhaps my hon. friends opposite would use the stronger word, 'lavishly.' We have provided for our capital and special expenditure. We have expended $127,000,000, apart from the ordinary charges, on what is called the capital and special account. Yet notwithstanding all these liberal allowances for all the public services, notwithstanding the large capital and special expenditure, notwithstanding the liberality with which all branches of the public services have been maintained, notwithstanding the energy carried into the development of our public works, we find ourselves at the end of this 10¾ year period with an addition to the public debt amounting to only $5,174,427. If it were not for the special item of the National Transcontinental Railway, which every hon. gentleman will admit is of exceptional character, we would find that during the 10¾ years we have had no increase of the public debt whatever, but a very considerable surplus over expenditures of every kind. If we look into the question of the debt in its relation to the population of the country, which is a very fair way to look at it, we find reason for believing that Canada is very modest in the matter of incurring public debt. As the country increases its population, we, of course, increase in ability to bear the burden. If the increase of the public debt should simply keep pace with the increase of population and the development of our resources, there would be nothing to complain of. But when we are able to show that from the point of view of the

debt per head there has been no increase, but in reality an actual decrease of the public debt per head, I think it will be admitted that we are making a very gratifying statement. Beginning at the year 1891 and taking the figures of the population as furnished from time to time by our census department, we find that the net debt of Canada per head stands as follows:

NET DEBT PER CAPITA.

| | |
|---|---|
| June 30, 1891 | 49·09 |
| " 1892 | 49·15 |
| " 1893 | 48·96 |
| " 1894 | 49·40 |
| " 1895 | 50·57 |
| " 1896 | 50·82 |
| " 1897 | 50·87 |
| " 1898 | 50·77 |
| " 1899 | 50·62 |
| " 1900 | 49·88 |
| " 1901 | 49·84 |
| " 1902 | 49·59 |
| " 1903 | 46·84 |
| " 1904 | 45·74 |
| " 1905 | 45·63 |
| " 1906 | 44·63 |
| March 31, 1907 | 42·84 |

I take as the estimate of population for the last date mentioned, 31st March, the figures furnished by our Census Department as 6,153,789.

The fiscal year for 1907-8 will close within a few days, on the 31st of March, according to the new system. In England the fiscal year is closed on the same date; and they are able to close up the business of the year very quickly. In fact I think it is the practice there to take the accounts as they actually stand on that date and declare the result immediately. That can be done in a country like England, with a comparatively small area and with nearly perfect means of communication. But with us in Canada, with a vast territory, and in some cases at least imperfect means of communication, it has been found necessary to make a liberal allowance in closing up the accounts. The Audit Act permits three months; we do not usually take the whole of three months; the practice in late years is to close up the accounts in about six weeks from the close of the year. Although we are now close at the end of the year, it is not easy to make a very close estimate for the reason that all over the Dominion, with vast distances, there are accounts still to be rendered. Still we are so near the end of the year that we ought to be able to make our estimate somewhat closer than usual. Our revenue to the 29th of February for the current year amounted to $87,601,299. For the remainder of the year we make a conservative estimate, for we are aware that at the present time there is some check upon business activity. We place the revenue for the year at $96,500,000. The expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund up to the 29th of February was $60,720,353. Making a reasonable allowance for the expenditure to the close of the year, we think the total outlay of the year chargeable to the consolidated fund will reach $77,500,000. If these figures be realized, with a revenue of $96,500,000 and an expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund of $77,500,000, we shall have for this year the magnificent surplus of $19,000,000. That will be a larger surplus than in any previous year.

Coming now to our capital and special expenditure, we have to estimate that on a pretty liberal scale, for we are now engaged in the construction of large works. We estimate our capital and special expenditure for the current year at $33,000,000. This will make our expenditure of every kind for the year $110,500,000. If we deduct from this our estimated revenue of $96,500,000 and the sinking fund of about $2,000,000, making $98,500,000, we shall find that there will be a balance at the end of the year to be added to the public debt, of probably $12,000,000. In this present year, in the figures which bring about this result of a possible and probable addition to the public debt of $12,000,000, we shall spend no less than $17,750,000 on the National Transcontinental Railway. If we did not have to make provision for that particularly large and exceptional item, we could close the year, not with an addition to the public debt, but with a reduction of the public debt to the extent of $5,750,000.

I gave the House a few minutes ago the figures of the debt per head up to the 31st of March last, at which time there was a reduction of the public debt. At the end of the current year there will be a considerable addition to the public debt, and therefore it might be thought that would affect adversely the figures I have given of the debt per head. But I believe it is not so. During the past year we have had a particularly large immigration; I believe the population of Canada has increased during the past year very much more than in any previous year in our history, and I have no doubt that if a careful account be taken, it will be found that the increase in population will more than balance this increase in the public debt, and the net result will be that the debt per head at the close of this fiscal year will be no higher than it was in the figures I gave some little while ago.

I have spoken of the expenditure on the National Transcontinental Railway. We have for several years been spending money on that great work. At the beginning of the work the demands upon the public treasury were not great, but we are now reaching a point when the expenditures for that service will and must continue to be large. I find we have expended up to date on the National Transcontinental Railway, that is on the eastern division which the government are constructing, the following sums:

| Year. | Amount. |
|---|---|
| 1904 | $ 6,249 40 |
| 1905 | 778,491 28 |
| 1906 | 1,841,269 95 |
| 1907 | 5,537,867 50 |

Making a total up to the date of the last public accounts, of $8,163,878.13. To this if we add the estimate for the current year, of $17,748,000, we find that at the close of the present fiscal year on the 31st of March, we shall have spent within a few dollars of $26,000,000 on the National Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought my hon. friend was going to build it for $13,000,000.

Mr. FIELDING. That was one of my hon. friend's dreams ; if I wished to be more accurate and more just I would use a harsher word. The total expenditure on the Transcontinental Railway up to the 31st of March, to be exact, according to the actual outlay at the end of last March, and the estimated outlay this year, will be $25,912,-478.13. In considering the question of our increased expenditures it is well to bear in mind that by the amendment of the British North America Act we are now paying to the provincial governments very much larger allowances than were paid in former years. Provincial subsidies have hitherto amounted to $6,745,133 per annum, but under the recent amendment to the British North America Act these provincial subsidies now call for $9,032,774, an increase for that item alone of $2,287,641. That, of course will stand in the general statement of expenditure of this government, but it is to be remembered that it is money which this government does not expend at all, but turns over to the provincial governments of the country to administer it as they think best and, I have no doubt, for the development of their respective provinces.

The trade returns for the eleven months which have passed are by no means discouraging. The total imports for eleven months to February 29, 1907, were $308,-264,306; for the corresopnding eleven months to February 29, 1908, the imports were $341,175,095.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these imports for home consumption ?

Mr. FIELDING. These are the total imports. The total exports for the eleven months of 1907 were $266,076,601 ; for the eleven months of 1908 they were $261,434,-521. It will be seen from this statement that the imports have somewhat increased and that the exports show a slight decrease, but on the whole the statement of the trade up to the present time is by no means discouraging, although I quite realize that we are now at the stage when there must be some falling off in our revenue.

Mr. FIELDING.

FISCAL YEAR 1908-9.

Turning now to the fiscal year 1908-1909, upon which we shall soon enter, I think I am correct when I say that the general feeling of our business men is one of hopeful confidence united with much caution. We are just emerging from a period of world wide financial stringency. Financial systems and institutions of all countries have been severely tried. It should be a gratification to us all that none have stood the test better than those of Canada. In the single case in which one of our banks became embarrassed, sister institutions promptly took over its affairs and its business went on without the slightest hitch so far as the public interests were concerned. One of the conditions which accentuated the difficulties in the neighbouring republic was, fortunately, unknown here. I refer to what is called the hoarding of money. In the United States men lost faith in financial institutions and withdrew their money and locked it up. Happily nothing of the kind occurred in Canada. There was a justifiable confidence in our banking institutions. Where money was withdrawn it was not to be hoarded, but to be applied to investment or other useful purposes. The curtailment of credit naturally produced some embarrassments. But even out of this condition good may come. There was danger that the rapid expansion might lead to overtrading and imprudent ventures. It is as well, perhaps, that all concerned should be warned against such things. Business has received a check, but I do not look for a continued period of depression. Conditions should improve in the early summer, and if we are blessed with a season of good crops confidence will be fully restored.

On the part of the government it is a time for caution, and yet a time for courage. Large new enterprises, which would call for great outlay, may well be laid aside for a little while. But the works which we already have in hand, and perhaps other works not calling for heavy outlay, must not be neglected. Particularly must we not fail to push forward the great enterprise of the Transcontinental Railway. We have reached a stage in that enterprise which calls for heavy expenditure, yet we feel it our duty to urge upon the commissioners the prosecution of the work so that the new road may be completed at the earliest possible date.

The main estimates for the year, already in the possession of the House, propose to appropriate on account of consolidated fund $76,871,471, and for capital account, $42,-365,620.

Supplementary estimates will come in due course and add considerably to these appropriations. It must be remembered, however, that the estimates do not usually by any means represent the actual expen-

diture. A considerable portion of the appropriations of every year remains unexpended and the works concerned are provided for in the following year.

As to the probable revenue for the coming year I would wish to speak with caution. The monetary stringency is producing a curtailment of imports. Some of my hearers will not regard that as a misfortune. I anticipate a falling off in our revenue in the early part of the new year. I am hopeful that later on the loss will, to a considerable extent, be made up and that in the end we shall find the revenue fairly satisfactory. I am estimating a revenue of $96,500,000, for the year soon to close. I do not feel justified in expecting so large a revenue for the coming year. Probably it will be more likely to fall below $90,000,000 than rise above it. Such a revenue would enable us to retain our strong financial position. We should have to be content with a reduction of the surplus. But I would expect the revenue to enable us to provide for all our consolidated fund expenditure and something as well by way of surplus. For our capital expenditure, or a considerable part of it, we shall undoubtedly have to add to our public debt. But, as I have often pointed out, it is unreasonable to expect that in a country like Canada we can carry on our work of development without occasional additions to that debt. If we have to add in the coming year to our debt account, it will not be for ordinary expenditure, but for our work on capital account, and particularly for our great work of the Transcontinental Railway. For that work alone we are asking an appropriation of $30,000,000 for the coming year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. minister if he has an estimate of the total cost of the eastern division of the road ?

Mr. FIELDING. No. Estimates were made in the earlier discussion, but I have not had them revised of late.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Would the hon. minister say at what he estimates the total expenditure ? He mentioned $30,000,000 for the Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not spoken of the capital expenditure for the current year, except for the Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is that ?

Mr. FIELDING. Thirty millions is what we are asking for. Of course, the estimates of the capital expenditure are before the House, but I have referred to this item particularly which is a large one and which seriously affects our finances.

## LOANS.

In regard to the general question of loans, always a matter of interest, we have been exceptionally fortunate in not being required to go very often to the money market. Our large surpluses have from time to time enabled us to meet payments which under ordinary conditions would have necessitated the borrowing of money. We have from time to time borrowed money temporarily on treasury bills, but as I have already pointed out we have added very little to the public debt. Now that we are in the midst of our Transcontinental Railway expenditure it is, of course, to be expected that we must go more frequently to the money market. Besides, we have reached a period in which we have to provide for very considerable maturing loans which have to be renewed, and this will necessitate our turning to the money market. Some have already been provided for and others are the subject of careful consideration and observation of the money market. In the last eight months we have borrowed over $31,000,000 in the London and Paris markets. This money, obtained at a time of financial stringency, was obtained, on the whole, on favourable terms. Some portion was obtained on treasury bills some on short term loans, and some, as in a recent case, on a long term loan.

## MATURED LIABILITIES.

On the 1st May, 1907, there fell due in London £1,831,398 1s. 5d. This represented a portion of the 4 per cent loan originally issued in 1874, which matured on the 1st May, 1904, and which was extended for three years from that date. On the 1st May, 1907, it was extended for a further period of four years to the 1st May, 1911, at the same rate of interest and with the same option to that offered to the holders in 1904, namely, the option of conversion into 3 per cent stock due 1938 ; the basis of conversion being £105 of threes for each £100 of fours, the option to expire on the 1st April, 1910.

This option was availed of to some extent by those who extended their holdings in 1904. The extension in 1904 amounted to £2,500,000. The balance between that and the amount extended in 1907 represents the conversion into 1938 stock.

On the 1st December, 1906, $500,000 3½ per cent Canadian currency debentures matured and were paid off at Ottawa on presentation. These debentures were originally issued on the 1st December, 1891.

## TEMPORARY BORROWING.

To provide for expenditure in connection with the Transcontinental Railway and other expenditures which could not be met out of the revenue, a temporary loan of £500,000 was made on treasury bills on the 17th August, 1907, for one year at the rate of 4½ per cent.

In December a short term loan for £1,500,000, to fall due 1st October, 1912, and bear-

ing 4 per cent interest, was negotiated; and on the 24th January a further temporary loan of £1,000,000 on treasury bills was made for one year at 4¼ per cent.

On the 6th February, 1907, a further temporary loan on the security of treasury bills was negotiated for $2,000,000 at the rate of 4 per cent for one year, one million of which was discounted by the Banque de Paris et de Pays Bas and the other million by the Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien. It was felt that at the time these temporary loans were made it would not be in the public interest, on account of the unsatisfactory state of the money market and the high rates of interest prevailing, to make a loan of a more permanent character. Conditions, however, have recently improved, and as on the 1st April, 1908, the Intercolonial guaranteed 4 per cent loan of £1,500,000 matures, it was thought advisable in providing for this at the same time to provide a further amount of £1,500,000, or £3,000,000 in all, the rate of interest being 3½ per cent. This loan is redeemable on the 1st July, 1950, with the option to the government to redeem at par on or after the 1st July, 1930, on giving six months' notice. Holders of the £1,500,000 4 per cent guaranteed Intercolonial Railway bonds maturing the 1st April, 1908, were given the option of exchanging their bonds for an equivalent nominal amount of this stock. The issue price of the loan was par and the amount was over-subscribed. Holders to the amount of £1,123,000 of the bonds maturing 1st April, 1908, exchanged for bonds of an equal nominal amount of the new loan.

To sum up, the following amounts have been borrowed temporarily since 17th August:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Treasury bills.. .. .. .. | £1,500,000= | $7,300,000 |
| Short term loan.. .. .. .. | 1,500,000= | 7,300,000 |
| Treasury bills.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | | 2,000,000 |
| In all.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | | $16,600,000 |
| To which must be added the long term loan of .. .. .. .. | £3,000,000= | 14,600,000 |
| Or a total of.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | | $31,200,000 |

A very interesting feature to which I wish to call the attention of the House is that the people over there who invest in Canadian securities seem to be fond of their Canadian investments and stay with them, and so when they are offered an opportunity of exchanging an expiring loan for a new one, in a great many instances they have come forward and simply continued their investment with Canada.

EARLY MATURING LIABILITIES.

On the 1st November, 1908, a 4 per cent loan of 1878-9 of £4,500,000 falls due. The amount of sinking fund of the loan is £1,128,014. This is a large obligation to be met, and due regard must be had to it in arranging our financial affairs. It is hoped that the summer will see still more improvement in the market conditions. Such arrangements will be made to meet the obligation as will be considered best in the public interest.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has not said anything about the overdraft, I think about £300,000, which he mentioned earlier and which was paying Bank of England rate.

Mr. FIELDING. I mentioned in an earlier discussion this session that there was an overdraft from our financial agents in London, and the arrangements which have been standing for some time have been that the bank charges us the current bank rates on overdrafts. It so happened that an overdraft occurred at a time when the bank rate stood remarkably high—higher than for the previous thirty years—the rate being 7 per cent. According to the letter of the understanding the bank might have required 7 per cent, but as the result of negotiations between the bank and myself the rate was fixed at 6 per cent for the short time during which the overdraft existed. The overdraft has since been paid off and it does not now form any part of our indebtedness.

I shall say a word now with regard to certain financial transactions between the government and the Quebec Bridge Company.

It will be remembered that last session the government took authority to advance money to the bridge company. The government had previously obtained from parliament authority to issue a guarantee of bonds to assist the bridge company. These bonds were prepared with a view to being sold in the money market, but the money market conditions proving unfavourable the bonds were not sold, but were used as a basis on which the company could raise money from the banks, and the money to carry on the bridge work for some considerable time was raised in that way.

It became apparent to the government that we would probably have to take over the bridge. Although no Act to that effect has ever passed we have the power in our legislation to take over the bridge provided parliament shall authorize it. That is to say, as between the government and the bridge company we have the right to take over the bridge, but we can only take it over when authorized by parliament. I think the general tendency of discussion has been towards the taking over of the bridge. Now, it appeared to us in that view, if these bonds had to be sold in an unfavourable money market at a sacrifice we might be obliged to buy them back in a few years at par, and we thought that in view of the shape the bridge question was taking it was better that these bonds should not be issued and that the company should arrange in some other way. Accordingly at the last session of parliament we ob-

tained authority to advance to the bridge company the amount required in the same way that we advance it to the Montreal Harbour Commission, taking over the bonds of the corporation and holding them as against the loans. We were proceeding to take action under that authority with a view of advancing the money to the company, and thus enabling them to close their transactions with the bank, when just at that particular stage the bridge disaster occurred, and for the time being further action was suspended. However, the reasons which prompted the presenting of the legislation last session still continue. We all recognize the fact that the bridge has to be completed and the general indications are that the government will have to take the enterprise over. How they may manage it and handle it is a question that has yet to be dealt with. At all events, with the fair presumption that the government will have to take the bridge over, it seems to me that the reason still holds good that we should not allow these bonds to be sold in the market at a sacrifice. We have therefore, determined to carry out the legislation of last session. We have recently advanced $2,000,000 to the bridge company to enable it to pay a part of its indebtedness to the bank. We are arranging to carry out the Act of last year to the fullest extent by giving them as soon as it can be arranged the balance of the money required. The bonds will then be entirely released; the bank will not any longer have any claim upon them; they will rest in the vaults of the government and the debt will become a debt to the government just as the debt of the Montreal Harbour Commission.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the claim of the bank ?

Mr. FIELDING. The amount advanced by the bank was $5,016,453, to which some interest of course has to be added. We have recently advanced to the company $2,000,000 and we shall in a short time arrange to pay them the balance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to say how much the country will have put into the bridge when that transaction will have been consummated in the way he has just mentioned ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid I cannot give a definite answer. We appropriated a subsidy, a part of which was paid, but when the Guarantee Act was passed, if I recollect aright, we cancelled the balance. The money actually paid in, as I have described the transaction, will be $5,016,000, with interest, plus that portion of the subsidy which was originally paid, but the amount of which I cannot state.

Mr. MILLER. $374,353.

Mr. FIELDING. I know there was $1,000,000 voted, a portion of which was paid, and the rest was cancelled by the guarantee. I think my hon. friend asked about the rate of interest. The rate of interest arranged by the bridge company with the bank, I understood, was 4½ per cent.

Mr. BRISTOL. Was there not some agreement between the Bank of Montreal, the government and the bridge company whereby 5 per cent was to be paid ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think so. It may be that the bridge company agreed to pay that rate, and if so I do not think the government objected. I do not recollect any special agreement about it.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister know whether the bridge company has any outstanding debts other than the bank advances ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not given the matter close attention lately and am not able to answer definitely, but I understand that all the funds for the purpose of the bridge have been obtained from the Bank of Montreal and are included in this debt. There may be amounts of which I have no knowledge.

Mr. AMES. In the amount of $30,000,000 which the minister says will be required for the Transcontinental Railway for the coming year, does he include the amount required for the bridge ?

Mr. FIELDING. No. The Quebec bridge, while it has a relation to the Transcontinental Railway, is for this purpose treated separately.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the government any estimate of the additional expenditure required to complete the Quebec bridge ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, that is a branch of the subject to which I have not given my attention. I am only explaining our financial transactions. That will come under the Department of Railways and Canals.

On one or two occasions in previous years I have presented to the House diagrams illustrative of the progress of Canada. I have had similar diagrams prepared for the current year, and they will be distributed in due course. I will present, however, figures which will show at a glance the great progress Canada has made in a comparatively few years. I take statistics illustrating thirty years of the progress of Canada :

**Total Trade**

| | |
|---|---|
| Year ended June 30, 1877.. .. .. .. | $175,203,355 |
| 1887.. .. .. .. .. | 202,408,047 |
| 1897.. .. .. .. .. | 257,168,862 |
| 1907.. .. .. .. .. | 617,964,952 |

Total Imports.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Year ended June 30, | 1877 | $ 99,327,962 |
| | 1887 | 112,892,236 |
| | 1897 | 119,218,609 |
| | 1907 | 359,793,278 |

Total Exports.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Year ended June 30, | 1877 | $ 75,875,393 |
| | 1887 | 89,515,811 |
| | 1897 | 137,950,253 |
| | 1907 | 258,171,674 |

Total Trade with Great Britain.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Year ended June 30, | 1877 | $ 74,823,292 |
| | 1887 | 83,455,681 |
| | 1897 | 98,935,040 |
| | 1907 | 208,745,193 |

Railway traffic—Tons carried.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Year ended June 30, | 1877 | 6,859,796 |
| | 1887 | 16,356,335 |
| | 1897 | 25,300,331 |
| | 1907 | 63,866,133 |

Bank discounts.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Year ended June 30, | 1877 | $126,222,470 |
| | 1887 | 169,357,326 |
| | 1897 | 226,960,482 |
| | 1907 | 639,970,696 |

Deposits by the people in the Chartered Banks.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Year ended June 30, | 1877 | $ 62,129,706 |
| | 1887 | 107,154,483 |
| | 1897 | 201,141,688 |
| | 1907 | 589,459,889 |

Deposits in the Post Office and Government Savings Banks.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Year ended June 30, | 1877 | $ 7,470,630 |
| | 1887 | 40,832,275 |
| | 1897 | 48,934,975 |
| | 1907 | 61,493,671 |

I think, Sir, I should avail myself of this opportunity to give to the House some explanation of the action of the government in connection with what is called the moving of the crops last autumn. I shall find it necessary to present to the House a Bill in a day or two, and before that Bill comes down I shall see that all the papers in connection with the matter shall be laid on the table, so that hon. gentlemen, before being asked to deal with the Bill, will have all the information before them. In the meantime, I may state briefly the history of the transaction. The money stringency, which was general, was particularly severe in our western country. That was natural, for the autumn is its period of greatest activity. At that season very much depends on the arrangements for the moving of the crops to the sea-board. At the beginning of November urgent representations were made to the government that the fiscal arrangements which could be made with the banks were insufficient to provide the means for handling the crops. We were informed that the ordinary lines of credit granted by the banks had either been exhausted or were too limited to meet the emergency. The condition of the crop was another feature to which our attention was called. Unfortunately, a considerable portion of the crop of last season was touched by frost, and its condition, we were advised, was such that it could hardly be carried over the winter with safety. For that and various reasons it seemed to be important that the crops should be moved and we were asked to devise some means of granting aid. Mr. Gladstone, or Lord Beaconsfield, on one occasion when told that something must be done said that evidently the party who said so did not know what ought to be done. I suppose that those who began this movement had no very clear idea of the form in which relief should be granted. I must do the banks the justice, if justice it be, to say that they were not the movers in the matter; they did not initiate the demand for aid. Indeed, it is fair to them to say that when the matter was first mooted, some of our best bankers were inclined to think that there was no need of further aid—that the banking facilities of the country were sufficient to meet all the requirements. However, representations continud to come to us in such form as demanded consideration. One of the first communications the government received on the subject was from one of our trusted officers in the Northwest, the warehouse commissioner, Mr. Castle, a gentleman in every way capable of advising what was the need of the situation. We summoned Mr. Castle to Ottawa and had the benefit of his knowledge and advice. The council of the Winnipeg Board of Trade urged upon us the necessity of taking action; the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association urged that we should take action; in many ways representations were made to us that it was really necessary that something should be done and done quickly. The season of navigation was about to close. Very much depends upon what may be done within the last two or three weeks in moving a crop when it has to be moved almost wholly by water—for only a limited quantity of this crop is moved all-rail. We came to the conclusion that the subject was one that we could not afford to set aside. Our bankers, who at first, were very dubious about it and thought it not necessary, modified their views, and advised the government that some such action as proposed should be taken. The conclusion of the whole matter was that we decided that we would aid such of the banks as were engaged in the grain trade, and might wish to avail themselves of the assistance, with loans not to exceed in the aggregate $10,000,000. When this matter was first announced, the banks, as I say, did not look upon it with too much favour, and were slow to take advantage of it. We had proposed that the rates of interest to be paid to the government for this loan should be 6 and 7 per cent. These are, undoubtedly, high rates of interest, but they were no higher than the Bank of England rate at that time, for it was then 7 per cent. So we decided to authorize the advance of this money to the banks on condition that they

should repay it within a short time at the rates of interest stated, and should put up securities for the loan which were to be submitted to a committee of banking experts whom I named for that purpose. The gentlemen whom I named were: Mr. Clouston, of the Bank of Montreal: Mr. Thomas Fyshe, former manager of the Merchants' Bank; and Mr. J. M. Courtney, ex-deputy Minister of Finance.

In a short time, an intimation was given to us that the banks were hardly willing to utilize the order in council under the proposed conditions. They said that the rates of interest were so high as to give them no profit. Much of the explanation was given me in conversation, of course, because banks do not like to put themselves on record in these things. It was intimated also that they were unwilling to put up securities in the hands of the government, as it would expose their business affairs to the inspection of the government. Therefore, it seemed that there was some doubt whether the banks would avail themselves fully of the aid we desired to give. The movement we had in view could only be made successful through the co-operation of the banks, so when we found hesitation on their part, we thought we should try to meet their objection. Some, proud of the strength of our banking institutions, were inclined to think that if a bank accepted aid of this kind from the government it would be a reflection on that bank. That was a mistaken view, of course; but still I know that there was hesitation on that account. Therefore, we decided to modify our arrangement, and let the banks have the money, if they wished to take it, at a lower rate of interest. Under the new arrangement, we allowed the Bank of Montreal to deal directly with the banks, the Bank of Montreal acting as our agent. They were to arrange matters with the banks and collect a rate of interest not less than 4 per cent. That was ultimately agreed upon as meaning 4 per cent for sixty days; 5 per cent for a second sixty days, and 6 per cent if payment was delayed longer. The object was to get quick returns, as this was an exceptional transaction.

I am inclined to think that if we had done nothing more than announce the intention to grant this aid much help would have been given, by that simple act, to the west. I have the opinion of eminent bankers who have told me that, as soon as it was announced that the government intended to provide relief for the situation, confidence in the west was restored, that bankers who had been curtailing their credits took a more generous view of the situation, and things began to improve. It has been stated in the public press that nothing was done under this arrangement, that the government did not give any money to the banks, or the banks to the people; that the whole thing was a misunderstanding—and I am afraid that sometimes even harder words were used. But I am glad to be able to say to the House that much was done under the arrangement. We found, after we had reduced the rates of interest in the manner I have described that the banks did take the funds thus offered to them by the government to the extent of $5,315,000. Nearly all of this money has now been returned. At this moment about $965,000 remains outstanding, and there can be no question that the balance will be promptly paid. What threatened to be a serious crisis in the financial situation of the west was averted, confidence was restored, the situation was improved, and the interests of the government were protected at every point.

Now came the question how we could provide this money. We do not have $10,000,000 always lying idle in the treasury of Canada; and, at a moment when the Bank of England rate was 7 per cent, it was not easy to borrow money quickly—and this was a transaction which required prompt handling, if we could borrow at all.

Mr. FOSTER. When did the Bank of England raise its rate to 7?

Mr. FIELDING. Early in November. It was 7 per cent when this transaction occurred. I am sure of that, for it was the basis of our proceedings. It was raised to 7 in November, and continued until January, if my recollection serves me well. There had been no such banking rate for thirty-four years, that is, the last experience of such a rate had been in the year 1873. It was obvious that, if the government attempted to borrow this money hurriedly in England, it might not be able to borrow it at all, for, in the existing state of the market, it was not a question of credit but of being able to secure the money on any terms. And, even though we could borrow, the borrowing might have a bad effect upon the general credit of Canada for a long time It seemed a case where the government might be justified in impairing to a small extent the reserves held against the redemption of Dominion notes. Any part of the $10,000,000 required could be furnished in the shape of Dominion notes, which we should issue in the usual way: but the issue of that amount of notes would carry us to a figure beyond our gold reserve. Though I speak of our gold reserve, it is not, in Canada, entirely gold, but is in part imperial guaranteed debentures, but I treat the two as one. We found that it was necessary, if we would provide this money promptly, in some degree to affect the position of our reserve. We decided to accept from the borrowing banks the securities they were able to give us, plus the guarantee of the Bank of Montreal—that is, the Bank of Montreal not only acted as our agent, but we required them to guarantee the whole transaction—so as I say, we agreed to accept these securities, plus the

guarantee of the Bank of Montreal as equivalent to the guaranteed debentures which we hold in our reserve fund and against which our notes are issued. It was a technical departure from our Dominion Notes Act which will require the ratification and approval of this parliament. But I think I will be justified in saying that if ever there was an occasion when the government might put a strain upon that question of their reserve, it was in the condition of affairs then existing and for the purpose which I have indicated. The highest point reached by the circulation was on December 31 when it was $62,623,628. This included the extra issue. But for this extra issue, the circulation would have been $57,500,000 and the reserve of gold and guaranteed debentures held against this would have been equal to 61 per cent. The effect of the issue was to reduce our percentage of reserve to 56 per cent, a difference of 5 per cent. For this 5 per cent reduction in our reserve we had the securities put up by all the banks to which the money was advanced, and we had, in addition to that, the guarantee of the Bank of Montreal. Thus I think it will be found that while there was a technical departure from the law governing our Dominion notes, which calls for ratification by the parliament of Canada if parliament shall so approve, still the occasion was a very exceptional one and one upon which we were justified in adopting exceptional methods. Even putting aside the securities to which I have referred, we still had, at the worst point, a reserve of 56 per cent of our total issue, which most financiers will say is a very strong position.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the date of these advances, when the loans were made?

Mr. FIELDING. The order in council was passed on November 12, and the advances followed on towards the latter part of November. I could not give the dates but I will see that, in the papers brought down, the dates are given.

The experience that we have had, the difficulties of the past season, must suggest to us all, particularly to those from the west, that there is some need of greater elasticity of our currency so that we will be able to meet a difficulty of this kind in the future, without even a technical violation of our currency laws. I think the best form in which we can do that is by extending the powers of the banks with respect to the issue of their circulation. I think it well to state at once my view in that matter and this statement will be followed in due course by a Bill amending the Bank Act. It seems to me to be the part of wisdom for the government to authorize the banks to issue what, for convenience, may be called an 'emergency currency,' (using an expression frequently employed in the United States) to allow the banks to issue for a limited time, during the crop movement, the season of emergency, currency to the extent of 15 per cent of their combined paid up capital and rest or reserve, these taken together measuring the strength and stability of a bank. I propose in a Bill which it is my intention to introduce to authorize the banks during the emergency period of crop movement which would be defined, beginning probably in October and ending after the turn of the year, to issue circulation to the extent of 15 per cent of their combined reserve and paid-up capital.

Mr. PRINGLE. Will the minister then increase the deposit which the bank will be required to put up to protect the note holder ?

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, yes, certainly. For every note a bank issues, it must put up proper deposit in the guarantee fund.

It may be thought that we would get the necessary additional currency by an increase of the bank capital That is a very desirable form of increase, and if we could rely upon the increase of the bank capital perhaps the other method would not be called for. Our bank capital has increased to a considerable extent, as will be seen by these figures for five year periods:

| Year. | Bank Capital. |
|---|---|
| 1895 | $61,701,007 |
| 1900 | 64,735,145 |
| 1905 | 82,199,900 |
| 1908 (January 31) | 93,057,255 |

This indicates a very considerable increase in the banking capital of the country; but in proportion to the increase in the trade of Canada the increase of the banking capital has not been large. Our home trade has largely increased as we know, but we have not statistics which will accurately measure that trade. Our foreign trade, for which we have accurate statistics, has enormously increased. In 1895 our foreign trade was $224,000,000 and in 1907 it was $617,000,000. Thus the trade of the country has enormously increased while the banking capital has, relatively, increased in a less degree.

The explanation of that of course is that the savings of the people in the way of deposits have furnished the money that has enabled the banks to handle this very large business. But the savings of the people, large and generous as they have been, are proving insufficient now to handle the business, and I think, in view of the fact that the banking capital has increased so slowly, we must look for help in the form which I have suggested. It is well to remember that the increase of bank capital may bring with it embarrassment as well as aid. Our banking capital is owned in Canada, very largely.

Mr. W F. MACLEAN. Why should it not be owned very largely abroad?

Mr. FIELDING. That is another question.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That should be the object of legislation.

Mr. FIELDING. Our banking capital is largely owned in Canada, a small percentage being owned abroad. The people in Canada who own the banking capital will probably find their surplus moneys locked up at the present time in various forms, they may be in bank deposits or in business enterprises; to call upon them to put up new capital might simply mean the transferring of money from one form of investment to another and this might be a cause of embarrassment to the shareholders, who might not be able to comply with the demand for increased capital. Of course if we can sell the bank shares abroad, as has been done in some cases, and bring in new capital, that would be the better condition, but then we have no guarantee that that can be done. While we have something to hope from the enlargement of the bank capital, because some large banks have already made application for the necessary authority and will undoubtedly increase their capital, I do not think we are justified in the belief that even with this increased capital we shall get enough money to handle the immensly increasing business of Canada. We therefore propose as a reserve fund, if I may so call it, to allow the banks to have this power of issuing a special circulation to the extent and on the basis I have mentioned.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN How much would that be on the present capital of the banks ?

Mr. FIELDING. The total paid up capital is $93,057,255. The total rest or reserve is $71,071,984. These two items combined, the capital paid up and the rest or reserve, make $164,129,239. Fifteen per cent of this would amount to $24,619,385. It is fair to say, however, that all the banks would not avail themselves of that privilege. Some of the banks are engaged in lines of business which move regularly and smoothly and probably they would not desire to engage in this crop movement business which calls for expansion. However that may be, it will be seen that the addition to the circulation last autumn of five or six million dollars was a great help and enabled us to tide over what would otherwise have been perhaps a serious difficulty in the west. We think that if we give the banks the power to issue this circulation we shall be doing something to meet a difficulty which has existed and which we may expect to exist in a less degree in the future. I do not expect that such a severe condition as that of last fall will occur very soon again. Our object in this is not to give the banks additional privileges, but additional means of meeting the country's demands, and we propose that on this extra circulation which they are to be allowed to issue they shall pay a tax to the government not to exceed 5 per cent. If banks are to handle the business —banks as a rule are not benevolent enterprises, they will expect a reasonable profit— they could afford to pay the government 5 per cent, in some conditions 4 per cent, if the market is favourable, and then lend the money to their customers at ordinary business rates. However, we do not feel that we should grant them this privilege for nothing, and we require them to pay a tax to the government not to exceed 5 per cent upon the circulation which is thus to be issued.

We propose to make some important changes in the excise laws, but they are not intended to affect the revenue. We propose to readjust the taxation on tobacco. There is a well known expression : Readjustment without increase. This, I think, is entirely a case of that kind. At all events, we do not aim at increase ; we aim to so readjust the tobacco duties as to meet the conditions which have arisen, but without adding anything to the burden of taxation. The first object of the change will be to establish a uniform rate of licenses for tobacco manufacturers instead of the varying rates which now exist. The second object will be to carry a larger part of the burden of taxation on the raw leaf as it is introduced into the manufacture of tobacco; and the third purpose is to establish a uniform stamp for cigars. The resolutions bearing on that subject will be introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, and I shall lay them on the table at the conclusion of my remarks. But I may present at once a summary of the changes proposed. It will be observed that some of them seem to be very important, but they work out so as to leave the burden of taxation substantially as it is to-day :

MEMORANDUM ON TOBACCO DUTIES.—EXCISE.

| | Present Rates. | Proposed Rates. |
|---|---|---|
| | $ cts. | $ cts. |
| Chewing and smoking tobacco from imported leaf....per lb. | 25 | 5 |
| Manufactured tobacco from native leaf.. .. .. .. ..per lb. | 5 | 5 |
| Snuff containing not more than 40 per cent of moisture..per lb | 25 | 5 |
| Moist snuff containing over 40 per cent moisture, in packages of less than five pounds. per lb | 25 | 5 |
| The same, in packages of five pounds and over.... ..per lb. | 18 | 5 |
| Cigars from imported leaf..per thousand. | 6 00 | 2 00 |
| Cigars from native tobacco..per thousand. | 3 00 | 2 00 |
| Cigars in packages of less than ten each.. .. ..per thousand. | 7 00 | 3 00 |
| Cigarettes from domestic leaf weighing not more than three pounds per thousand.. ..per thousand. | 1 50 | 2 40 |

| | Present Rates. | Proposed Rates |
|---|---|---|
| | $ cts. | $ cts. |
| Cigarettes from foreign leaf weighing not more than three pounds per thousand.. ..per thousand. | 3 00 | 2 40 |
| Cigarettes from either foreign or native leaf, weighing more than three pounds per thousand.. .. .. ..per thousand. | 8 00 | 7 00 |
| Foreign leaf tobacco, unstemmed.. .. .. .. ..per lb. | 10 | 28 |
| Foreign leaf tobacco, stemmed. per lb. | 14 | 42 |

It is not intended that this change of rates shall take effect immediately. It will be necessary for the department to equip itself with a quantity of new stamps to meet the new conditions, and in the resolutions I shall present it will be proposed that these rates shall take effect and go into operation by proclamation of the Governor in Council. As it is not intended that the burden of taxation shall be in any respect varied, it is thought that there will be no disadvantage in pursuing that course.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is there any change in the spirit duties?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has read us what he proposes as the rates, but he has not given us any reason for the changes.

Mr. FIELDING. I said the reasons were, first, a desire to have a uniform license instead of a varying license; in the second place, a desire to have a uniform stamp rather than the varying stamps they now use in the cigar trade; in the third place, the desire is to have the tax on the raw leaf rather than on the manufactured article. The taxation will be collected on the raw leaf to a larger extent than it is at present. This, we think, will be a convenience to the department, and it is in accordance with the wish of a large proportion of the people interested in the tobacco trade. However, I will put the resolutions in full on the table, they will appear on the Order Paper, and my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue will deal with them at a later stage.

Coming now, in conclusion, to the question of the customs tariff, I have to say that we do not propose to make any changes in it at present. We made a revision of the tariff a year ago, and while I do not imagine that it is a perfect instrument, we think that on the whole it has worked well and is well adapted to the requirements of the country. Some industries have made representations that things are not quite as well in their line as they would like to have them, and they would be glad to have some change. I do not suppose that we shall ever reach a time when there will not be some persons who think that there should be a change, that present conditions are not all they wish. There is always a disposition to feel that when any business difficulty arises the proper remedy is to be found in a higher tariff. One would think that what is occurring across the line to the south of us would go far to dispel that old-time heresy. Over there they have the benefit, if it be a benefit, of a much higher tariff than we have in Canada. We know that the conditions of business over there during the past few months have been very much worse than they have been with us. However that may be, we think that the Canadian tariff is in a pretty fair condition, and we think that those who have made representations to us with a view to a change—in some respects, possibly not in all—will find that as general business improves, as we think it will in a short time, their disadvantages will disappear and their industry will have all the encouragement that it reasonably requires.

One deputation came to us at the eleventh hour. Yesterday we were waited upon by a deputation of quite a number of gentlemen largely interested in the production of pork, who complained to us that the peculiar conditions existing at the present time in relation to their trade placed them at a disadvantage. They seemed to think that to some extent at least that disadvantage arose from an evasion of the customs laws as respects the importation of foreign pork; and they seemed to think that if the customs laws were more rigidly carried out in respect to the dumping clause, they would get some measure of relief. Whether they are correct in their impression as to the cause of the evil is a matter to be inquired into. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs has taken that matter up with a view to looking into it very carefully, and if there has been any failure on the part of the customs to administer the law properly, I am sure the Minister of Customs will be glad to find a remedy. The production of pork, particularly of bacon and hams, has become in Canada a very large and important trade, and we should be very careful to see that everything possible is done to encourage it. I am hopeful that the result of the investigation by the Minister of Customs and of the application of the law, if necessary, in a stricter form, will give these gentlemen the relief that they desire.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Does the minister mean by that that the Chicago article is now flooding the Canadian market?

Mr. FIELDING. The complaint made is that a considerable quantity is coming in and sold at prices that they cannot fairly compete with; they suggested that there was something illegitimate in the prices.

Mr. BRODER. Was the deputation composed of people outside the trade?

Mr. FIELDING. They were chiefly representing the farming interests, I believe,

and I think some of the gentlemen were more or less connected with the packing trade, too. However, these representations came to us only yesterday, and I do not now say more than they are receiving the careful consideration and attention of the government.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Does the new French treaty have any effect on this trade?

Mr. FIELDING. No; the new French treaty is not yet in operation. But if I had any occasion to mention it, I should recall the fact that my hon. friend condemned the treaty and voted for it.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the House to understand that this was a representation of the farmers or of the pork packers that met the hon. minister yesterday?

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that the deputation was chiefly representing the farming interest. Although there were one or two gentlemen having some interest in the packing trade the farmers' interest was the one most strongly represented to us.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Does the hon. the Minister think that Canadian packers would prefer to sell American products as Canadian products if they could bring them in here cheaply?

Mr. FIELDING. I think that the Canadian packers would not prefer to bring in American pork to sell as Canadian and to sends it across the water and get the benefit of the great reputation that Canadian pork has. If that has been done I trust that between my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) there is some machinery to prevent it.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the tendency in late years has been to let the House be content with a budget speech not so long as some of us have, in times past imposed upon it and I thought that I would be content with a somewhat concise statement of the financial position of the country and not having any tariff changes as respects customs to propose there is no reason why I should continue my remarks. I therefore beg to move:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved that it is expedient that the Inland Revenue Act be amended as follows:

1. That section 275 of the said Act be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

275. The person in whose favour a license for manufacturing tobacco or cigars is granted, shall, upon receiving such license pay to the collector the sum of fifty dollars.

2. That section 279 of the said Act be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

279. There shall be imposed, levied and collected on tobacco and cigars manufactured in Canada, the following duties of excise, which shall be paid to the collector as by this Act provided, that is to say:

(a) on all chewing and smoking tobacco, fine-cut, cavendish, plug or twist, cut or granulated, of every description,—on tobacco twisted by hand or reduced into a condition to be consumed or, in any manner other than the ordinary mode of drying and curing, prepared for sale or consumption, even if prepared without the use of any machine or instrument and without being pressed or sweetened, —and on all fine-cut shorts and refuse scraps, cuttings and sweepings of tobacco made from raw leaf tobacco or the product in any form, other than in this Act otherwise provided, of raw leaf tobacco, five cents per pound actual weight;

(b) on common Canadian twist, when made solely from tobacco grown in Canada, and on the farm or premises where grown, by the cultivator duly licensed therefor or in a licensed tobacco manufactory, five cents per pound actual weight;

(c) on all snuff made from raw leaf tobacco, or the product in any form of raw leaf tobacco, or any substitute for tobacco, ground, dry, scented or otherwise, of all descriptions, when prepared for use, five cents per pound actual weight;

(d) snuff flour, when sold or removed for use or consumption, shall pay the same duty as snuff, and shall be put up in packages and stamped in the same manner as herein prescribed for snuff completely manufactured,—except that snuff flour not prepared for use, but which needs to be subjected to further processes, by sifting, pickling, scenting or otherwise, before it is in a condition fit for use or consumption, may be sold by one tobacco manufacturer directly to another tobacco manufacturer, and without the payment of the duty, under such regulations as are provided in that behalf by the department;

(e) on cigars of all descriptions, made from raw leaf tobacco, or any substitute therefor, two dollars per thousand;

(f) on all cigars, when put up in packages containing less than ten cigars each, three dollars per thousand;

(g) on cigarettes made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor, weighing not more than three pounds per thousand, two dollars and forty cents per thousand.

(h) on cigarettes made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor, weighing more than three pounds per thousand, seven dollars per thousand;

(i) on all foreign raw leaf tobacco, unstemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, twenty-eight cents per pound, computed according to the standard of leaf tobacco as hereinbefore established;

(j) on all foreign raw leaf tobacco, stemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, forty-two cents per pound computed according to the standard of leaf tobacco as hereinbefore established.

3. In all tobacco manufactories where less than fifty per cent of Canadian raw leaf tobacco is used and where ten per cent, or more of other materials is used, such materials shall be subject to a duty of sixteen cents per pound actual weight.

4. All stemmed and unstemmed raw leaf tobacco and all materials and articles the pro-

duct in whole or in part of raw leaf tobacco which are in process of manufacture in any tobacco or cigar manufactory licensed to use foreign raw leaf tobacco shall, in addition to the duty already paid upon the raw leaf be subject to the difference between the rate so paid and that hereby imposed, and all other materials in stock in any factory at the time this Act comes into force shall under the conditions of subsection 2 of this section, be subject to the rate of duty therein mentioned, and the quantity upon which such additional duty shall be paid as well as the quantity upon which the percentage of such other materials shall be based shall be determined in such manner as the department directs.

All manufactured tobacco and cigars in bond at the time of the coming into force of this Act shall be subject to the rates of duty thereon now existing, and such rates of duty shall remain in effect so long as any goods in which they apply remain in the bonded warehouse of the manufacturer or any other person.

5. That sections 280 and 281 of the said Act be repealed.

6. That an amendment be made requiring manufacturers of wood alcohol to take out a license and to pay therefor an annual fee of one dollar.

7. That the rates of duty hereby imposed shall come into force and effect upon any such day or days as the Governor General by proclamation directs.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, the new matter which has been brought out by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), during the course of his speech, will be taken up in order in the course of the remarks which I may make to the House. Some of it is quite new and it has been pretty difficult to grasp all the significance of it or even to get the facts down. As to the resolutions, for instance, affecting the excise, they are not very clear unless they have greater explanation, and it is quite impossible for me to take these up and follow them without knowing something more about the facts of the case. The minister's explanations were not very extended as to the reasons why these changes were proposed or as to the particular effects they would have. I propose therefore to address some more general remarks to the House taking up the various points made by the hon. the Minister of Finance during the course of his remarks.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that it has been a very favourite custom of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, in speaking in reference to their administrations in Canada, to do three things. In the first place, they have been very careful to depreciate the condition of affairs as they found it in Canada in 1896 when they came into administrative power; in the second place, they have been equally careful to keep as far as possible in the background the great truth that for the last ten years there has been an exceedingly progressive and prosperous condition as regards business matters, that there have been great activity and development among all the great nations of the world in which world wide progress all the principal countries, and Canada amongst the others, have had their share of the great blessing; in the third place, they have been equally careful to make it appear that what prosperity and progress have come to Canada have been due to the policy of the administration at present in power to which the government of the country changed in 1896. Perhaps I could not better illustrate this than by reading a remark made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) in his place in the House of Commons, not a very long while ago. He proceeds, in the course of his speech, to say:

> From 1891 to 1895, when every one will admit that the national policy was in its decline, when these gentlemen opposite know that the country was not doing as well as it was during the five previous years——

He continues:

> It did not take five years of Liberal rule to make the country prosperous . . . . although the development of production in Canada came quickly and effectively under our policy. During the first few years after we put our policy in force the farmers of Canada began to produce more; the farmers of Canada began to be better off. . . . Then the full effect of our policy came into force; then the country began to feel the full tide of prosperity.

I propose to make that, which might be amplified by speeches from multitudes of partisans and by writings from a great many good party papers, the text of a few remarks by way of recalling to our minds the condition of things in 1896. I think I would be perfectly justified in saying that probably no government ever came into power in Canada at so favourable an opportunity as the government of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in 1896, or found the country in a condition of affairs more broad or stable in its foundations and in its opportunities for progress and development than they found it in 1896. In 1889 and in 1890 a world wide depression commenced and that world wide depression continued for some two, three, or four years striking every considerable country. We do not need to strain our memories to know what took place in the United States of America. Their banks were tumbling in every direction, great industries were putting up their gates, men who had found plenty of employment before were walking the streets asking for employment and finding none and in every grade of business and in every region of industry, there were depression and failure and there were all the consequences which resulted from such conditions. In the Dominion of Canada, to go no further, we felt the effects of the depression, as Canada

always feels the effect of a world wide depression and particularly of a depression which takes place in the country to the south of us. But, it is indisputable that in the Dominion of Canada, during these five years of depression and of hard times, comparatively speaking, this country came through that period with probably better results and in a better condition than any other country in the world. I do not need to go far to give proof of that. I go to our own records. The government of that day helped the country to come through that period of depression with the least evil effects to itself. What did we do? The people were aided in the first place by relief from taxation. In 1890 when the first stress of hard times came the aim of the government was to lighten the load of taxation upon the people and in that year taxation was taken off the common necessaries of life to the amount of $521,755. In 1891, pursuing the same course the government struck the duty entirely off all raw sugar and reduced the duty on refined sugar, and in the years from 1891 to 1895 the relief given to the tax payers in that respect alone was $19,851,995, counting the decreased duties upon a nearly equal consumption.

In 1894 a general reduction of the tariff was made involving a saving to the taxpayers of $1,500,000. So that footing up the relief in the way of lessened taxation granted by the government in these years it amounted to $21,873,750. That was one way by which the people were enabled to retain in their pockets as their earnings and their savings a very large amount of money which might otherwise have been taken out of their pockets and spent in the general services of the country, and which enabled them to meet the stress of hard times in better fashion and to come out in better form.

But, Sir, there was another way in which the government aided in that time of trouble. It economized in expenditures. I think a government should always set an example to the country. I think a government ought to act very largely as a business man or as an individual having a business and a home would act, and economize in the matter of expenditures when depression is on. Well, Sir, in 1889 the total expenditures of this country were $43,518,198.

In 1890 we spent $41,770,332.

In 1891 we spent $40,793,208.

In the five years succeeding we spent on an average in round figures $42,000,000 a year. So that by this economy in expenditure we thereby saved to the country in money which we would have had to have borrowed and the burden of carrying which would have been laid upon the people. As showing the reduction in this respect, in 1891 $41,702,383 was expended as against $43,518,198 in 1889. In these two ways the country was helped to go through the period of stress and by that help it came out all the better.

Take some comparative statistics. The fall from 1890 to 1894 in the exports of Great Britain amounted to £47,000,000; in France, £19,000,000; in Germany, £8,000,000 in the United States, $140,000,000; in Australia, £19,000,000. The fall in the imports of Great Britain in that time amounted to £12,000,000; in France, £13,000,000; in Germany, £10,000,000; in the United States, $170,000,000, and in Australia, £19,000,000. But, Sir, in that period when trade was falling both in imports and exports in all these great countries of the world, Canada came through that period with an import trade just about stationary and with an increase of exports in that period of $17,000,000. Her savings increased in that period by $46,000,000; the mileage of her railways increased 2,700 miles; there was a largely increased business in passengers of 1,100,000; in freight of 750,000 tons; there was an increased shipping return in and out (excluding coasting) of 640,000 tons; an increased coasting trade of 2,700,000 tons. Industries were well sustained; the imports of raw material in their principal parts were very nearly doubled in that time. The exports of manufactured goods increased in that time 35 per cent; the exports of agricultural products were $22,000,000 in 1890 and $36,000,000 in 1895, an increase of 65 per cent, and in agricultural and animal products there was an increase in the exports in that time of 35 per cent.

All know how well our banks stood during all that stress; there was not a single failure. The upward movement was well under way in the latter half of 1895 and continued in 1896. May I give one or two statements with reference to that which may have weight. Probably one of the greatest writers on economic subjects, the Hon. Mr. Wells, of the United States, writing in the 'Forum' in 1894 with reference to the Dominion of Canada and the general depression of trade over the world said:

> In the Dominion of Canada separated from us on the north by an imaginary line there has been no panic, no unusual demand for money, no stoppage of industries, no restriction of trade, no increased rate of interest; in short nothing beyond the ordinary course of events except as far as these events may have been influenced by contiguity to what may be termed a financial cyclone whose pathway of destruction was contiguous to but not within Canadian territory.

I could duplicate that statement by the reports of bank managers, of boards of trade in our own country, and by publicists of equal repute with Mr. Wells in other countries and by copious illustrations from the financial papers of Great Britain, but I do

not care to place these upon the records; they are within the knowledge of all.

So that in 1896 when these gentlemen came into power, Canada strengthened as well as chastened was on the upward grade in that great march of prosperity, that great outburst of progress and development which probably has had no equal in any period of the world's history. All through the world in every great country for the succeeding ten years, in increasing degree there has been this general record of the stimulation and extension of industries of the great employment of labour, of the immense productions of articles manufactured and grown in the soil and taken from the mine and from the sea; in fact, in all the characteristics of great development and of great commercial interchange between the countries. My hon. friends found when they came into power in 1896 a country united from sea to sea, a country united in sentiment. There was not a single question which really separated the people of this country, one part of it from the other. The only troublous question that was on the surface—it was not nearly as deep as it was made to appear—was the question which was largely fanned into life and kept fanned into life by hon. gentlemen opposite, namely, the famous school question which was debated at that time. But that went very little distance to disturb the good, straight, stable relations of this country. Talked a good deal about on the platform, made a hobby by party papers, given a greater value and a greater force than it intrinsically possessed, it would seem at one time to an outsider to have been a question of great disturbing moment. It was not a question that could not be solved by the good sense of the people; and at no time, in my belief, did it threaten a disturbance of the good feeling and unity which existed between the different sections of the people of this country. Our hon. friends found a Northwest, which had passed the stage of experiment, and which, after ten or twelve years of continuous temptation of the soil, so to speak, the learning to adapt methods of culture to the climate and the variations which existed, came out of that period of experimentation, and in 1896 stood as a great producing agricultural country free from any causes of universal or overpowering disaster. That period of experimentation had passed, and the Northwest in 1896 had made its record and its story as a great country promising immense profits to agriculturists. In 1896 the stream of immigration from the United States and from other countries of the world had begun to set towards that country. In 1896 it was traversed by a great trunk line of railway, with a network of parallel and intersecting lines, which afforded excellent means of ingress and egress for people going and coming and for the products that went in and came out. On the Pacific coast there stretched away to China and Japan and the Australian colonies well equipped lines of steam service, which by the way hon. gentlemen opposite always fought when votes were being asked by the government then in power for their establishment; and on the Atlantic side, stretching down towards the West Indies, and going across to the old country, were other well equipped lines of steamship communication. So that in matters of transportation there was a mechanism ready, abundant and well distributed, as a means for the development and growth of the country. The battle of industrial progress and industrial establishment had been fought out in the preceding eighteen years. Year after year it was fought out at the polls. Year after year the people supported the industrial policy, with protection as its principle, and in 1896, despite whatever may have been said or used in the canvass, the principle of industrial establishment and progress in this country was absolutely settled. The best proof of this fact was that when the gentleman who for eighteen years had fought it at the polls, came into power pledged to eliminate the whole principle of protection, they did not essay the task. They adopted the principle and went forward on the lines which had been laid down by the Liberal-Conservative party. In all these respects, the condition of this country in 1896 was not what my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture presented it as being, in the extract which I have read; nor was it anything else than sane and sound. The period of great industrial prosperity and progress had begun to be opened up. So much for that phase of the question.

That was the condition of things our hon. friends found. What was the task that was ready to their hand? It was a task which had not been imposed upon them by the country, but which had been set by themselves. I want to draw particular attention to this point. These gentlemen, during their eighteen years of profession and canvass, in their march towards the seats of power in this country, had outlined their task and had set it before them for accomplishment. What was it, Sir? The task that they had set for themselves was, in the first place, to lighten the burden of taxation, which they declared was grievous. The system of taxation and the amount of taxation was, to use the vivid language of some of the front benchers, bleeding the people of this country white. Another part of their task as set by themselves was to reduce the expenditure of this country. The right hon. gentleman who leads the government himself stood in the city of Toronto before the elections of 1896, and pledged his word that if the people would put him in power he would reduce the expenditure of this country by some millions of dollars, and

would reduce the taxation as well. He was also, with his party, to diminish the public debt, to eliminate the principle of protection, to get for us reciprocity with the United States of America, to secure for us a mutual preference with Great Britain, to lop off over-expenditures in the civil government, to diminish the number of ministerial positions, to rid the people of the burden of superannuation, to cut down the gross expenditure at Rideau Hall, to take away the poison of the reptile press by destroying the newspaper and printing patronage given to friends of the party in power, to make the civil service more in consonance with the requirements of the country, to abolish bounties, to do away with subsidies to railways, to keep the lands for the settler and away from the speculator. The Senate was to be put upon a new and stable basis, the independence of parliament was to be assured, the purity of the electorate was to be guarded, and the standard of public life in this country was to be elevated. This, Sir, was the task, I say, not simply by the mandate of the country, but imposed upon themselves by the hon. gentleman and the party which he led. Eighteen years of profession had made this their certain task when they got into power, and the election of 1896 was in the nature of a contract, which sealed the bargain and the agreement and placed these men in the seats of the mighty in order that they might carry out their self-imposed task.

Now, Sir, that part of the world which takes a direct interest in Canadian affairs waited to see these gentlemen essay their task. Had they tested their theories and their policies and proven successful, they would have established themselves as able men and their policies as well conceived. But had they attempted this task and failed, that would have been proof positive either that their policies were wrongly conceived or that they were incapable of carrying even a well-conceived policy to success. Canada might well be vastly interested had these hon. gentlemen undertaken to administer the affairs of this great and growing country with $3,000,000 less of taxation than had been taken from the country by the party they succeeded. Canada might well be intensely interested to see these hon. gentlemen undertake to administer the country's affairs with millions lopped off from the expenditure which formed the standard in 1896. And equally interesting would it have been to note the effect had these hon. gentlemen carried out the task they set themselves and eliminated the principle of protection from the tariff, absolutely destroying every vestige of it as they promised to do.

But, Sir, when they came into power they dropped the task they had set themselves, they forgot the promises they had made, they repudiated the policies they had proffered to the people. They did not attempt the new work with new tools as they had promised. They found a workshop already built, with tools in place and fires burning bright. They entered that workshop, they used those tools, they employed the same system as their predecessors; and to-day, eleven or twelve years after they came into power, they are still at the old stand doing their work—not over efficiently—in the old way, so far as principles and policies are concerned, with some deviations which I propose to take up a little later.

Take first, for instance, their great policy of diminution of the taxation. Have they reduced taxation? Let me read a short table which places this matter in its proper light:

Comparison of taxation in 1896, 1906 and 1908:

| | 1896 Conservative. | 1906 Liberal. | 1908 Liberal. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Customs .. .. | $19,833,279 | $46,064,598 | |
| Excise .. .... | 7,926,006 | 14,010,220 | |
| Total.. | $27,759,285 | $60,074,818 | $73,359,108 |
| Tax per head.. | $ 5 46 | $ 10 00 | $ 11 00 |

Increase 1908 over 1896.$45,599,823 00 or 163 p.c.

Now, let us look at the total taxes collected in ten years under Conservative rule and under Liberal rule:

| | |
|---|---|
| Total taxes collected by Conservatives in ten years, 1887-96.. .. .. | $287,931,372 |
| Total taxes collected by Liberals in ten years, 1897-1906.. .. .. .. .. | 430,329,802 |
| Excess taxen by Liberals over Conservative government.. .. .. .. .. | 142,398,430 |

So, as regards the amount of taxes, there can be no doubt of the vast increase made by hon. gentlemen opposite. Why, Sir, it reads almost like a fairy tale. Looking at it one way, these hon. gentlemen opposite might proclaim this increase of taxation a great feat. The taxes in 1896 amounted to $27,700,000. Let me show how this amount has been exceeded under Liberal rule:

Amount by which taxation under Liberals exceeded taxation under last year of Conservative rule:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1896 | Taxation under | Conservatives.. | $27,756,000 |
| 1897 | This amount was | exceeded by.. | 948,000 |
| 1898 | " | " .. | 1,817,000 |
| 1899 | " | " .. | 7,199,000 |
| 1900 | " | " .. | 10,984,000 |
| 1901 | " | " .. | 10,984,000 |
| 1902 | " | " .. | 15,630,000 |
| 1903 | " | " .. | 21,256,000 |
| 1904 | " | " .. | 25,902,000 |
| 1905 | " | " .. | 26,261,000 |
| 1906 | " | " .. | 32,315,000 |
| 1908 | " | " .. | 45,590,000 |

What does that mean? Does that mean that the country is paying less than it was paying in 1896? No, Sir, but that the country has been bled, if white in 1896 so far as the amount of taxation is concerned, infinitely whiter by the taxation as it has developed in 1908. Hon. gentlemen will say: That is beside the question; we have reduced the taxation, that is, we have reduced the rate of taxation. No man can

deny that the burden, the amount of taxation at least, has been vastly increased. Has the rate of taxation been increased or not? Hon. gentlemen opposite will say that the rate of taxation has not been increased. Let us go to the word and the testimony. I take from the Trade and Commerce Report these figures: The Liberal-Conservatives from 1879, when protection was introduced, until 1896, when these gentlemen came into power, had an average tax rate on dutiable goods of 28:35 per cent. In 1896 the rate of taxation was 29·74 per cent. These gentlemen then came into power and the rate of taxation from 1897 when it was 29·96 per cent went down gradually, but very slightly, until in 1906 it became 26:83 per cent. There was a possible reduction in rate of 3 per cent. But, Sir, there is another point to be taken into account, and that is that under these hon. gentlemen quite a large proportion of the amount of protection is imposed not by way of customs tariff, but by way of bounty and it is absolutely necessary that that should be taken into account if you wish the figures to rightly express the truth. What did these hon. gentlemen do? The rate of taxation is too high, so they say in and, we will reduce the customs taxes on various articles of iron, on twine and on oil brought into this country; we will reduce the rate per cent and the customs tax on the articles, but we will protect the makers by paying a bounty upon the articles they make and in this way make up to them the loss of protection. So I say it is absolutely necessary in order to be fair that you shall take the protective burden imposed by way of bounty as well as the protective burden imposed by the customs duties. I have added the bounties and the customs duties together and the result shows that in 1897 the average duty (including bounty) was 30·15 per cent; in 1906 it was 28·22 per cent and in 1907 about 27·40 per cent. Thus if you take the real test of the protection, the customs duty and the bounty protection together, you will find that whereas from 1897 to 1906 the rate was 28·62 per cent, the average from 1879 to 1896 was 28·35 per cent. Consequently the real incidence giving protection in this country by customs duty and bounty was from 1897-1907 just a little more than the incidence given from 1879 to 1896 under the national policy. So I say in actuality the duty for protection has not been diminished to any appreciable extent. I go still further, I say and will prove that the duty rate has practically been increased. In the first place the Finance Minister commenced by imposing duties upon spirits and tobacco of $1,783,000 in 1897. He increased the duties upon sugar in 1898, under a false pretense that by the preference on sugar he was going to help the sugar exporters of the West Indies, when in reality, the United States had a countervailing bounty which more than overtopped the preference that we were giving to the West Indian planters, but in spite of that being proved and known, the Finance Minister never gave up his added duties upon sugar.

But leaving that aside, everybody knows that there has been a very sharp increase in prices in the last ten years. In the United States the best authorities give the increase at from 50 per cent to 60 per cent. In Great Britain it is given from 35 per cent to 40 per cent. In Canada it is anywhere from 35 per cent to 50 per cent. We have not the same close system of statistics as they have, for instance, in the United States, and we therefore do not get it so correctly, but there has been this large increase in prices. You have your ad valorem duty, we will say, of 30 per cent. In 1896, $1,000 bought you a certain quantity and quality of goods. You brought these into this country, the ad valorem duty was 30 per cent and the importer paid $300 of duty. To-day the same quantity and quality of goods will cost you $1,500 owing to the increase in prices. When it comes to the Canadian border the ad valorem duty is still 30 per cent, but 30 per cent upon $1,500 is $450. This is the duty which the importer now has to pay, whereas he paid only $300 three years ago. Thus the increase in price with the maintenance of the same ad valorem duty has added very largely to the incidence of the taxation.

What I mean to say by that illustration is this, that the Finance Minister, in order to get the same amount of duty, namely, $450 upon the same amount and quality of goods ten years before, would have had to place a duty of 45 per cent upon them instead of a duty of 30 per cent; and therefore, by the increase in price the duty really is made, as compared with 1896, a 45 per cent rate instead of a 30 per cent rate. But that is not all that the ultimate consumer has to pay. The consumer not only pays the extra price and the extra duty, but he pays the extra profits of the wholesaler and retailer upon the extra cost of the goods, because the retailer and the wholesaler have their profits upon the cost of the goods. The cost of the goods now is $1,500, whereas ten years ago it was $1,000, therefore the profits of the retailer and of the wholesaler are made upon the invoice of $1,500 instead of the lessened invoice of $1,000. Therefore the consumer has to pay an extra price of $500 and also an extra $150 of duty and the extra profit of the wholesaler and the retailer; so the rate of duty under rising prices kept at the old ad valorem, becomes really higher and higher in proportion as the price advances from year to year. Now, Sir, take for a calculation the $173,000,000 worth of dutiable goods imported in 1906. If you take those at the values of 1896, it would be about $120,000,000, and take the rate of duty of 1896, 26·83 per cent, it would have yielded you only $32,800,000. But the

Finance Minister gathered, not $32,800,000, but $46,400,000 as duty into his treasury on exactly the same ad valorem, because in 1906 the value of imports was $50,000,000 greater than in 1896. Now if you take either an increase price of 50 per cent or an increase of 35 per cent, just as you please, and work it out, you get this result, that to the extent of the rise in prices the Finance Minister has been able, with the same ad valorem duties, to take a largely increased taxation out of the pockets of the tax payers. Does the right hon. gentleman, who wisely does not often dabble in figures, take in the extent of the change in this taxation business ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I am sorry to say that I cannot.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid that he does not. Let me give him an illustration. In 1896 the taxation was $27,700,000. Reduced down to weeks, it meant taking out of the people $530,000 weekly ; reduced to days, it meant $76,000 per day. But in 1908, with $73,000,000 of taxation, it means that you take out of the pockets of the people $1,400,000 weekly, or $200,000 each day. Does my right hon. friend deny the accuracy of the calculation ? It is a sum in simple arithmetic which I think he will not find it difficult to pencil out for himself.

Now, Sir, that being the fact with reference to taxation, let me ask my right hon. friend to listen to himself, which he sometimes is rather loath to do. I find this gem preserved from the platform speeches of 1893, in the city of Ottawa. The speaker is Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Pointing up to the hill he says :

You have seen those beautiful buildings on parliament hill. The government which has its headquarters in those buildings takes $36,000,000 or more in the form of taxation every year.

The ministers who spend that money you may be sure do not take it out of their own pockets; they take it from you, from me, from all the people of the country.

That money is taken from our pockets by an ingenious system of taxation. The government wields a magic wand the touch of which draws the money from your pocket without your understanding that the money is taken from you as taxation.

If our countrymen would but reflect on these matters, I am sure they would put an end to the policy which makes such things possible.

The tax is levied indirectly, the effect of it is none the less to take the money from you and to hand it over to the government.

Every one of you knows how much municipal taxes and how much taxes school you pay, and how much you pay for the support of the provincial government. But how many can tell how much they pay to the support of the Dominion government?

Take all the other taxes you have to pay and add them together and they do not amount to as much as you are required to pay to the Dominion government.

Every pound of nails, every axe, every yard of cloth you buy from your merchant is a medium through which you pay to the Dominion government.

And drawing himself up he says :

I hold that it is important that we should have a series of meetings in the province of Quebec and elsewhere to explain these things to the people, for the people do not pay as much attention to these things as they ought. If they were understood, the present government would be chased out of power, just as the robbers were chased out of the temple.

Now I commend that speech to my right hon. friend when the gentlemen on the hill are taking, not $36,000,000, but $73,000,000 out of the pockets of the people. I commend it to my right hon. friend when every pound of nails, every axe, every yard of cloth, is still taxed. I commend it all the more to my right hon. friend when, whereas in 1893, when he was making that speech $530,000 a week was taken out of the pockets of the people, under the present method, $1,400,000 per week is taken out of them by this government.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

## PRIVATE BILLS.

### CANADA WEATHER INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 37) to incorporate the Canadian Weather Insurance Company.—Mr. M. S. Schell

On section 5—first general meeting and election of directors :

Mr. FIELDING. There is an error in section 5. The Bill is not as intended. It says that:

So soon as fifty thousand dollars of the capital stock of the company has been subscribed, &c.

It should be one hundred thousand dollars. I am advised that the solicitor so understood it. I would therefore beg to move :

That section 5 be amended by substituting for the word ' fifty ' the words ' one hundred.'

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

### SUBSIDIARY HIGH COURT, ANCIENT ORDER OF FORESTERS.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 62) respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—Mr. Guthrie.

On section 6—lapsed policies:

Mr. FIELDING moved:

That the words 'yearly or' in the third line of section 6 be struck out and that the words 'or quarterly' after the word 'half-yearly' in the third line be inserted.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 9—R. S. c. 79.

Mr. FIELDING. Section 9 appears to have been inserted by a misunderstanding as it refers to part II of the Companies Act. As this society is not a stock company, section 9 would not be appropriate. I think it is a pure error and I beg to move that section 9 be omitted.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. While these two Bills with respect to insurance are before the committee I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) whether it is his intention to afford better protection to Canadian policy-holders in American companies. There is one of those companies being wound up and another under investigation in New York in which a number of Canadians are interested and apparently the time has come when some further protection should be afforded to Canadian policy-holders by means of greater deposits being made by these American companies with the Canadian government. At the present time the Provident Savings Company is being investigated in New York and I do not think that the Canadian policy-holders are properly secured. After what has taken place in New York in connection with a number of insurance companies I think the attention of the government should be directed to this matter. Some day later on I intend to call the attention of the government to the condition of Canadian policy-holders in these companies and to the manner in which their interests are jeopardized. I think the minister ought to be prepared at an early stage to say whether he is satisfied that the deposits now in the hands of the Canadian government are sufficient for the protection of Canadian policy-holders.

Mr. FIELDING. The superintendent of insurance is of opinion that with respect to this particular company the deposit which has been hitherto required is a reasonable and effective one. However, the policies are being revalued and it may be that a further deposit will be called for.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

## WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

The order for private Bills having been exhausted the House again resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Fielding to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. FOSTER. Passing from the subject of taxation to that of expenditure, let us inquire further what has been the record of these gentlemen in reference to that very important feature in the administration of the government of Canada. When these gentlemen were in opposition they were equally strong in the matter of over-expenditure as they were with regard to the matter of taxation. In 1893 their platform held this well known plank:

> We cannot but view with alarm the large increase in the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878 and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

But that is not so strong and so vivid as individual statements made by many of the leaders of the party. For instance, my right hon. friend, speaking in 1896, three years after the Liberal convention, declared:

> The expenditure of this country has grown until the people are unable to bear it. I promise you that if you put our party into power we will reduce that annual expenditure by $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 per annum.

Again he said:

> If we get into power we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie——

A long way off.

> And I say that although we may not be able to bring the expenditures to what they were under him we can reduce the amount $3,000,000 a year.

Then, Sir Richard Cartwright, the mild-mannered and sweet-tongued coadjutor of my right hon. friend, declared this among other things:

> I repeat it now that $38,000,000, let alone $40,000,000 is in my judgment a monstrous sum for the people to be called on to provide. When the United States mustered 20,000,000 strong its total expenditure for federal purposes was barely $22,000,000 of dollars.

And Sir William Mulock, who was also a co-worker with my right hon. friend in the political programme of the Liberal party, declared:

> There is nothing to warrant this enormous expenditure of nearly $38,000,000 except the fact that we are burdened down with debt and office holders great and small.

This same gentleman, I believe, is now an office holder. Mr. Charlton, a leading member of the Liberal party, declared:

> The Liberal party if in power could at once reduce the public expenditure and effect other savings to the extent of $5,000,000 per annum without impairing the efficiency of the service.

And I hold in my hand a very instructive little document with the imprint of the Liberal party upon it, prepared for their programme in 1895. It has some delicious de-

coration on its front page, in which I am represented as usual in a very fine drawing, mounted on a poor broken down farmer's back, with a monopolist pretty well up on my own back, but resting mainly upon the farmer, rolling along a ball to which the farmer is attached by a chain, and that is called : 'Unnecessary taxation and extravagance of expenditure.' And a policeman, with the name of the opposition on his club, is watching myself taking some money out for subsidy purposes from the Dominion treasury. The watchman on the premises is my good friend, now Sir Wilfrid Laurier. And one of the statements in this pamphlet—I preserve it for the sake of its historical connection — declares that the taxes have greatly increased and the annual expenditures, and it then gives a list of the expenditures for four years, and concludes :

And Mr. Foster's estimates for 1894-5 reached the appalling total of $39,225,156.

The word 'appalling' and the figures being in very prominent type. Now, Sir, let us see what this policeman and these guardians of the treasury and these denouncers of annual expenditures over $38,000,000 have done. Here is a comparison of expenditure :

COMPARISON OF EXPENDITURE.

| — | 1896. | 1906. | 1908. |
|---|---|---|---|
| On Consolidated account | $36,949,142 00 | $67,240,641 00 | $77,500.000 00 |
| On Capital account | 4,753,241 00 | 16,037,001 00 | 33,000,000 00 |
| Total expenditure | 41,702,383 00 | 83,277,641 00 | 110,000,000 00 |
| Expenditure per head | 8 14 | 13 50 | 18 00 |
| Increase, 1908 over 1896 | | | 68,797,617 00 or 165 per cent |
| 10 years' expenditure under Liberal-Conservative government, 1887-1896 | | | $423,358,830 |
| 10 years' expenditure under Liberal government, 1897-1907 | | | 655,335,633 |
| Excess, Liberal over Conservative period | | | 231,976,802 |

AVERAGE YEARLY EXPENDITURE.

| Years. | Administration. | Amount. | Yearly excess over Expenditure, 1892-96. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1887-1891 | Conservative | $ 42,530,000 | |
| 1892-1896 | " | 42,141,763 | |
| 1897-1901 | Liberals | 50,110,011 | $ 7,968,248 |
| 1902-1906 | " | 72,110,840 | 29,969,077 |
| 1908 | " | 110,500,000 | 68,358,237 |

| | Liberal-Conservatives, 1896. | Liberals, 1908. |
|---|---|---|
| Year | $41,702,383 | $110,500,000 |
| Per week | 800,000 | 2,120,000 |
| Per day | 114,000 | 303,000 |

Let us put it in this form : Under the Liberal-Conservatives in 1896 $800,000 weekly was spent in the general expenditures of the country ; under the Liberals in 1908, not $800,000, but $2,120,000 per week is the figure of the expenditures on the public services of the country. In 1896 the Liberal-Conservatives spent $114,000 a day ; the Liberals, in 1908, spent $303,000 for every day of twenty-four hours in this Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, I call the attention of the House to that. But is this the end? Does the year 1908 show us the highest point of expenditure? The Minister of Finance did not say so. He did not say the exact opposite, but his acts carried the exact opposite, for what are the estimates? The estimates for the year 1908-9 already brought down are $119,250,000. The estimates for last year added after the main estimates were $16,000,000. This year the larger expenditure for the Grand Trunk Pacific will make that much more, and so the expenditure for 1908-9 must come pretty well up to

$140,000,000. Just think of it—$140,000,000. In 1896 my right hon. friend, Sir William Mulock and Sir Richard Cartwright, declared that $38,000,000 was a monstrous sum to spend in a country like this.

Now, let us come to particulars, and let us see where these hon. gentlemen are. There were certain special expenditures which they were never tired of going around the side lines and concessions and commenting upon. Let us take a few of these. They declared that the press of this country was actually demoralized and made a hireling press because in 1896 $42,713 was distributed in advertising in the papers of the country. What must be the condition in 1906, when $181,911, an increase of 139,198, or 324 per cent, is spent in advertising in the press of the country, in 99 cases out of 100 in the Liberal press. Another source of complaint was the printing. The government Bureau, they said, was established to do the government printing, could do it better, more cheaply and without the idea of patronage; and they made the side lines reverberate with the statement that $189,320 was spent in 1896 in printing outside of the government bureau. What should be the reverberation now, in view of the fact that in 1906 $689,796, an increase of $500,476, or 263 per cent, was spent in printing outside of the Bureau, again in 99 cases out of 100 in Liberal printing offices, with the exception of the printing of Dominion notes and inland revenue and postage stamps, which is done, not by a Canadian concern, but by a concern which came from the United States and domiciled itself in Ottawa. Let me give you another fact. From July 1, 1896, to March 31, 1907, the government has spent in advertising $1,279,136 and in printing outside of the Printing Bureau $4,391,183, a total of $5,670,319; and ninety-nine one-hundredths of that is done in Liberal newspaper offices with the idea of patronage in view. Not many years ago Sir Richard Cartwright penned or spoke these words:

Poisoning the wells.—There is one act which even among savages and barbarians is looked upon as inhuman, not to be tolerated even under the extremest exigencies of war, and that is the poisoning of the wells from which friends and foes alike must quench their thirst. But here in Canada we have a government which does worse, which does not hesitate deliberately to poison and corrupt the very sources of information from which alone the ordinary voter can learn how public affairs are being administered, and whether he is well or ill served by those to whom he must per force entrust the guardianship of his interests; and I say that of all the corrupt acts of the government and all the signs of the degradation and debasement of public opinion which are everywhere manifest, there is not one act so fraught with evil consequences, not one sign so significant of degradation as the manner in which the public press has been openly and systematically debauched year after year, with the full knowledge and apparently the full approbation of almost every class of well to do supporters of the government, and with very few evidences of any great disapproval, even on the part of those who were not supporters.



If that was true in 1896, it is 324 per cent more true with regard to advertising and 263 per cent more true with regard to printing than it was in 1896. I commend this government and the party supporting it to the tender mercies and criticism of Sir Richard Cartwright, who, if he has a spark of his old spirit left, although he rests quietly on the cushioned seats in another chamber, will, I am sure, feel that if he spoke the truth then, he could speak it at the present time, if he were untrammelled, with a hundred-fold more effect and force. The following tables give a comparison of some of these expenditures mentioned above.

EXPENDITURE COMPARED.

SPECIAL ITEMS.

| | 1896. | 1906. | Liberal excess. | Increase |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $ | $ | $ | per cent. |
| Advertising.... | 42,713 | 181,911 | 139,198 | 324 |
| Printing (outside Govt. Bureau) | 189,320 | 689,796 | 500,476 | 263 |
| Superannuations | 311,231 | 356,280 | 45,094 | 14 |
| Pensions..... | 86,080 | 179,023 | 92,943 | 108 |
| Civilgovernment (Salaries at Ottawa) ..... | 1,396,628 | 1,911,611 | 514,983 | 37 |
| Rideau Hall.... | 24,053 | 72,652 | 48,599 | 100 |
| Legislation..... | 904,687 | 1,351,916 | 447,229 | 48 |
| | (1881) | (1901) | | |
| Census ..... | 452,508 | 1,184,459 | 731,951 | 160 |

DEPARTMENTAL.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Marine..... | 1,137,765 | 4,601,000 | 3,463,235 | 300 |
| Militia..... | 1,136,714 | 4,294,125 | 3,157,411 | 275 |
| Interior ..... | 1,255,368 | 3,182,081 | 1,926,713 | 150 |
| Public Works... | 1,299,709 | 7,484,716 | 6,185,007 | 475 |
| Mounted Police. | 533,014 | 1,004,079 | 471,065 | 90 |
| Justice..... | 1,143,497 | 1,699,242 | 555,745 | 49 |
| Agriculture, Arts and Statistics. | 333,042 | 1,365,643 | 1,032,601 | 310 |

Now, is the country thinking at all with reference to this enormous increase of expenditure? I believe it is. How could it be otherwise when it finds the expenditure going up by leaps and bounds. In the last year of Conservative rule, the expenditure was $41,700,000. See how it has increased since then:

Table showing amount by which expenditure under Liberal rule has increased over the last year of **Conservative rule.**

| | |
|---|---|
| In 1896 Lib. Cons. expendediture | $41,700,000 |
| 1897 this was exceeded by.. .. | 1,200,000 |
| 1898.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 3,600,000 |
| 1899.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 9,800,000 |
| 1900.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 12,000,000 |
| 1901.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 16,200,000 |
| 1902.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 22,200,000 |
| 1903.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 20,000,000 |
| 1904.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 30,500,000 |
| 1905.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 37,100,000 |
| 1906.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 41,500,000 |
| 1908.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 68,300,000 |

Leaving this for a moment—but I will return to it later—let me say a word with reference to the public debt. Did you notice how long and how lovingly the Minister of Finance lingered over the public debt ?—the fine explanation he gave, the details into which he travelled and among which he wandered. Did you notice the exceedingly great contrast when he came to talk about the expenditure ?—how quickly he slid over this part as though the ice were very thin indeed. In one sense it makes some difference, but for all practical purposes it makes little difference, whether the debt is increased or not, under present circumstances. Why has not the debt increased ? Mr. Speaker, I will give you a political recipe, so that, when you become leader of a government, you can make it absolutely certain that the public debt shall not increase while you are in power. All you have to do is to tax the people yearly enough to pay not only your current but your capital expenditure. That is what the Minister of Finance has been doing. This is the way the public debt stands :—

| | |
|---|---|
| In 1887 the public debt was.. .. .. | $227,000,000 |
| In 1896 the public debt was.. .. .. | 258,000,000 |
| In 1908, the public debt is.. .. .. .. | 275,000,000 |

Up to the present time, leaving out 1908, there has been, under this government, a comparatively small increase on the debt. But even the Minister of Finance will not have the heart to call on the people for a sufficient amount of taxes to pay all the capital expenditure and all the great increases in the expenditure on current account in future. The consequence is that he now faces an inevitable increase in the debt, added to the extraordinary increase in the taxation by which he has swollen the expenditure. So that, in the years immediately before us, besides keeping up the same mad, reckless looting of the public pocket, he will have to increase by tens of millions our national debt. There is nothing else before the minister. The net debt increased from 1887 to 1896 by $31,000,000. The Minister of Finance plumes himself on the statement that from 1896 to 1906, under the Liberals, the debt increased only $8,500,000. But read the footnote, if you please. From 1897 to 1906 the Minister of Finance collected from the people in taxes $142,000,000 more than the Liberal-Conservatives collected in their last ten years of power. If the Liberal-Conservatives from 1887 to 1896 had exacted a similar amount of taxation to that imposed by the Liberals in the last ten years, the Liberal-Conservatives would not have increased the debt by $31,000,000, but they would have reduced it by $110,000,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend laughs at that. But does he deny that it is true?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE (Strathcona). Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, let me put it the other way. If the Liberals had reduced the taxation as they promised to do—no, I will not hold them to a redemption of their promise ; but if they had not increased the taxation, the debt, under their regime, would have increased not $8,500,000, but $150,000,000, if they had maintained the scale of expenditure which we know they have maintained. Sir, what happens when the banks of this country put $60,000,000 of their reserves out in New York and London in the great commercial centres ? Why, the cry is raised that the resources of the country are being used outside while our own business people are famishing for lack of capital. That may not be a fair criticism—it is not altogether fair, because a large part of the amount placed abroad by the banks is their reserve, which they could not loan out here even if they had it. But if they were to loan abroad a vast sum like this which they could loan here, there would be a well-founded complaint that business men were denied money to carry on their operations while the money which should be used in Canada was being used in a foreign country. But all the banks are merely subsidiary in our great system. The great money reserve of this country is in the earnings of the people ; the banks collect only a small portion of the earnings of the country and make use of it in their processes for the promotion of the business of the country. Yet what has taken place in the last ten years ? Hon. gentlemen opposite have taken $142,000,000 out of the earnings and savings of the people of this country more than we did, more than they then declared was necessary and right, more than they declared they would take. What have they done with that money ? Some unthinking person says they have given it all back to the people. Not at all, every dollar of that money that is put in fixed works, such as buildings and works of that kind, which return nothing to the people except use, and the money invested in hundreds of thousands of different constructions into which the people's money is put, is effectually barred out from the currency and from the producing power of the country. It is as if it were hoarded. Much employment has been given for the time being, but so far as returning any value is concerned, its usefulness has absolutely ceased. It is fixed

in these constructions which may be of use but return nothing in a financial way to the people of the country. The Conservatives in their last years of office preferred to incur a debt of $31,000,000 and leave that extra taxation which they would have had to take from the people of the country with the people who needed it, and to do with that $31,000,000 of debt, what was necessary in the way of capital expenditure to be used and to be enjoyed not only by the people of those years but by the future generations. That is the proper way of financing. You have no right to take, especially from a young, and new striving and struggling country, any great amount more than is absolutely needed for the current expenditures of the country. When you are building the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, when you are putting up immense public works for the use of the country for hundreds of years, why call upon the poor toiling people of one year to put up these works which are to be enjoyed by all generations to come after us. The proper method of financing is to borrow the money for these capital expenditures and place the burden of interest equally on each generation which enjoys the use of these permanent works. Then those who come after us will pay their proportion of the cost of the works which they are using and, in good time, as the country becomes wealthy and able to do so, it can pay off its debt year by year as it pleases. The Finance Minister has made, to my mind, a radical mistake and has done an irreparable injury to this country in his mad race for taxation and his avoidance of borrowing capital for these capital constructions, consequently drawing from the people their savings and earnings in larger proportion than he should draw them and so crippling them to that extent. If this government remains in power much longer, as by the good will of the people, I hope it will not, it certainly has mapped out for itself exactly the same course. The Finance Minister is a little dubious as to whether he will get all the taxation next year that he got this year. During the first part of the year he fears he will not, but—and will you mark how even the proudest and most self-reliant of these hon. gentlemen some time or other must lean on Providence—the Finance Minister was gracious enough to say this afternoon that if we only were blessed with good crops, he thought the latter part of the year would probably bring us out of the deficiency met with in the first part of the year. Thank goodness that once in a while, in an unguarded moment, we have these hon. gentlemen relying a little on Providence. Speaking of Providence reminds me of an utterance made at Halifax when my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) and the right hon. gentleman who is his leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had a jollification, a sort of union meeting in that

Mr. FOSTER.

city. The right hon. gentleman spoke on that occasion and among other things he told a story which is not exactly true but is near enough to the truth to pass. He said that at a board of trade dinner in Toronto where he delivered an address after I had delivered one, I had been attempting to prove that at that time the people of Canada were happy and prosperous and that he said at that dinner:

Gentlemen, we shall be in power before long and when in power I promise such an era of prosperity that it will not require statistics to prove it—you will have it in your pockets.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier proceeded:

We are told by our opponents that this prosperity is not due to our policy but that it is the work of Providence. I am ready to admit that; but Providence works by human instruments to chastise people and to bless them. The instruments to chastise the people were our good friends the Tories; but when it became time for a change Providence used her humble friends of the Liberal party to bless the people and to bring such an era of prosperity as they have had for the last ten years. I believe when the next appeal is made to the people of Nova Scotia they will be once more found on the side of Providence and on the side of Mr. Fielding also.

Well, some people are very familiar with Providence, but if we may fall into the same language and allow the picture to come up in our minds it would be an astonishing sight now if Providence and——

Mr. BENNETT. Pugsley.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) had been careering up and down the streets of the city of St. John putting up those posters asking the people whether they were going to vote for wharfs or primers. It would be astonishing also to see Providence and the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) walking up and down the streets of the city in accord. In fact it would be somewhat astoninshing to see Providence and any one of the ministers actively conjoined in all the deeds of recklessness and extravagance and graft which have been but partially exploded and exposed to the country during the last few months. I should think Sir, that gentlemen ought to be a little careful as to how they put themselves on such a familiar footing with Providence and although the right hon. gentleman who leads the government might in the opinion of most of his friends be allowed to do that for himself, he ought to fight very shy of putting Providence and the hon. gentlemen who are connected with him in the same arm-and-arm fashion as he described them in the city of Halifax.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) went very rapidly over the matter of the money obligations which are weighing and pressing at the present time upon the gov-

ernment. If I am not mistaken, I think the matter assumes something like this form: On May 1, 1907, there was a due loan of $9,376,386, which has been renewed to May 1, 1911, at the same rate of interest; so we will transfer that down to May 1, 1911, and dispose of it at the top of the list. On April 1, 1908, $7,300,000 comes due; on November 1, 1908, $21,900,000 comes due; on August 17, 1908, $2,500,000, which was a loan made a short time ago at 4½ plus ⅛ per cent, becomes due. That makes $31,700,000. So far as I can see, the sinking funds applicable to these are about $10,000,000, which leaves $21,700,000; and an overdraft since that time of $1,500,000, bearing current Bank of England rates, has been due. Then in June, 1909, something over $24,000,000 becomes due; on October 1, 1910; January 1, 1910, something over $58,000,000 becomes due. There are sinking funds to a certain extent, but I think not very much attached to those loans, as I think we gave up the idea of attaching sinking funds to loans about the time these were made. On May 1, 1911, $9,376,386 comes due; then on October 1, 1913, there is $8,273,333 coming due. So that between the present time and October 1, 1913, some $131,700,000 falls due of loans now current. Subtract the ten or twelve millions of sinking funds from that, and taking account of some payments that have been made in the meantime, it is not much out of the way to say that about $100,000,000 or over is to be met in the way of renewing loans between this and October, 1913, and most of it between this and 1910, or a little less than two years.

Well, now, that is a tremendous obligation. And the fault I find with the Minister of Finance is this, that in these years of plenty and an overflowing treasury he has neither taken the precaution to reduce the obligations of the country, nor in those times when money could more easily have been got has he taken time by the forelock and made his dispositions so as to be ready to meet these obligations when they fall in. For the Minister of Finance is not all-seeing. He cannot tell what may happen, or what may be the conditions financially of the world in 1910; as he did not know two years ago of the stringency which has suddenly come upon the world in the year we are passing through. But in all that time, neither by economy nor by prudent foresight, has he taken a single step to diminish or provide for the obligations of the country.

On the other hand, he has been rushing with rapid pace into renewed and extended obligations which are to meet him during the next five, or six, or seven years. What are these? There is the obligation undertaken in behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. My hon. friend was not as full as he should have been of explanations as to the amount of obligations to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Surely in this year, when, I think, 75 per cent, if not more, of the whole line between Winnipeg and Moncton is under contract, or is about going under contract, when estimates have been made, as I understand, for the whole of it the minister should have come down to the House with a full explanation of these estimates by the commission, the engineers, as to what would be the cost of the line between Moncton and the city of Winnipeg, some 1,850 miles. But, Sir, he has given us not a single figure with reference to that. We do not know, after his explanations how much this is costing per mile, how much the whole road between these two points will cost per mile. We have not the slightest information with reference to that. The minister has already expended so many millions, he is calling now for millions more, and he does not give in his financial exposition one single word to enlighten us as to the cost of this road. What is the reason? Is the minister putting off the evil day?

The right hon. gentleman who leads this House, in 1903, told the people of Canada that the total cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific to this country would be within $13,000,000; and he illustrated that by saying, not more than one year's surplus. The Minister of Customs, who faces me, in the contest of 1904 in the province of Ontario, used his leader's arguments over and over again, and I remember combatting them then and there. I took the trouble to read the whole speech of the leader of the government in 1903, and from the beginning of it to the end there is nothing that you can take as an indication of the cost of that road except that flat assertion that it would not cost the people of Canada more than $13,000,000. What other thing happened? In his argument for the line between Quebec and Moncton, he declared that the line between Quebec and Moncton could be shortened by 120 to 140 miles. On what basis did he say that? I do not know. On what basis did he make the strange assertion that it would not cost the people of this country more than $13,000,000? As soon as we begin to get the estimates and surveys we find that the road between Moncton and Quebec is not shortened by more than ten or twelve miles, if it is shortened by that much. We find that not merely does $13,000,000 not cover the whole cost to Canada, but that the cost to Canada in the interest alone on the construction account, and the interest we pay after seven years from the time it is constructed, will be some $30,000,000 or more, so that $13,000,000 would not pay half the interest.

Sir, it is a rather hard commentary on hon. gentlemen opposite that they will put through immense votes of this kind on scanty and wrong information. In 1903 the Prime Minister declared that they had mountains of information with reference to the country from Quebec to Winnipeg in

that northern region. He declared that it was an absolute necessity to build that road in order to get a way to a Canadian seaport. He declared, as I have said, that the distance between Moncton and Quebec would be shortened by from 120 to 140 miles and he made the flat declaration that the whole cost to the country would not be more than $13,000,000. More than that, Sir, he kept back from the people and parliament of this country the offer that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway made for the building of a road west of the lakes, an offer which carried out the idea that they were willing to build it, hand over the traffic on this side to the Intercolonial Railway and take nothing but a simple subsidy for the western part from the lakes out to the Pacific coast. What happens? The government engineer goes out to the west, comes back again and says that the cost of that road in the west will be at least double, that it will be 100 per cent greater. But the lines that have been let, the miles that have been let and the figures that have come down to us show that the cost is going to be $30,000 and $40,000 and $50,000 a mile. I believe, Sir, that before you finish that line from Moncton to Winnipeg you will have seen the end of $130,000,000 of the money of this country. If it comes within that I would be surprised; if it goes a great deal beyond that I would not be very much surprised. The then Minister of Railways and Canals, who knew something at that time about railway building, told the Prime Minister to his face that it would cost $139,000,000. The Prime Minister set it aside with a wave of his hand and declared to the people of this country that $13,000,000 would measure the outside of the cost. And so, from Victoria and Vancouver to Sydney and Halifax the canvas made in the election of 1904 was that so good a bargain had been made by the government that the people of Canada would only be called upon to put their hands in their pockets for a paltry $13,000,000—one year's surplus. Well, Sir, there is confronting the Finance Minister $100,000,000 to be raised for renewing loans and $100,000,000 yet to be raised within the next five or six years to build and complete the road from Moncton to Winnipeg. These are astounding obligations of themselves, but added to these there is the wild pace that has been set for expenditures of every kind in every quarter of the land. There are subsidies to the provinces in the west which increase year by year as the population increases. There are subsidies to the old provinces which have been increased pretty nearly $3,000,000 per year and consequently in five, or six, or seven, or eight years will entail just five, or six or seven, or eight times that much more of an expenditure compared with a similar period of the past. All these things and this last obligation of the government to stand behind the Quebec bridge face the government. Two hundred million dollars—more than $200,000,000 of capital money has to be got somewhere within the next 6 years, and it is a problem which I am afraid the Finance Minister enters upon with too light a heart, with too free a mind and the importance of which and the difficulties surrounding which he does not himself to-day see. He says that the debt has not increased. Well, there are two points that I want to make reference to. By the way, about the Quebec bridge, is not the Finance Minister himself on record as declaring on his knowledge as Finance Minister that the bridge, the approaches, the substructure and the superstructure would not cost more than $4,500,000?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think I am.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I have seen that statement somewhere.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sure that if the hon. gentleman gets that statement anywhere he will get it on the authority of some engineer, because I certainly never on my own authority would make any such statement either as to that or any other amount.

Mr. FOSTER. I find here in a speech delivered by my hon. friend in 1903, at the same time that the Prime Minister declared that this whole Grand Trunk Pacific would only cost the country $13,000,000, that the Finance Minister said:

> Five or six companies will use this bridge, the Intercolonial Railway, Canadian Pacific Railway, the Quebec Central Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Quebec and Lake St. John, and there are other railways . . . . . I understand that the bridge proper, the crossings and approaches, will cost about $4,500,000.

He then finds fault with the estimates of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and says the 'we are not very far apart,'

> But his estimates would probably include some of the terminal facilities in the city of Quebec, which may be important as part of the general scheme, but are not essential as part of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway scheme.

So I think that from whatever source my hon. friend got the information, that is the information that he imparted to this House, and that is the information that the representatives of the people and the people at large have to depend upon. Now, as I said before, it is extremely unfortunate that men like the leader of the government should declare that the Grand Trunk Pacific would not cost the people of this country more than $13,000,000 and that he would declare that it woulde be shortened between Quebes and Moncton over the present In-

tercolonial Railway by 120 to 140 miles, and that there should not, by lapse or lack of care, come to this House the Grand Trunk's offer made to him a year and a half before it was discovered and brought to the attention of this House. Why my hon. friend the Minister of Finance should give $4,500,000 as the cost of a bridge which at that time was contemplated to be taken up or backed by the government is something that I cannot understand. It is unfortunate that information of that misleading kind should be given, for it is upon information from the front benches that the people of the country would like to go and they must perforce go. In reference to the debt the point that I wish to draw the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is this: At a certain period in his career, when he was forecasting the future, he declared that:

We shall float our new loans——

That is those that are now to be renewed.

—at a much lower rate than the old loans bear. We shall save say $1,000,000 on the renewal of those loans from 1903 to 1910, may be more.

The Finance Minister might have given us to-day just how much interest has been saved on the $31,000,000 that this government have obtained in London and Paris as over the old loans. It is a significant fact that during the last ten years a great deal of money borrowed by Canada at high rates of interest running up to 4½ per cent and 5 per cent, has been retired at exceedingly good rates, and yet the burden of interest on the debt in 1906 was $10,502,429 and in 1906 it was $10,814,697. So that though the debt has not increased up to 1906 except by a very small portion, the interest burden of the debt is a good deal more than it was in 1896, although between 1896 and 1906 a number of loans bearing a high rate of interst has been replaced by loans bearing a smaller rate of interest.

The Minister of Finance had another idea, and that was that he would bring about a reduction of the cost of capital to the people of this country. In one of the first years of his ministry he brought in a proposition to reduce the savings bank interest from 3½ to 3 per cent and then from 3 per cent to 2½ per cent by easy stages of half per cent reduction each time. He did that, he said, in order to bring about a reduction of the cost of capital to merchants, manufacturers and borrowers generally. He did make a reduction of a half per cent in the rate of interest. I would like to ask the bankers and the merchants and the capitalists and every poor borrower who goes to a bank, whether the device of the Minister of Finance has been very effectual in reducing the cost of capital. If my hon. friend has noticed that it has, there are few other people who have. But, the saving of a million and more dollars of interest that my hon. friend thought he would save has now vanished into thin air and if he has a reputation for great surpluses and a reputation for great expenditures, he has also achieved the reputation of being the Canadian Finance Minister who has paid the highest interest on a loan for Canada of any Finance Minister since 1867. Contrast with the conditions prevailing in the United States used to be thought right by hon. gentlemen opposite, but we do not hear so much of it now. Let us do a little contrasting with our great competitor to the south—the population of the United States is 84,000,000, the debt per head of that population is $11.46 and the debt per head of the people of Canada is about $45. In the United States the interest burden of the debt is 28 cents per head of the people, in Canada it is $1.50. The customs and excise taxation taken out of the people of the United States is $6.50 per head, in Canada it is $11 per head. The expenditure of the United States on ordinary expenditure account is $6.60 per head and in Canada it is $12 per head.

And so I might go on, but these are simply invitations to hon. gentlemen opposite to carry their minds back to the condition they were in before 1896, and to shake themselves clear of the idea that they have some God-given instrumentality that is going to see them through this career of extravagant expenditure and multiplied increases of obligations and debts and enable them to look upon it from a less interested point and therefore to gauge more properly what are their duties in respect thereto.

Now, Sir, I do not want to criticise harshly the Minister of Finance in his dealings with the banks—his peculiar dealings with the banks—with reference to the Northwest crop. It is always a perilous thing for a government to interfere with the general financial management of the business of the country. I think the United States president and cabinet found that out not many months ago, and although in their great extremity they came as they thought to the rescue, it is the opinion of some of the best bankers and publicists in the United States that the country would have been better if they had not interfered. The Minister of Finance has not brought down the papers and we do not know the representations that were made to him. He mentioned a few but I imagine there are many which he has not mentioned. However the Minister of Finance pretty nearly conceded the fact, that after all, the banks would have been able to deal with the situation themselves if they had been left alone. The banks were not behind this proposition; they were not in favour of it. One can easily see why the banking interests of this country thought themselves sufficient to do that work and to do it well. But the

Minister of Finance was over persuaded and he came as he said to the rescue. Now I am not going to criticise his conclusions in that respect, but there is one thing I will criticise. In what way did the Minister of Finance come to the rescue? By absolutely breaking the law of this country to which he is as much bound to pay respect as the humblest citizen of Canada. Owing to mad extravagance of expenditure the government had nothing to give or to lend in order to relieve the situation. Owing to the same reasons they did not dare to go into the money market in London and ask for $5,000,0000 or $10,000,000, because, as the Minister of Finance said, they would have had to pay a very heavy rate for it and the credit of the country would thereby be damaged. And so the Minister of Finance by reason of his previous course having nothing to give and not being able to borrow, had no recourse than to enter the treasury of the country, locked by the law of the country for the security of the note holders and savings bank depositors, and take therefrom gold and the equivalent of gold which was the only and the legal reserve for the security of such depositors and note holders. I say that when the government undertook to do that with no more of a crisis than was on the country in November, they did what I believe was a rash thing. But if the government did think it was absolutely necessary, then when these loans were made in December, 1907, and this parliament was sitting in November, 1907, the Minister of Finance should not have lost a single day before coming to parliament and explaining what he had done and asking for a Bill of indemnity. What right has any member of the government to break the law, to break down the reserve of the people? It is the people's reserve and not the government's, and to continue to do that for three months and parliament in front of them all that time and never come to parliament with an explanation and ask for a Bill of indemnity, was something very extraordinary. It is pretty nearly enough, if a thing like that has to be done by a government during recess, to call parliament together in order to get a Bill of indemnity. But when parliament is assembled and ready to act, to go for three months and not give any sign and not ask for any Bill of indemnity is another of these peculiar and reckless and unwarranted acts that this government performs from time to time. Are we governed by law and the parliament or is a committee called the cabinet doing the whole business of Canada and making and breaking the laws of Canada. They broke the law in this case and for the time being they made a law for themselves. It may turn out all right, I have no doubt it will turn out all right. But it might have turned out all wrong. The Minister of Finance congratulated Canada because the people were not hoarding their money. There is not much chance for the people to hoard it; the government is too busy taking it out of their pockets at the rate of $50,000,000 a year more than the Conservative government took from the people. They have not much chance to hoard under such conditions.

But, Sir, the same wave of lack of confidence that swept with lightening rapidity over the United States, breaking fortunes, smashing credits and bringing banks down to the dust, might easily have spread to this country, and if it had, what would have been the position of the government breaking into the strong chest and taking the only reserve, and the insufficient reserve, which the people had for their savings and their notes? I think the position was a pretty grave one; but if the government did take the responsibility of that extreme measure, they should not have waited a single day in coming to parliament, giving the information and getting their Bill of indemnity; for if a government can do this on pressure from one section of the country, it may do it on pressure from another section of the country. Once done it is easy to do it a second time, and always they can say: Our men will carry us through. It is a dangerous precedent. It has not taken place in Great Britain, with one or two exceptions, since the Bank of England was formed; I hope it will not take place again in this country.

I said something with reference to the taxation and the expenditure and the debt. You will notice that this year the Finance Minister has not had so much to say about the surplus. He did roll out the surplus of nineteen millions or twelve millions, or whatever it was, but the roll of it was somewhat disturbed by the announcement which had immediately to follow, that the capital expenditure wiped it out and something better, so that in reality there was no surplus. The Minister of Finance has talked a great deal about that surplus in the country. In Halifax, with his audience before him, he said: Now, which would you prefer—Mr. Foster with his three millions of surplus in the last ten years of his administration, or myself with my seventy-seven millions of surplus? And every waiting man in the audience, I suppose, said: Give me Fielding and the seventy-seven millions of surplus. He asked also: What do the people prefer—do you prefer Mr. Foster, who sighs for the good old days, when thirty-eight millions was the maximum of revenue, or myself, who think I am going to have a hundred millions of revenue? And every waiting auditor agreed, and said: Give me Fielding and the hundred millions of revenue.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that my hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. Duncan Ross) applauds the idea. He was not in the

audience at Halifax, but I have no doubt he is waiting, waiting, still waiting.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I do not blame them a bit.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, Sir, I do not evade the comparison. It is true, our net surplus from 1887 to 1896, ten years, was $3,000,000 or a little better; and it is true that the hon. gentleman's surplus from 1897 to 1908 is about $80,000,000. Where it is, is a different question. He has had it, and he has not had it; he boasts of it, and he cannot find it; it is all swallowed up, and more is swallowed up, and additions are made to the debt. But I think it is fair for me to say to him this: With your taxation during our ten years, we would have had a surplus of $110,000,000. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is surprised at that. He should be surprised that he declared that $13,000,000 would pay for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. With our taxation, which my right hon. friend declared they should reduce, the Finance Minister's deficit would have been $150,000,000 in those ten years if he had gone on the same scale of expenditure; and yet my right hon. friend laughs. Does my right hon. friend dispute the accuracy of the figures? Will he not call together some of his friends in the province of Quebec and try to exemplify to them, not only how the robbers should be chased from the temple now, with their taxation of $73,000,000, as it is this year, but how this surplus that is talked about has been gained? By the simple but ingenious method of taxing the people—taking it out of the people. If you take it out of the people, why of course you will have it, and you will not have an increase of the debt. But that might be a reason for sober second thought as to whether or not it is proper to overtax the people and to draw from the earnings and savings of the people these immense sums of money. I have no doubt which will be the best for the people. The Minister of Finance was so eager for a surplus that he had to dock the savings bank depositors—the labourers, farmers, school children, widows, working girls, who put their dollars in there from month to month to lay up something for a rainy day—one-half of one per cent in order to add to his surplus. He has added about three and a quarter millions to his surplus by abstracting so much from the payment of interest to poor savings bank depositors. His anxiety for a surplus has led him into another rather dubious transaction. The bounties, which we paid out of revenue, the Finance Minister pays out of capital. In these last years of his administration he has transferred from revenue account to capital account some ten or eleven millions of bounties. If my hon. friend changes his system of book-keeping, and thereby adds millions to his surplus, I should think he ought not to vaunt it abroad and boast of it before this House. He has not given any valid reason why he changed the system; but that change causes a misrepresentation of comparisons before the people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word or two with reference to some examples of reckless expenditures. They are found all over. The rapid pace that has been set and the recklessness with which expenditures have been undertaken have obliterated all the old rules and the old lines with reference to expenditure. In Mackenzie's time, and in our time, there was a pretty well defined line between federal and provincial expenditures. The rule was—and we stuck by the rule as fast as possible, though, I suppose, that like all such rules under any government it has its exceptions—that federal expenditure should be for federal purposes and that the provinces should be allowed to care for matters within their own scope. There should be a complete dementation of the line between public and private advantage and interest. Is it not a well understood rule that no public money should be spent by the federal government for private interests?—that the government should not spend money to build a house, a factory or a barn for any private individual. And yet example after example can be given in which that rule has been transgressed by the government and expenditures of public money have been made to assist private individuals in their business. To-day we find the Minister of Public Works declaring that he will put wharfs in any little lake or river because the people there ought to have such facilities as well as those on the sea-board. In Mackenzie's time, and in our time—though you might find exceptions—the rule was held to that wharfs and docks and breakwaters built by this government should be built on the highways of travel and on the sea-board, and not in little lakes and rivers here and there.

Then, consider such expenditures as that on the 'Arctic.' In all the flurry there was been about the 'Arctic' have or have we not lost sight of the real service supposed to be rendered? Why has the 'Arctic' made three voyages—starting now on a fourth—at a cost to the country of about $400,000? All she has to show for it is a few hundred dollars of customs collected, a few hundred dollars charged for whaling licenses, the flagging of a few unimportant islands and the looking up of cairns marking the position of those islands. But this cannot be given as justification for the expenditure of $400,000 of the people's money. What then is the justification? Has any foreign power claimed jurisdiction in those northern waters? And if a foreign power were to make such a claim would it be best to deal with that by sending Captain Bernier to these northern waters to license a whaler or two? Or would it be better to

take up the matter diplomatically with the country that puts up that claim? Certainly there can be no doubt as to which would be the cheapest. But has any country put forward such a claim? Has Denmark? Has Norway or Sweden? Has the United States? Not the shade of a shadow of such claims has been put forward by any of these countries. Has Russia put forward such a claim or Japan? Neither. There is to-day no pretense that a claim has been made by any power to the sovereignty of those islands. What, then, is Captain Bernier, doing for the $400,000 spent on these expeditions? Is he seeking information of advantage of commerce, as to the passage of Hudson straits and the like of that? No; his duty is simply to flag islands, hunt up whalers to take out licenses and collect a few dollars of customs dues. How long is this mad expenditure of the people's money going on for such worthless purposes? Then take the North Atlantic Trading Company. Was there ever a more reckless bargain than this under which $370,000 of the people's money was paid out? To whom has that money been paid? Does anybody know? Yes, Mr. Preston knows. But he refused to tell what he knew to the people who had to pay the money. And the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows, for Mr. Preston told him. But the Prime Minister has not told parliament, though parliament gave him the money to spend on this North Atlantic Trading Company. This bargain was entered into without the authority of parliament, and all the information we have about it is that the people to whom the money was paid were so nervous about it that they said their names had to be kept secret, for if their names became known they would have to commit suicide

Then take the wharf at Grand Vallee. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had a supporter in this House who bought a lumber property far down the river St. Lawrence—I think for about $25,000. This supporter came to his friend and leader, and his friend and leader authorized the expenditure of about $80,000 to put a wharf on this man's private property, in a place where there was not even a post office and where there were no people except those employed in this man's works. And when the wharf was pretty well built, it was found to have served this gentleman's purpose of selling out his property for four times what he gave for it. That was the effect of this donation. Does the Prime Minister think this a proper expenditure of the hard earnings of the people? It is wrong, it is reprehensible, and no man should stand up in favour of the diversion of the public moneys in that way.

Then there is the Ross rifle concern—there is a pretty pickle of fish for an economical government. The government entered into a contract to get a rifle made in Canada, which is not made in Canada, and has not been from the beginning. They gave away 19⅓ acres of the people's domain—gave it away practically, although, in form, it is given under a 99 year's lease at $1 a year. But that is renewable at the end of 99 years and renewable again. And now these gentlemen are face to face with the difficulty that, if they want to get rid of the Ross rifle factory, they have to come to the people of this country and ask for $1,000,000 or more of their hard earnings to rectify the foolish thing that was done by this government. Was that lease ever ratified by parliament? Was there any enactment which provided for it? I can see that you may lease for a resonable time public property, but when you alienate it as you practically do by that kind of lease, is there any right to do that unless parliament authorizes it, and has parliament authorized it? I do not think so. And then the idea of paying for that Ross rifle, its absolute cost before the parts of the rifle are assembled, giving an amount for which you could buy as good a rifle for British or American use in advances alone, and then year after year finding them away behind in their contract wherever the trouble lies. It is no wonder the Auditor General asked where he was coming to if that kind of contract and financial arrangement was to be carried out.

Then there is the Quebec bridge. Here is the Minister of Finance and his colleagues actually taking hold of an immense undertaking which will cost millions of dollars, pledging their credit to it after giving a subsidy to a company which, however estimable and however substantial the members of the company in their private capacity may be, was absolutely unable, when its bonds were guaranteed by the government, to raise money to build that bridge and has been unable ever since, except by means of the government bonds, and the government bonds to-day mean as it is spelled outright in this House that the government itself is paying the 5 per cent interest on that money and the government itself has to pay the cost of that bridge.

Why, if a public work of a national character is to be built, should it be built by the middle man? My private opinion is that if it had not been for Mr. Parent, a close friend of the Prime Minister and some of the Prime Minister's associates we never would have had the government in a bargain like that, where the government stands to lose everything and the promoter to gain whatever is to be gained, and where, from the peculiar shiftlessness between the two, nobody seems to have been responsible, death in wholesale has come to many citizens of this country and a tremendous financial burden has been thrown upon the taxpayers of Canada.

Then there is the Ghicoutimi Pulp Company. What reason in the world was there

why Canada through its Minister of Marine or its Minister of Public Works should build in the river for the Chicoutimi Pulp Company a series of piers and booms which the company should have built for themselves, which they were willing to build for themselves if they had not found the government so easy a mark, and in the building of which $50,000 of the people's money has been expended? These piers and booms have been used by that company and others and the government has not received any return for the expenditures made. Why should not every manufacturer come to the right hon. gentleman and ask him to build a factory or a portion of the concern in which he is carrying on his own business? That is the way private interests are served by the public moneys of the country. Why should it be done? Will the Prime Minister himself stand for such an example of expenditure as that?

Then we have the St. Joseph's wharf where $17,000 was spent against the protest of the sitting member, a supporter of the government, and against the protest of every man who knew anything about the matter. Yet the people's money was used to the extent of $17,000 and the wharf is rotting and overturning to-day, a wharf which no sane man would have put there, which the men who contemplated establishing a business at that time would not have put there.

Then there is the mint. Here is another example of misrepresentation or lack of information. The history of this mint is peculiar. It was mooted in my time and the government of which I was a member said: The time may come in the history of Canada when we should have a mint, but there are so many things that we need more than we do a mint that it will have to be put off to the distant future. It was again brought to the attention of parliament, I think by Mr. McInnis, in about 1900 and the Finance Minister himself made a reasoned speech against the establishment of a mint not only in Victoria, but anywhere in Canada. It was a well-reasoned speech, every argument that he advanced was, I believe, a good argument and each argument was sufficient to preclude the possibility of building a mint, at least for the present. Then what happened? An election was being run in British Columbia. Maxwell was the candidate for the right hon. gentleman. Maxwell wanted support in the election. My right hon. friend wanted to give it. He did not send him money out of his own pocket. Oh no. He mortgaged the public treasury and telegraphed to Mr. Maxwell: The Mint shall be built. Thereafter through the riding it was 'Maxwell and the mint, vote for Maxwell.' That is a matter of history. Then the Finance Minister had to swallow his argument and his reasons. He did it like a little man; he came down here and gave us the most detailed information, declaring that the mint would cost $300,000, maybe a little less, certainly no more, and after all the fixings and everything were installed, and the plans were detailed out, the mint was to cost not more than $350,000. The mint is not yet finished but when it is finished, having cost over $500,000 now, it will cost at least $550,000 to $575,000. You have taken that much of the peoples' money in a country where necessary expenditures are so much called for and you have solidified that and fixed it in the Royal Mint. To carry the mint on and to pay for the depreciation of the building and the interest on its cost, will necessitate from $120,000 to $130,000 annually for up-keep alone. This is just so much taken out of what otherwise would be the profits of the people. You get nothing upon the gold you coin here. You would have the same profit upon the silver if you coined it as you have received on silver coined in Great Britain. The only extra cost entailed by coining it in Great Britain would be the cost of bringing it across the ocean. My belief is that the minister could more economically and at a lower cost have the coinage made at home than we can make it here, so that this expenditure is an absolute loss. You say that the establishment of the mint is a matter of sentiment. It may be, but there are many things that are matters of sentiment which we can afford to do without for a certain time, and I think myself that making that enormous expenditure, almost twice as much as the original estimates after the plans had been prepared, is a fair example of the reckless and unnecessary expenditure of this government—and it is an expenditure that might very well have been saved for the present at least.

Then let me instance the Yukon. Sir Richard Cartwright and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance used to sing the praises of the Yukon. What did the Finance Minister tell us? He announced that there was a large increase in the Yukon in 1900, a new source of revenue, he says, in the last year or two. In 1901 he declared the receipts were largely over the expenditure. 'It is the policy of the government,' he said, 'to make the Yukon pay for the Yukon.' So we were led to believe that this hitherto undiscovered country would be made a great source of revenue under economical management. What is the story as it is told to-day? The revenue in 1901 was $1,794,000; the expenditure was $1,311,000; the surplus was $48,000. But against that there was a capital expenditure of $583,000. The revenue goes on decreasing and the expenditure increasing until, in 1906, you have a revenue that has dwindled down to $750,152, while the expenditure has gone up to $1,394,012 on consolidated revenue account alone. The total from 1900 to 1906 gives as revenue $12,852,000, and as expenditure on consolidated revenue account of $14,474,000, a deficit of $1,511,454, and a capital account ex-

penditure of $2,133,445. There is a total deficit in the management of the Yukon in those years of $3,648,899. In 1901 the population of the Yukon was 28,000; in 1906 it was about 8,000; to-day it is probably not more than 5,000. In 1901 the cost per head of government was $46 a year; in 1906 the cost per head for government was $175. The revenue decreases and the expenditures go on, and the officials live, in numbers and in affluence and in point of salary, about as they lived before in the most prosperous times. The highest of them is out of the country for four or five months of the year, and they all draw salaries, without seemingly the least effort being made by the government to cut down expenses and to manage more economically. The gold output in 1900 was $22,275,000; the gold output in 1907 was $4,314,000.

There was another expenditure. The government built, by day's work and contract together, a telegraph line into the Yukon, and how does that pan out? Shortly after it was built the Canadian Pacific Railway made an offer to the minister to take over the line and to pay the government 4 per cent per year and operate it themselves. The government refused. To-day how does the account stand? From 1899 to 1906 the revenue has been $707,000 and the expenditure $1,326,000. The length in mileage is 2,256½. There has consequently been a deficit of about $620,000 in that line to the Yukon in those years. How is it going on now?

| Year. | Revenue. | Expenditure. |
|---|---|---|
| 1904 | $126,000 | $199,000 |
| 1905 | 115,000 | 229,000 |
| 1906 | 77,000 | 208,000 |
| 1907 (six months) | 38,000 | 122,000 |
| | $358,701 | $760,025 |
| Deficit | | $401,324 |

And still the work goes on, and the deficits go on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken up the attention of the House longer than I had thought. There is another phase of the subject that I would like to discuss, and it will take me, I think, about three-quarters of an hour. But I am very tired of speaking, and if it be the pleasure of the right hon. gentleman, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This debate will go on to-morrow, I suppose?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10 p.m.

Mr. FOSTER.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 18, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Blain—asked:

What is the total amount of customs duties paid to date upon the materials imported from the United States which entered into the construction of the Quebec bridge?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The collector at Quebec reports the total amount of customs duties paid to date on materials imported from the United States for construction of the Quebec bridge to be $504,884.76.

BENJAMIN PACAUD.

Mr. CLEMENTS—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has one Benjamin Pacaud, recently of the town of Sandwich, been appointed to the customs staff at the port of Windsor?
2. If so, what are his duties and what salary does he receive?

Hon. WM PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

MR. DONALD FRASER.

Mr. COCKSHUTT—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Is one Donald Fraser still subcollector of customs for the port of Huntingdon, British Columbia? If not, when was he dismissed from the service?
2. What was the cause of his dismissal, and was a thorough investigation made as to his conduct?
3. What was the nature of the settlement arrived at in his case?
4. What was the total amount of his defalcation?
5. If any restitution was made on his behalf, what was the amount of money refunded?
6. Was any prosecution instituted against said Fraser? If not, for what cause?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Upon inspection of the outport of Huntingdon, B.C., by Mr. Inspector Clute, in September, 1905, irregularities were discovered, and Mr. Donald Fraser, the subcollector, was thereupon placed under suspension by the inspector. A thorough investigation of the outport was then made, and deficiencies to the amount of $4,241.46 were found to exist, which amount was paid by Mr. Fraser to the inspector of customs at that time.

When the report of the inspector was received by the department, an order in council was passed dispensing with Mr. Fraser's services. No further action has yet been taken.

## RAW WOOL.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. How many pounds of raw wool were imported into Canada in the years 1905, 1906 and 1907?

2. What duties were collected on same?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. The quantity of raw wool imported into Canada during the fiscal years ended June 30, 1905, 1906 and 1907 was as follows:—

| | |
|---|---|
| 1905 | 7,617,211 |
| 1906 | 6,311,837 |
| 1907 | 6,310,179 |

2. During the fiscal year 1905 there were 69 pounds of dutiable raw wool imported, and the duty paid thereon amounted to $1.58. All the balance of this article was imported free of duty.

## MR. W. J. JOHNSTONE.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What amounts, if any, have been paid to W. J. Johnstone, a chief clerk in the Post Office Department, inside service, in the years 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, inclusive, in addition to his salary?

2. How many days leave of absence, if any, have been granted to said W. J. Johnstone in above years, showing year by year?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. The Post Office Department has paid nothing to Mr. Johnstone other than his regular salary, but the Department of Labour, as explained to parliament yearly when the vote has been asked for, has paid him at the rate of $500 per annum for performing the duties of accountant for that department, which payment began on the 1st of September, 1901, during which year he received $416.66. Since then, as stated above, he has been paid at the rate of $500 per annum.

2. During the year 1904 Mr. Johnstone was, owing to illness, absent between two and three months. Outside of this leave there has been no absence from duty other than the annual vacation to which every clerk is entitled.

## POSTAL REGULATIONS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What is the total amount of money claimed by the daily papers of Canada, as damag to their circulation owing to the action of the Postmaster General in connection with the changing of the postal regulations last May?

2. Has the government received any complaints from the Canadian Press Association in regard to the regulations governing weekly papers? If so, what is the nature of said complaints, and what action does the government intend to take in regard to same?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. The daily and weekly papers of Canada claimed, that as the treaty between Canada and the United States was abrogated in the middle of the calendar year, and that their obligations to subscribers had to be fulfilled regardless of the increased cost of postage for that period, the department should refund the difference in postage between the amount they were paying under the old treaty, viz.: (½ and ¼ cent per pound) and the amount they would have to pay under the amended treaty. The department compromised by returning to them 3 cents a pound.

2. No.

## CHARLOTTE COUNTY WHARF.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. BLAIN—asked:

1. Has a petition been received from the residents near Welch's cove in the parish of Lepreux, county of Charlotte, New Brunswick, for the erection of a wharf at that point?

2. Is it the intention of the government to place an amount in the estimates to build a wharf at Welch's cove?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). No information in the department.

## NEGRO POINT SUBMARINE SIGNAL.

Mr. DANIEL—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has a submarine signal apparatus been recently installed off Negro point, bay of Fundy?

2. If so, what is the cost of same, showing expenditure in detail for submarine apparatus, cables, and electric wiring to Tiner's point, right of way, power station at Tiner's point, and plant therein, and anything else appertaining to cost of said submarine apparatus and station?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes.

2. Total cost, $23,811.60, divided as follows, viz.:

| | |
|---|---|
| Station building at Tiner's Point | $2,384 50 |
| Electric land line | 3,646 00 |
| Land at Negro Head | 215 00 |
| Installation of machinery | 599 44 |
| Machinery | 3,000 00 |
| Two bells (inc.) | 3,700 00 |
| Two tripods | 1,000 00 |
| Cables | 9,266 00 |
| | $23,811 60 |

## QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the government received any communications calling their attention to the need of raising the Quebec bridge, now in course of construction, so that it will not be a barrier to large steamships plying between Montreal and foreign ports?

2. If so, how many of such communications has the government received, and what are the names of the men and organizations who have forwarded such communications or pe-

titions, giving a synopsis of each communication or petition?

3. Does the government intend to change the plans to meet the wishes of the petitioners, if any? If so, to what extent will said changes be made?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. Yes.

2. Two communications were received; one from the board of trade of the city of Montreal and from the Montreal Harbour Commissioners, asking that such action be taken by the government, as will insure that the Quebec bridge, when rebuilt, shall be at least 190 feet above tidewater.

3. The matter has not yet been disposed of.

## CANADIAN NEWSPAPERS—REMISSION OF SURTAX.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the Post Office Department paid back to certain Canadian newspapers any money as drawback or otherwise to indemnify them for the American surtax in consequence of the last postal arrangements with that country?

2. If so, to which newspapers was it paid, and how much was paid in such a way?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Yes.

2. Cheques have been issued to the undermentioned newspapers in settlement of their accounts.

| | |
|---|---|
| Acton 'Free Press' | $ 10 44 |
| Ailsa Craig 'Banner' | 7 74 |
| Alliston 'Herald' | 5 76 |
| Alvinston 'Free Press' | 11 22 |
| Amherst 'Gazette' | 1 30 |
| Amherst 'Telegram' | 1 39 |
| Amherst 'Templar' | 0 15 |
| Amherstburg 'Echo' | 25 83 |
| Antigonish 'Casket' | 44 49 |
| Arichat 'Richmond Record' | 2 85 |
| Athens 'Reporter' | 5 64 |
| Atwood 'Bee' | 3 15 |
| Aylmer West 'Sun' | 5 22 |
| Aylmer West 'Express' | 13 50 |
| Ayr 'News' | 3 18 |
| Ayton 'Advance' | 9 60 |
| Baie St. Paul 'L'Echo de Charlevoix. | 19 14 |
| Baldur 'Gazette' | 0 65 |
| Barrie 'Gazette' | 4 20 |
| Barrie 'Advance' | 8 28 |
| Barrie 'Examiner' | 6 06 |
| Battleford 'Herald' | 1 02 |
| Beamsville 'Express' | 2 85 |
| Beeton 'World' | 3 99 |
| Belleville 'Intelligencer' | 22 38 |
| Berlin 'Journal' | 31 97 |
| Berlin 'Canadian Colonist' | 0 69 |
| Berlin 'Glocke' | 0 81 |
| Berlin 'Gospel Banner' | 121 86 |
| Berlin 'Youth's Banner' | 16 62 |
| Berlin 'Missionary' | 21 51 |
| Berlin 'St. Jerome Schoolman' | 6 48 |
| Berwick 'Register' | 14 40 |
| Blenheim 'News-Tribune' | 14 58 |
| Bobcaygeon 'Independent' | 4 08 |
| Bowmanville 'News' | 3 51 |
| Bracebridge 'Muskoka Herald' | $ 2 79 |
| Bradford 'Witness & News' | 4 86 |
| Brantford 'Expositor' | 14 04 |
| Bridgetown 'Monitor' | 38 34 |
| Brighton 'Ensign' | 14 64 |
| Broadview 'Express' | 46 38 |
| Burks Falls 'Arrow' | 6 12 |
| Burlington 'Gazette' | 3 96 |
| Caledonia 'Grand River Sachem' | 4 95 |
| Caledonia 'Haldimand Banner' | 2 04 |
| Calgary 'Farm & Ranch' | 23 64 |
| Campbellton 'Events' | 12 60 |
| Candiac 'La Vérité' | 51 03 |
| Cannington 'Gleaner' | 2 79 |
| Cap Magdeleine 'Annales du Presse, St. R.' | 54 84 |
| Carberry 'Express' | 1 38 |
| Carleton Place 'Herald' | 5 67 |
| Carleton Place 'Central Canadian' | 10 20 |
| Carlyle 'Herald' | 1 92 |
| Cayuga 'Haldimand Advocate' | 22 80 |
| Montreal 'La Presse' | 20,652 75 |
| Montreal 'La Patrie' | 2,863 12 |
| Toronto 'News' | 185 25 |
| Toronto 'World' | 791 84 |
| Toronto 'Globe' | 1,093 40 |
| Toronto 'Mail' | 1,009 84 |

## MR. REGINALD DALY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. When did Reginald Daly enter the service of the Geological Survey Department, and at what salary?

2. Has he been continuously in the service ever since, and at what rate of salary from time to time?

3. What sums of money has Mr. Daly been paid by the government, specifying each financial year separately, and the number of months in each time paid for?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. July 1, 1901, $2,000 per annum.

2. Transferred to Department of Interior July 20, 1905, salary $2,000 per annum.

3. Sums paid to Dr. Daly for salary:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1901-02, 12 months | $2,000 00 |
| 1902-03, 12 months | 2,000 00 |
| 1903-04, 12 months | 2,000 00 |
| 1904-05, 12 months | 2,000 00 |
| 1905-06, 12 months | 2,000 00 |
| 1906-07, 12 months | 2,500 00 |
| 1907-08, 6 months | 1,249 98 |

## MR. BROCK.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What position does Mr. Brock occupy in connection with the Geological Survey Department, is he permanently appointed to this position, when was he appointed, and what is his salary?

2. Was Mr. Brock in the service of the department before being appointed to the position above referred to? If so, when, how often, for what periods, at what salaries and what sums of money has he been paid?

3. Did Mr. Brock on certain occasions sever his connection with the department? If so, when, during what periods, and for what cause?

4. Was Mr. Brock paid for any period or periods during which he was not in the actual

service of the department? If so, upon what occasions, for what length of time, and why?

5. Is the government aware that during the absences of Mr. Brock from the service he was employed by private parties and firms?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. Acting Director Geological Survey Branch Department of Mines, November 28, 1907, salary $2,200 per annum.

2. Yes. Temporarily engaged on field work, seasons 91, 92, 93, 94 and 96. First permanent appointment May 1, 1897.

Salary 1896-97 $ 166 66
" 1897-98 1,000 00
" 1898-99 1,050 00
" 1899-1900 1,100 00
" 1900-01 1,200 00
" 1901-02 1,250 00
" 1902-03 541 66 (Leave of absence Oct. 1, '02, to May 1, '03, School of Science, Kingston, without pay.)
Salary 1903-04 $ 562 50 Ditto Oct. 1, '03—May 1, '04, without pay.
Salary 1904-05 $ 583 33 Ditto Oct. 1, '04—May 1, '05, without pay.
Salary 1905-06 $ 624 28 Ditto Oct. 1, '05—April 26, '06, without pay.
Salary 1906-07 $1,612 50 for 9 months.
" 1907-08 1,843 32 Leave of absence, June, '07, without pay.
Leave of absence, Nov. 1 to 28, '07, without pay.

3. No.
4. No.
5. Yes.

EMPLOYMENT OF DR. A. E. BARLOW.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Was Doctor A. E. Barlow in the service of the Geological Survey Department prior to and in the year 1902?

2. Did Doctor A. E. Barlow leave this service in 1902 or 1903, or thereabouts? If so, when and for what cause?

3. What was the rate of salary paid to Doctor A. E. Barlow up to the time he severed his connection as above-mentioned?

4. Did Doctor A. E. Barlow again return to the service of the department? If so, when, at what salary, and has he since been continuously in the service of the department?

5. Is Doctor A. E. Barlow now in the service of the department? If so, at what salary?

6. What sums have been paid to Doctor A. E. Barlow as salary since 1896?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. Yes.

2. Six months leave of absence were given Dr. Barlow from July 1, 1901, to make an examination of the nickel deposits, Sudbury region, for Dr. Mond, the results of which were given to the Geological Survey as per agreement with Dr. Bell the then acting director.

3. Dr. Barlow did not sever his connection with the Geological Survey until the 31st July, 1907, his salary then was $2,000.

4. Dr. Barlow resumed his regular duties on the staff upon the completion of his work for Dr. Mond, and was continuously in the service until the 31st July, 1907.

5. No.

6.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1896-97 | $1,350 |
| 1897-98 | 1,350 |
| 1898-99 | 1,350 |
| 1899-1900 | 1,550 |
| 1900-01 | 1,650 |
| 1901-02 | 1,700 |
| 1902-03 | 1,750 |
| 1903-04 | 1,800 |
| 1904-05 | 1,850 |
| 1905-06 | 1,900 |
| 1906-07 | |
| 9 months | $1,462.50 |
| 1907-08 | |
| 4 months | $654.16 |

EMPLOYEES OF PARLIAMENT AND OF PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What are the names and salaries of the permanent and sessional employees of the Senate and House of Commons at this date?

2. To what religious denomination do they belong individually, Protestant or Roman Catholic?

3. What is the date of appointment of each?

4. What are the names and salaries of the employees of the Printing Bureau, including the King's Printer and staff, at this date?

5. The religion of each, specifying whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, and date of appointment?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). This question will stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

EMPLOYMENT OF MR. D. B. DOWLING.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Was Mr. D. B. Dowling in the service of the Geological Survey Department in January, 1907, and January, 1908; and if during a portion only, what portion of the year?

2. What position did he occupy and at what salary?

3. Is Mr. D. B. Dowling now in the service of the department, when did his present engagement of service begin, and at what salary?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Mines):

1. Yes. Leave of absence without pay from 1st May to 1st October, 1907.

2. Field geologist—technical class—$1,800.

3. Yes. No new engagement—Resumed duties 1st October, 1907, $1,850.

SUTHERLAND RIFLE SIGHTS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. Who has the contract for manufacturing the Sutherland rifle back sights for the De-

partment of Militia and Defence, and where are they being made?

2. What is the date of the original contract, the condition as to delivery, price of the sights, and how many have been delivered under the same?

3. Have any modifications been made in the original contract? If so, what and on what date?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. (a) The Sutherland Rifle Sight Company, Limited.

(b) At Westville, Nova Scotia.

2. (a) April 16, 1906.

(b) Deliveries to begin September 15, 1906, and to be completed March 15, 1908.

(c) $1.

(d) None.

3. An order in council dated March 7, 1908, authorized an increase of 20 cents in the contract price, and extended the time for commencement and completion of the contract to March 15, 1908, and September 15, 1909, respectively.

THE DREDGE 'SIR WILFRID LAURIER.'

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. When was the dredge 'Sir Wilfrid Laurier' completed, and what was the cost?

2. Did this cost include the scow necessary for carrying on its operations?

3. If not, was the construction of such scow asked for by public tender?

4. Is the scow now being built? If so, where, and at what cost?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING, (for Minister of Public Works):

1. (a) To be completed 1st June, 1908.

(b) $90,000.

2. No.

3. Tenders were not advertised for, but the following were asked to submit offers: The Collingwood Shipbuilding Company; The Polson Iron Works Company.

4. An order in council was passed March 9, 1908, awarding contract to the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company for $34,000.

RENT OF CANADIAN BUILDING.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What portion of the Canadian building, so called, is rented by the government, and for what departments?

2. Who owns the building?

3. What is the total amount of space rented, the amount paid per square foot, the total annual rental so calculated, and the length of lease?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (for Minister of Public Works):

1. (a) The whole building, with the exception of a small office reserved by the Imperial Realty Company. (b) Interior, Agriculture, Railways and Canals, Marine and Fisheries, Auditor General.

2. The Imperial Realty Company.

3. 1st lease, 1906 to 1911: 66,660 sup. feet at 41 cents per sup. foot, $27,330.60. 2nd lease, 1907 to 1911: 37,090 sup. feet at 41 cents per sup. foot, $15,206.90. Totals, 103,750 sup. feet, $42,537.50.

HERD OF BUFFALO, ELK PARK.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What is the present location of the herd of buffalo purchased by the government in Montana?

2. Has any area been set apart for their permanent location, and is that area a solid block, or does it include lands owned by other parties? If so, by whom?

3. What methods will be taken to keep the buffalo within the range?

4. If the area is to be fenced, what will be the mileage and the cost per mile of fencing?

5. Have tenders been ordered for the construction of the fence?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Those which have been brought into Canada are located in Elk Park, in townships 54, ranges 19 and 20, west of the 4th meridian.

2. Yes. It includes lands covered by the Hudson Bay Company grant, several sections belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. These companies are being negotiated with for the surrender of these lands, and have expressed a willingness to do so. There are also two homestead entries in the names of W. Wojewidke and E. C. Bidette.

3. A fence will be erected around the tract.

4. About seventy miles. The cost has been estimated at about $1,000 per mile.

5. Yes.

CAPTAIN BERNIER'S WORK.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What islands have been flagged by Captain Bernier as the result of his three cruises in the northern waters?

2. How many whalers have been licensed each year, and what amount of money has been collected therefor?

3. What customs ports have been established during their voyages, at what points, at what yearly cost for maintenance, and what customs dues have been collected each year?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I would ask to have the first two sections of the question stand.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The answer to the third section of the question is:

3. The collection of customs duties in the northern waters of Canada has been looked after since 1902 by officers of the Northwest Mounted Police and by an acting officer of customs on board the government ships visiting various fishing stations in these waters. Superintendent J. D. Moodie, of the North-

west Mounted Police, was authorized in 1903 to act as customs officer in the northern waters without salary, except as a police officer. A customs office was opened at Fullerton, Hudson bay, 7th November, 1903, under Superintendent Moodie's directions, the officer in charge to receive 10 per cent of the collections. James Duncan, an officer of the preventive service, at salary of $800 a year, accompanied the expedition of 1906-7 for the customs. He secured orders for payment of customs duties to the amount of $985.21. The customs duties previously collected in these northern waters since 1902 amounted to $671.22.

## RAMSLAND HOMESTEAD ENTRY.

Mr. LAKE—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

1. In respect of the N.W. ¼ section 35, township 31, range 6, W. 2nd meridian, what sum was paid by Mr. O. Ramsland in respect of entry fees, or in regard to any improvements there may have been on the land, and where are such payments accounted for in the Auditor General's Report?

2. Was a re-entry for another homestead granted to Dimitry Soochochen after his abandonment of the above homestead? If so, for what section, and on what terms?

3. Did he receive any consideration for abandoning his first homestead?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. $5 entry fee, being the usual fee for half of a quarter-section, and Mr. Ramsland only entered for the north half of the north-west quarter of section 35, township 31, range 6, west 2nd meridian. This payment is accounted for in the Auditor General's Report for 1905-1906, page L—93, Dominion lands revenue, Yorkton agency, and is included in the amount of $41,210 in column headed 'Homesteads.' Nothing was paid for improvements.

2. No.

3. No.

## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE —TERCENTENARY OF QUEBEC—VISIT OF THE PRINCE OF WALES.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE (Montmagny). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before we pass to the Orders of the Day, I want to draw the attention of the government upon a paragraph of the parliamentary letter of the newspaper 'La Patrie,' dated 12th March instant, relating to a conversation between Mr. Byron E. Walker, president of the Canadian Bank of Commerce and one of the members of the commission appointed to organize the celebration of the Quebec Tercentenary. This conversation was published in the Halifax 'Chronicle,' as follows:

The Prince of Wales and the fleet of men-of-war will not stop at Halifax. Owing to the shortness of the time allowed to His Royal Highness, the date of his visit was fixed to the end of July, though it would have been preferable to put it to a later date, during the fall. It is proposed to invite to the celebration representatives of all the English possessions and even representatives of Hindoo States, outside of the English and French fleets, and the Canada militia. It will not be a celebration exclusively Canadian, neither a Canadian celebration. It will have an Imperial meaning; during a whole week we will make of the Plains of Abraham the centre of the empire.

I would like to know, if this conversation of Mr. Walker was representing the views of the commission appointed by the government, and if he was authorized to make such a declaration?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. (Translation.) In answer to my hon. friend, I must say that the commission has not yet been appointed; that Mr. Walker had no communication with the government, and consequently was not authorized to make such statement, for which the government is not responsible.

## ROBBINS IRRIGATION COMPANY.

Mr. H. B. AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine) moved:

For a copy of all papers necessary to bring the information contained in sessional paper, No. 90, 1907, up to date.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) please explain?

Mr. AMES. The object is to have the balance of the papers in reference to the Robbins Irrigation Company's operations in Southern Alberta.

Motion agreed to.

## MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, and memoranda exchanged between the British government and the government of Canada relating to the establishment of the Royal Mint at Ottawa.—Mr. Caron.

For a copy of all correspondence, reports, communications and other papers and documents of every kind and description not already brought down, relative to the rifle known as the Ross rifle, or to the contract between the government and any person or corporation with respect to the said rifle, or to the value or efficiency thereof, or to any alleged defects therein. Also a copy of all letters, telegrams, despatches, reports, and other communications of every kind from the British government or any member or official thereof, or from the War Office, or Secretary of State for War, or any officer or official or person employed by or in the service of the British government, to the Governor General of Canada, or to the government of Canada, or to the Minister of Militia, or to any officer or official or person in the public service of Canada, relative to the said rifle, or to the value or efficiency of the said rifle or any defects therein, or any matter or thing connected therewith.—Mr. Worthington.

For a return showing: 1. The contracts between the Commissioners of the National Transcontinental Railway and S. D. McArthur, M. P. & J. T. Davis, and MacDonell & O'Brien, respectively, for construction of the said railway in districts B and F, and the plans and specifications relating thereto.

2. All classified progress estimates from the respective residencies, of work done in each month of the year 1907 under each of said contracts, as made by the resident division, district, and other agencies; and all reports upon, and changes, revisions, corrections, additions and deductions made in such estimates; and all correspondence in regard thereto between the said engineer, or with any inspector, or between them and the chief engineer, or the commissioners, or between the commissioners, or any of them, and any engineer or other official, and the contractors or sub-contractors.

3. The amounts of the moneys paid upon or in respect of such several progress estimates, and the dates of such payments.

4. All instructions from time to time to any engineer or inspector with regard to any work done or to be done under said several contracts, or as to the classification of such work.

5. All claims for extras or allowance upon work done during said period under each contract, whether allowed or disallowed, and the correspondence relating thereto.

6. All letters, communications, protests, objections, reports or statements, to or from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company with regard to any work done during the aforesaid period under the said contracts, or with regard to the classified progress estimates aforesaid.—Mr. Barker.

For a return showing the amount paid for the property known as the hospital lot, Belleville, Ontario, the first site selected for drill hall in Belleville; the amount received for the same property on its re-sale by the government; the amount paid for passing the title and making the transfer to the government and from the government, to whom, and when; date the purchase was made, and when the property was re-sold; and upon whose recommendation the property was purchased, and resold.—Mr. Porter.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. H. A. WARD (Durham). I would like to ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) when I may expect the return asked for on February 19 regarding the case of one Blunden.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I shall be able to present that return to the House to-morrow or next day.

## GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

On the order,

Second reading of Bill (No. 27) to amend the Government Railways Act.—Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) will be here in a moment. I know that he desires to proceed with this Bill, and, in his absence, I move the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read second time.

## WIRES AND WATER MAINS ACROSS RAILWAYS.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin). Moved the second reading of Bill (No. 43 to amend the Railway Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to facilitate the crossing of railway rights of way by telegraph and telephone wires, water mains and viaducts of different kinds. In effect, the Bill provides that in the event of any person desiring to cross the track of a railway with telephone, telegraph or electric light wires, water mains, &c., he must give the railway company notice through its agent in the municipality, or, in case there is no agent in the municipality, then through the nearest agent.

At the end of ten days they can go on and construct the line. If the railway authorities take exception to the crossing of the track, or to going under it, as the case may be, then the railway authorities must apply to the Railway Commission and the Railway Commission must notify the individual or corporation that they desire to cross the track. The Railway Commission must then notify the individuals or corporations, as the case may be, that they must send plans and specifications of the proposed work to the Railway Commission and it has to judge with respect to them. Those are the changes in connection with the law. There is also a provision in the Bill that no railway company may demand any payment in connection with the crossing of their line whether it is by a telephone, a telegraph or other electric wire, but in the event of a crossing under the track by a water main, a viaduct, or a sewer, &c., the parties must pay for an engineer, the cost of such engineer not to exceed $3 a day. Under the present law a person desiring to cross a railway track with a telephone, telegraph or other electric wire must apply to the railway authorities. In almost every case there is great delay. They have to make their application to be allowed to cross, usually a considerable interval elapses before they receive an answer, and when they do receive an answer it is generally to the effect that if they pay $5 they will be allowed to cross the railway. I submit that this is a great injustice. I submit that these railway corporations have no right to draw one cent from the country in this way. We have a right to expect that we can cross with our wires at any time without any cost. The result is that we find it necessary, in so far as telephones, telegraphs and electric wires are concerned, to make application to the Railway Commission and then we find very frequently that they are engaged, or that

they have more work than they can overtake, or that they are taking their holidays and there are three or four weeks during which no business can be done. This happens to be about the time when telephone and other electric wires and water mains are constructed. The fall of the year is the most convenient time for farmers to undertake work of this kind. Thus we find that great expense is put upon individuals in connection with these lines. I submit that the railway companies have no right to claim any money for allowing people to string wires across their tracks. But that is the course they pursue and in order to prove that I need only read to you a letter which I received in my own riding. An application was made by a builder there to be allowed to cross the track with a telephone wire. He had obtained authority to do so from the municipal council. He made application and in a few weeks the company sent back word that he could cross by paying $5. He came to me and I wrote a letter to Mr. Murphy, superintendent of the railway, remonstrating with him and telling him that I did not think that they had the right to tax people for crossing their line. I received the following letter in reply:

Your letter of the 17th in connection with Mr. Cole's application to string wires across our tracks at Shelburne, duly reached me.

I note that Mr. Cole has applied to the Railway Commission for permission to put his wires over our tracks. You, of course, understand that in connection with such crossings this company is put to considerable expense, handling the application, preparing blue prints, &c., which the amount of $5 does not really cover.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) E. MURPHY.

I say there is no expense in connection with it and they have no right whatever to charge municipalities or individuals one cent. But we find that whilst that is their price in connection with telephones, telegraphs and other electric wires, they go one better, in fact you might say very much better, in connection with water mains or sewers. They have the form of a lease which they send out accompanied by a demand upon those who wish to cross with water mains for $4 and $1 per year for all time to come. I have a copy of one of these leases here. A lady came to our town and purchased a large house on the opposite side of the railway track from the public utilities, such as waterworks, electric light, telephone, telegraph, &c. She applied to the Bell Telephone Company asking that they install their service, which was immediately done. You will understand that the Bell Telephone Company have an agreement under which they do not require to delay and under which they can string their wires across the track. She also made application to the electric company to install their apparatus in her house. She then found that she had to make application to the railway company. I should say that before doing so she made application to the municipality, and the council very gladly granted the right to lay the water mains along the streets and to extend them across the railway. But when she made application to the railway company for permission to cross with electric wires they told her that she would have to pay $5 a year. They also told her she would have to sign an agreement by which she would have to pay $4 for the crossing and $1 a year for all time to come. This letter says:

I recommend that the application be granted at a rental of $1 per annum. In fixing rentals superintendents should take into consideration the company has to pay all taxes on premises and make sufficient allowance to cover same; Mrs. Witters to pay $4 for repairing.

I may say that the municipality of Shelburne made an application last fall to extend their water main across one of the streets over which the railway passed and the railway company sent a lease similar to this asking the municipality to sign it. Now, as to these crossings in connection with telegraphs, telephone and power wires, or the construction of water mains, in 99 cases out of 100 they are all on the streets or highways, and the railways do not pay any taxes in connection with their railroad so far as the highways are concerned. Of course they own the railway track and they do pay taxes on it, but in crossing public highways in rural districts or villages, towns, and cities they pay no taxes. And in endeavouring to obtain such a lease as this which I have referred to, seeing that they do not own the property they are endeavouring to get that lease by misrepresentation. They have no right to demand one cent from any municipality for such a purpose. The municipalities owned these streets and highways before these railroads were built and it is only because the charter parliament gives a railway that it has any right to cross any public highway. Quite a number of municipalities and individuals throughout the country have signed these leases in ignorance of their legal position and fearing there would be delay if they applied to the Railway Commission. and that they might be put to the expense of employing a lawyer. It is an imposition for the railways to force such a lease on the municipalities. The municipality of Shelburne handed the lease back to the representative of the company and told him it was an enormous amount of impudence for the company to ask the municipality to sign a lease for the privilege of crossing one of their own streets. Every such lease that is to-day in existence in the Dominion of Canada should be cancelled. I venture to

say that when it is known, as it is pretty generally known now, that the railways have not the right to demand this lease, very few of them will be signed in the future. It is in the interests of the railways themselves that they should cease endeavouring to retard progress in the matter of telephone and telegraph communication. The use of the telephone is increasing rapidly and it is of the greatest importance to the people that every facility should be granted for its extension. The rural districts are building telephone lines in every direction to connect with the cities, towns and villages, and the farmers' sons being thus placed in communication with the populous centres, it makes them more contented on the farm. Then, the telephone is a source of wealth to the farmer. Numbers of progressive farmers have telephones in their own houses, and if they wish to market their cattle or grain on a certain day they can learn by telephone in the morning how the market stands and if it is unfavourable they can hold their stock for another day. Without the telephone they would have to take chances on bringing their produce in and selling it at a low price.

Many farmers communicate with cattle buyers and grain buyers in order to obtain from them information in regard to the city markets, and by this means hundreds of thousands of dollars have been saved to the farmers of this country. The use of the telephone makes people in every way more contented on the farm. So far as the Railway Commission is concerned, we have no complaint to make. They have done their work as well as possible, but I know from my own experience that during the summer months, not only in the province of Ontario, but in other provinces, business has been held up for weeks and months either because the members of the commission were on their holidays or were pressed with other work. But I am glad to know that the commission have not refused one single application of this kind that has been made to them, which proves beyond a doubt that not one of these applications was necessary, and that the only reason the railroads had refused them was that they might obtain the $5, or, in the case of water mains, that they might get a lease with $1 a year for all time to come. If the present law is not changed, we are going to throw an enormous amount of unnecessary work upon the Railway Commission, who are already very much overworked. I find from the return which has been brought down in answer to my request, that during the last two and a half years there were in the Dominion of Canada 1,386 applications for telephones, 215 applications for water mains and 65 applications for telegraphs, making a total of 1,666 applications. Every one of these applications has been granted by the Railway Commission, proving beyond a doubt, that there was no necessity for one of them being made. In some cases a length of time has elapsed before the application has been granted, for the reason I have already suggested. On one or two occasions I myself wrote to the commission, and received the reply that they were sorry they had not yet reached my application, but that it would be attended to as soon as possible. If a change is not made in the law, the applications will be more numerous than ever, for the people will no longer consent to pay to the railroads $5 which they have no right to pay, and will no longer consent to sign a lease which is a fraud on its face, which is obtained by misrepresentation. The railroads might just as well stop endeavouring to get them, for they will not be carried out. So far as the railroads under the control of the government are concerned, no such thing has been found necessary. I took occasion in Toronto to call on the commission controlling the Temiscamingue and other railroads under the Ontario commission and they told me that their custom was, when an application was sent in for permission to cross their railway, to immediately send word to their manager that such an application has been made, with a paper or a book giving him instructions as to what kind of wires should be used, the height at which they should be placed, and so on, and they said that in not one case had twenty-four hours elapsed before these instructions were sent out after the application was received. In no case was there a refusal. I have endeavoured to obtain some information in regard to the custom in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, and so far as I have been able to ascertain there has been no obstruction. After the application is made, the custom, I understand, is to send it to the manager of the section concerned, and he immediately gives instructions for the crossing to be made and how the crossing shall be accomplished. Now, if crossings can be made over the railroads under the control of the Ontario government and the Dominion government without any obstruction or delay, and without any charge, I think it must be apparent to every hon. gentleman in this House that it is a great injustice on the part of the railroad companies to endeavour to obstruct the progress of the country, or to extract from the free and independent electors or from the municipalities of the country one dollar of what belongs to them for a right which they ought to enjoy. I think it has been proved beyond a doubt that this obstruction on the part of the railroads is purely for the purpose of making money. If this Bill passes, and we make it a misdemeanour for the railroads to attempt to collect money from the people, and we make it necessary for them, if they desire to raise any objection, to notify the Railway Commission, I venture to say that these difficulties will be reduced to a mini-

mum and there will not be a baker's dozen of applications of this kind to the Railway Commission in the next three years. In that way, by passing this Bill, we shall be taking a great deal of unnecessary work from the Railway Commission and shall be accomplishing a great good for the farmers and municipalities of the country. In regard to the crossing of railroads by water mains, I may say that in looking over the cases that have been before the Railway Commission, I find that it is their custom to cause the individual or corporation to pay the engineer a sum not exceeding $3 a day. In every case I find the board has awarded $3 a day. Hon. gentlemen may say that that is a small amount, but the work is one which does not tax the engineer to any extent. In the case of a water main, the custom is to run it up to the track on each side, and so far as small water mains are concerned the ground is not broken. They have apparatus for boring beneath the track, and in no case is the engineer there more than an hour. As regards sewers and different kinds of viaducts in cities that might be different, but it is contended that since the corporations have their own engineers they should not be called upon to pay a large amount. In the case of water mains I am governed by the decision of the Railway Commission in every case, and that is that $3 a day should be paid for the services of the engineer. The provision which I propose in this connection is as follows :

In no case shall any municipal corporation or telephone or telegraph company be required to pay to the railway company any fee for the supervision of the work that is so undertaken; but in every case where a water main, conduit or sewer is carried under the railway, the person or corporation so carrying it shall pay to the railway company a sum not exceeding $3 a day for the services of the railway company's engineer in supervising such work.

This will effectually prevent the railways from trying to complicate the work. This Bill has received the consideration of a very large number of municipalities. It has been before the country a number of weeks and has been well advertised. After I introduced it into this House, I found that the union of municipalities took up the question and published the Bill in their journal, in the December number. Hon. gentlemen are aware that the 'Canadian Municipal Journal' is an organ devoted specially to the interests of the municipalities and is the mouthpiece of the Municipal Union. As soon as I introduced this measure, I had a letter from the secretary of the Municipal Union asking me to send copies of the Bill to the newspaper, and I also had a letter from the secretary saying that the Union approved of the Bill but suggesting certain amendments in some minor details, which I shall deal with later on. Here is the reference in the 'Municipal Journal' :—

A very important amendment to the Railway Act has been introduced by Dr. Barr, which we give in full along with a letter from Dr. Barr.

Here is the letter which I wrote to the secretary of the Municipal Union :—

Dear Sir,—In reply to yours of the 17th, I herewith inclose a copy of my Bill which I introduced to the House yesterday. I am very much pleased to hear that the Union of Canadian Municipalities is taking an interest in the Bill. I think the municipalities have been put to very much unnecessary trouble in crossing railroad lines with their telephones, telegraphs and water mains, and an unnecessary amount of work is thrown on the railroad board, in settling those questions. My Bill gives the best solution of the question I can form, and if your organization approves of the Bill or the principle of the Bill, I would be pleased to have your assistance, as I am aware the railroads will oppose the Bill. Should you approve of the Bill and find any amendments you could suggest, I would be pleased to give them my careful consideration.

I remain,

Yours Truly,
JOHN BARR.

Immediately afterwards I received letters from almost every part of the Dominion. For instance, here is a telegram from Victoria, B.C., the riding of my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) :—

Victoria, B.C., January 14, 1908.

Dr. John Barr,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

Railway Act amendment please include as subject matter in amendment 246 all municipal utilities, sewers, drains, culverts for wiring, also drainage by resolution of council.

W. J. DOWLER,
Clerk Municipal Council.

I endeavoured to meet those wishes as far as possible and did amend the Bill in that sense. I also have a letter from Gormley, the riding of the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) North York :

Gormley, Ont., January 22, 1908.

Dear Sir,—A copy of the 'Canadian Municipal Journal,' with your proposed amendment to the Railway Act has been received and considered by the board of directors of our company, and I am instructed to inform you that we most heartily approve of your amendment. It is quite proper that there should be strict supervision of the crossing of all railway tracks by telephone lines, but there is no reason why a general order could not cover the matter and safeguard the public as efficiently as does the present annoying procedure. Trusting that you may be successful in this matter.

Yours Truly,
The Bethseda & Stouffville
Tel. Co., Limited.
Alex. D. Bruce, Pres.

As you are aware, Sir, this Bill has been published in almost every municipality in the Dominion. The Union of Municipalities is an organization that has the supervision of all matters connected with municipal affairs. The 'Canadian Municipal Journal' finds its way into almost every municipality. It is the custom for a municipality to take one for each council and one for the clerk at least. I know that the circulation of the 'Journal' is very great indeed. My Bill was published in the 'Journal,' with the result that not only have I had a large number of letters myself, a few of which I will read, but Mr. Lighthall, the honorary secretary of the Union of Municipalities, has sent me a large bundle of letters every one of which expresses approval of the Bill. A number of those who communicated with Mr. Lighthall took occasion to write a number of letters concerning the Bill, and part of the correspondence he has sent me resulted from these letters. I desire to read a number of the letters received. It will be seen that they are from widely separated parts of the Dominion.

The first of these is from Mr. T. G. Meredith, city solicitor of London, a gentleman who is very well known:

London, Ont., January 22, 1908.

W. D. Lighthall, Esq., K.C.,
Hon. Sec. Union of Canadian Municipalities,
Montreal, Que.

(Re Railway Crossings.)

Dear Sir,—I duly received your letter of the 23rd ultimo, inclosing copy of Dr. Barr's Bill respecting crossing of railways by municipal works. I have been instructed by the City Council of London to say that they are in favour of the amendments proposed by Dr. Barr, and will be glad to do what they can to assist in the passing of the Bill. I agree with you that the Bill should be extended so as to include conduits and sewers. Probably the Bill has been amended to meet these views, and to express more clearly the intention of the Act.

If such be the case I shall be obliged if you will let me have a copy of the Bill as amended. Will you please let me know when the Bill will likely be considered by the Railway Committee, and what assistance you think London can give to procure its legislation. An early reply by letter or telegram will oblige.

Yours truly,
T. G. MEREDITH.

City Clerk's Office,
Calgary, Canada, January 14, 1908.

W. D. Lighthall, Esq., K.C.,
Hon. Sec.-Treas. Union of Canadian Municipalities,
Montreal, Que.

Dear Sir,—Your letter of the 23rd ultimo was laid before the council at their meeting last evening and on motion it was resolved as follows:

That this council heartily endorse the principle of the Bill introduced into the House of parliament by Dr. Barr, M.P., re crossing railways by municipal works.

I am, yours very truly,
H. E. GILLIS,
City Clerk.

Regina, Sask., January 13, 1908.

W. D. Lighthall,
Russell House, Ottawa.

Regina council confirms my letter of 4th instant regarding Dr. Barr's Railway Bill.

J. KELSO HUNTER.

Victoria, B.C., January 14, 1908.

W. D. Lighthall,
Russell House, Ottawa, Ont.

Have wired Dr. Barr on lines your letter to city solicitor by resolution of council.

W. J. DOWLER,
Clerk, Municipal Council.

Montreal, December 30, 1907.

W. D. Lighthall, Esq.,
New York Life Building, Montreal.

Dear Sir,—Your letter of the 23rd December, 1907, has been duly received. I approved of the principle of the Bill of Mr. J. Barr, but I believe the words 'drains, conduits and other works' should be inserted in the Bill. We intend, in the town of St. Louis, to build a tunnel across the Canadian Pacific Railway and such a work should be included in the Bill. If there should be a fight, why not for the whole? I remain,

Yours very truly,
C. GILMOUR,
Mayor, town of St. Louis.

Fort William, Ont., December 31, 1907.

W. D. Lighthall, K.C.,
Hon. Sec. Union of Canadian Municipalities,
Montreal, Que.

Re an Act to amend the Railway Act.

My dear Sir,—I think Mr. Barr's Bill meets a need of municipalities who have to cross railways with wires and water mains. At present there is usually a long delay. In our own case it took me months as mayor to get an arrangement with Canadian Pacific Railway and then they wanted the municipality to be responsible in case of accident, &c.

Wishing you a Happy New Year,

I am, yours truly,
JOSHUA DYKE,
Office of Mayor.

Amherst, N.S., January 3, 1908.

W. D. Lighthall,
Hon. Sec. Treas. Union of Canadian Municipalities,
Montreal, Canada.

Dear Sir,—Your letter received re Act to amend Railway Act. I might say that I have placed this matter before the presidents of our local telephone companies, and they think that this Act covers the ground very well and could not suggest any amendments. I think, as you have mentioned, that it should include conduits and sewers.

I do not think the railway should be allowed anything for their engineer's inspection of work, when the town had in their employ a competent engineer, and the town would be held responsible for the work. If they chose to send their engineer, it would be at their own expense.

Please excuse short delay. Wishing you a Happy New Year, I remain,

Yours very truly,
THOMAS P. LOWTHER,
Mayor.

The next is dated from the mayor's office, in the city of Charlottetown, P.E.I. It is as follows :

W. D. Lighthall, Esq., Montreal.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your favour of December 23, which should have been answered before this date, I would suggest that the following be added to clause 2, on the fifth line after the second word: mains, conduits, sewers or any other kind of construction pertaining to municipal works.

I remain, yours truly,
(Sgd.) JAMES PATON.

The next letter is from Prince Albert, almost as far west as we could go, so it will be seen that this Bill has aroused interest from end to end of Canada ; every part of the Dominion has the same grievances, and not one letter has been received that is not in favour of the Bill. This letter reads as follows :

Dear Sir,—Replying to your letter of the 23rd ultimo respecting the Bill to be introduced by Dr. Barr, M.P., re crossing railways by municipal works, I beg to say that the principle of the Bill appears to be all right, and with the inclusion of sewers and conduits would appear to cover the ground unless some provision should be made to include municipal street railways. I have no doubt the wording will be whipped into shape in committee.

Sincerely yours,
R. S. COOK.
Mayor.

The next letter is from the city clerk's office, Moncton, N.B., and is as follows :

City of Moncton, New Brunswick,
City Clerk's Office,
J. S. Magee, city clerk,
January 9, 1908.

W. D. Lighthall, Esq.,
Secretary Union of Canadian Municipalities, Montreal, province of Quebec.

Dear Sir,—Your telegram to hand. Regarding the Bill introduced by Mr. John Barr, M.P., I fully endorse the conditions therein and would suggest that the Bill be amended providing that the same conditions shall apply to sewers passing under the railway track as to water mains.

. . . . . .

I have this day wired you as follows:

I find it will be impossible to attend meeting of executive at Russell House, January 14. Am writing.

Trusting that your meeting will be of much benefit, I remain,

Yours truly,
J. S. MAGEE.

The next is dated from the City Chambers, Regina, Saskatchewan, January 4, 1908, jumping again from the east to the west. It is as follows :

W. D. Lighthall, Esq.,
Secretary Union of Canadian Municipalities, Montreal.

Dear Sir,—Replying to your letter to Mayor Smith, calling attention to the Bill of Dr. Barr, M.P., regarding crossing of railways by municipal works, which his worship has handed to me to acknowledge, our new council meets on Monday when the several committees will be appointed, but in the meantime I might say that the city of Regina approves of the Bill with the addition of conduits and sewers, as this city is particularly interested in crossing the Canadian Pacific Railway with its sewers, having had to do so twice already, and should the corporation in the future decide to construct a municipal telephone system the conduits will also be necessary.

Yours truly,
J. KELSO HUNTER,
City Clerk.

The next letter is dated Law Department, city of Hamilton, F. R. Waddell, city solicitor, addressed to Mr. Lighthall, and reads :

Hamilton, Ontario, January 2, 1908.

Dear Sir,—Your letter of the 23rd of December last duly received. I am of the opinion that the Bill introduced by Dr. Barr, member for Dufferin county, to amend the Railway Act would be satisfactory to the municipalities and the Bill should also include conduits and sewers.

(Sgd.) F. R. WADDELL.

The next is from St. Boniface, Manitoba, and is as follows :

W. D. Lighthall, Esq.,
Secretary Union of Canadian Municipalities, Montreal.

Dear Sir,—

Re Dr. Barr's Bill.

I hasten to reply to your letter in this matter. The Bill is badly drafted in my opinion. No doubt, as you say, it should include sewers and conduits. I do not think that municipalities should in any case pay for the services of the railway company's engineer in supervising the work.

I might say, of course, that the Railway Commission have control of that matter, and therefore I think in this case this gentleman is wrong, but in all other respects they heartily approve of the Bill. The next letter is from the Bell Telephone Company of Montreal, dated March 4, 1908, and is addressed to myself. I was not certain whether I should have the approval of the Bell Telephone Company, but as I knew that they had at one time trouble in crossing the railroads, but I thought that they had so arranged matters that they were probably satisfied. I find, however, that this is not the case, and I received this letter :

Montreal, March 4, 1908.

John Barr, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—I have been handed a copy of Bill (No. 43) entitled 'An Act to amend the

Railway Act,' introduced by you at the present session, asking for the replacement of section No. 246 of the Act, with the object of simplifying the procedure in obtaining authority to cross over or under railway lines b means of telegraph, telephone, or power wires, or water mains or conduits.

This company is naturally very much interested in the subject, and has found the present procedure most cumbersome. I feel sure that the members and officers of the board will bear me out in stating that the furnishing of a plan and profile of each proposed crossing and the making of a formal application with notice to the railways in each case, as called for by the present Act, involves much labour and expense which is quite unnecessary to properly protect the interest of the railway company and the public generally.

This company, since the coming into force of the Act, has had many hundred, and I think I am safe in saying, several thousand, applications of this nature covering solely crossings over or under railways at highways and while the board upon our application has settled standard specifications covering the manner of construction and conditions as to the responsibility of the telephone company and the railway company, which has simplified the procedure very much, the delay involved in obtaining an order before proceeding with the construction, and the cost and labour involved in furnishing a profile in each case, still renders the working of the Act unnecessarily troublesome.

I have frequently discussed with the late chairman of the board, and Mr. Mountain, the chief engineer, the question of obtaining an amendment to the section to do away with the necessity of furnishing a plan in each case, and I understand they both heartily concurred.

I will take the opportunity of calling upon you the next time I am in Ottawa——

I might say that this gentleman has called upon me; we have discussed it, and he highly approves of the Bill as it stands today. He goes on:

I will take the opportunity of calling upon you the next time I am in Ottawa, and if any information from the records of the company showing the unworkable nature of the present section will be of assistance, you might kindly let me know.

Yours faithfully,
LAWRENCE MACFARLANE,
General counsel.

I might say that I talked the question over with Mr. Macfarlane. He highly approves of the Bill and believes it is in the best interest of his company, and he thinks that the Bill in its present form will be most desirable.

I might say in explanation of passages in some of these letters, that the first Bill which I introduced did not include viaducts, sewers, &c. But, with the advice I have obtained and with the assistance of the law clerk of the House I have reconstructed the Bill to a certain extent, as you will find by reference to the reprint, and the result is that I have placed before the House a Bill which has met with the approval of the great mass of the people whom it has reached. I believe it is a Bill that is in the interest of the public. I think it is necessary that we should have this amendment to the law in order to diminish the work thrown upon the Railway Commission and to relieve the country of unnecessary expense. I believe it is necessary in order to facilitate the progress of the country and therefore I think it will meet with the approval of this House as I know it will meet with the approval of the country. It may not be perfect, but if it is not perfect, I invite this House, and particularly the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) and the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman), both of whose constituents have approved of the principle of the Bill, to give me their assistance in making any improvements that they think can be made in it. I also invite the cooperation of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) as this is a Bill largely designed to further the interests of rural communities. I say that an injustice is done in every case in which a five dollar bill is demanded by these railways for crossing over their lines, it is an insult to our intelligence and a fraud on this fair Dominion of ours and on every one of our municipal councils. Therefore, I say that the Bill is in the best interests of the country at large. The machinery of the Bill provides that after making application to the station master in the municipality, or to the nearest station master, they must give the railway company ten days notice and that if they string the wires across the railway it must be done in accordance with the plans and specifications of the Railway Commission. We know that the plans and specifications of the Railway Commission provide that the wire must be copper, it must be strung across on arms, it must be 24 feet above the track, and so on. Therefore, under this provision the railway corporation cannot suffer. It may be to their interest to have these lines cross their track. We do know that sometimes villages and towns are very much annoyed by the action of the railway companies. They cannot do without the railway, but sometimes the railway stops traffic much longer than the law allows and very frequently, if there is no particular friction, the municipal authorities do not object as they are anxious that the railways should have every facility possible to handle the traffic which is entrusted to them, but when they attempt to make a charge for carrying electric wires along streets that the people own and that they owned before the railways were constructed, I say it is time that we interfered in order to see that justice is done. With regard to water mains and conduits going under the track it is my opinion that the people construct-

ing them should pay for the privilege and that the railways should be protected in this particular. In order to safeguard the interests of railways and to protect the travelling public I believe that any municipality placing water mains or sewers under railway tracks should not do so except under the guidance of an engineer and that the services of the engineer should be paid for by them. It may be that the compensation allowed with respect to the construction of sewers is altogether too small. I might also say that some objections have been taken to the fact that provision is made for ten days notice being given to railway companies. It has been said by some that this is altogether too short a time. Well, it is possible that it is too short a time. I do not think the country would suffer if we gave them fifteen or even twenty days notice. I do not think that if this House decided that they should have fifteen days notice the country would object, and I do not think that I would object. I have prepared this Bill with the greatest possible care. I have had the assistance of the law clerk, he has carefully gone over it and given me all the help he could, but if there is any other amendment which the House may desire to make to the Bill in committee I will be ready to approve of it. I hope I will have the assistance of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) and of the other ministers who are interested in it. I have understood that there will be no objection to it going to the Railway Committee. I would probably have preferred to have had a committee of the whole House but if the government desire that it shall go to the Railway Committee then I am satisfied. Having given this explanation of the purpose of the Bill I hope it will receive the approval of the House. I therefore beg to move that the Bill be now read the second time.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal that the government can accept in the Bill proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Barr); in fact, if my hon. friend will refer to the Bill which has been introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) he will find that many of the most important provisions of the Bill are already provided for in the Bill which has been introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals. Under such circumstances the government has no objection to the second reading of the Bill affirming the principle of it, and my hon. friend will have an opportunity of discussing the provisions of it when the Bill of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals is called up.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

## INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order :

Second reading of Bill (No. 64) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—Mr. Porter.

Mr. PORTER. While I am prepared to move the second reading of the Bill I have been informed by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) that general amendments are likely to be introduced in a few days to the Inspection and Sale Act and he has requested me to allow this Bill to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 66) to amend the House of Commons Act. He said : Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to provide that writs to fill vacancies in the House of Commons shall be issued within a certain period, and in that way to avoid the prolonged disfranchisement of constituencies which has sometimes occurred. The Bill is framed on practically the same line as that which has been in force in Ontario since the year 1904.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) if he thinks, in view of the invariable practice that has been followed in this House since confederation, there is any necessity for such a Bill as this. If any vacancies have taken place during the recess these vacancies have always been filled before the ensuing session, and so far as I can remember no constituency has been left unrepresented, certainly not within the last ten or twelve years. The provisions of this Bill are very drastic and if they became law they might involve results which my hon. friend has perhaps not considered. I will mention two instances. In the session of 1896 which was the last of that parliament, Mr. Bryson, member for Pontiac died in January and Mr. Amyot, member for Bellechasse died later. It was known that parliament must end on the 24th of April and nobody moved to have the writs issued, and it was the desire of both sides, and properly so, that elections should not be held in these constituencies to fill these vacancies for the very short time before parila- would dissolve. Now, were the Bill of my hon. friend law the writs would have had to be issued mechanically quite independent of any action by parliament, and elections would have been brought on in these constituencies notwithstanding that every one knew there would be general elections about the month of June in that year. Such a contingency may arise at any time. We may come to the last session of a parlia-

ment and we might be forced under such a Bill as this to bring on elections which neither political party desired and which the public interest did not require. I know that in certain cases injustice may be done, but I do not think any serious injustice has been done in the past in this respect. I would ask my hon. friend not to press his Bill to-day but to leave it for consideration when the Bill of the Minister of Justice comes up later.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no objection to accept the Prime Minister's suggestion but I would like to add something in reply to what he has said. It may be open to very serious debate as to whether even in the cases he cited in 1896, new writs should not have issued forthwith. Even if we should know that parliament were coming to an end in three or four months why should a constituency remain unrepresented when very important questions are before the people, as was the case in the session of 1896. The expense of an election is trifling as compared with the whole cost of government; and while the expense may be regarded on the one hand, there is on the other the very important question of having every constituency in the Dominion represented in parliament. It would be very easy to provide for any such case by amending this Bill so as to say that the House itself should have control; and if parliament were to expire in a month or a few weeks, the House could be given power to direct that the clerk of the Crown in Chancery should not in a particular instance carry this provision into effect. My recollection as to what has taken place is a little different from that of the right hon. gentleman, because I think the constituency of St. James, Montreal, was unrepresented for a whole session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Do you say St. James ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am speaking from recollection, but I remember there was at least one constituency in which the writs should have been issued much earlier than they were. In the legislature of Ontario, under a law similar to our present law, the riding of North Renfrew remained unrepresented for about 18 months thus showing the possibility of abuse under the present statute. This Bill is framed entirely on the Ontario Act of 1904, chapter 10, and I believe the Act has worked well in that province. As a result of it the by-elections have been brought on within a month or two at the outside, though the statute permits a delay of three months. I am willing to accept the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman and I understand we shall have an opportunity of discussing the question further if we desire to do so.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a second time.

## DOMIONION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. G. O. ALCORN (Prince Edward) moved second reading of Bill (No. 80) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: I made a pretty full explanation of this Bill when it was before the House for its first reading, and as the Minister of Justice has introduced a Bill bearing on the same subject, and as there are one or two other Bills standing for second reading also dealing with the same matter and it will be convenient that all should be considered together in Committee, to which I understand the Government has no objection, I beg to move the second reading now.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

## GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. McCool for a copy of all the plans and reports in the possession of the government in connection with the building of the Georgian Bay canal.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (South Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, I do not make any excuse for bringing this subject before the House again, and advocating the construction of the Georgian bay water route because of all the great questions which are agitating the country to-day that of transportation is the most important. I may say in the first place that of all the great countries in the world that have natural waterways and canals, Canada stands first, Russia second, and the United States third.

The question now is, shall we close our creditable position and go to the rear ? I for one trust that we shall continue to advance and not recede. We have already spent $90,000,000 on our canals, and we have spent on the Georgian bay survey no less a sum than $640,000. We are told by some that the days of canals are over. I cannot agree with that. Let our neighbours to the south give an answer to that contention. The state of New York alone voted $101,000,000 to deepen the Erie canal from seven feet to twelve feet, to enable it to float boats carrying 1,000 tons, or 30,000 bushels of grain. Take the case of the Sault canals. In 1870, or 38 years ago, the Weitzel canal was started, and it was completed twenty-seven years ago. It is 515 feet long, 80 feet wide and 17 feet deep. But this canal was no sooner constructed than it was found it was entirely inadequate to the wants of the traffic, and the Poe canal was started. It has a length of 800 feet, is 100 feet wide,

and has 22 feet of water on the mitre sills. It was completed in 1896, only twelve years ago. The Canadian canal was under construction at the same time. It is 900 feet long and 60 feet wide and has 22 feet of water on the mitre sills.. It was completed in 1895, or nearly 13 years ago. These two canals will accommodate vessels carrying 10,000 tons, or from 300,000 to 400,000 bushels of grain ; and one of these boats can be locked through in from 11 to 15 minutes. It is interesting to note that our Canadian lock, which is worked by electricity, has passed a boat through in 8 minutes, thus making the record for rapidity of work. But notwithstanding that we have these three large canals at the Sault, they are entirely inadequate to the tonnage passing through, and the Americans are now constructing another, which is to be 1,350 feet long and 80 feet wide and is to have 24½ feet of water on the mitre sills. It is to cost no less a sum than $3,500,000, and the canal which is to approach it will cost $2,000,000, making a total of $5,500,000. That shows the imperative necessity of a canal there. It is interesting to note that last year, when the water was low, certain vessels were unable to go through the American canal, and they had to back out and go through the Canadian canal, which had three inches more depth than the American canal. Although these locks were only completed twelve years ago, they are all too small, and something must be done to meet the difficulty. The question is sometimes asked why it is that so many more vessels go through the American locks than through our own. The Americans have a much better system in many respects than we have. They have a fine post office erected between the Weitzel lock and the Poe lock, and when a captain leaves the port from which he starts, he does not always take his orders with him, but his instructions are forwarded to him through the post office at the Sault, and when he arrives there he goes to the post office and gets them. We have not such facilities on our side. That is one of the reasons why so many more vessels go through the American canal than through ours. It is also interesting to note that the Americans have spent $14,000,000 on their locks, while we have spent only $5,000,000 on ours.

Let us note also the rapid increase in traffic through these canals. In 1900 it amounted to 25,000,000 tons, in 1905 to 44,000,000, and in 1907 to 58,000,000. Thus it more than doubled in seven years ; and had it not been for the commercial depression which took place just at the close of last season, it would have amounted to at least 60,000,000 tons. Let us compare this with the traffic through the Suez canal, which in 1904 amounted to 13,401,000 tons, in 1905 to 13,134,000, and in 1906 to 13,445,000. That is to say, the tonnage that passes through the Sault canals in seven months of the year is more than four times the tonnage which passes through the Suez canal in the entire year. That shows the necessity we have for a canal in our own territory. The International Waterways Commission state, on page 4 of their report, that there was an aggregate saving in 1905 on through Lake Superior freight alone of $116,000,000 owing to the construction and operation of these canals. Surely that is an abundant reason why we should go on and construct our own canal. But what other evidence have we from the American side ? In addition to these canals, they are constructing the Panama canal at a cost of $300,000,000, notwithstanding the fact that the American government laid itself open to a war by purchasing and undertaking the completion of this canal. The Panama canal was originally intended to be 100 feet wide ; but they are now widening it to 110 feet at an additional cost of $5,000,000. That shows you what the American people think of canals and the canal system.

What has been the history of our own Canadian canals ? Take, for example, the amount of freight passing through the St. Lawrence canals. In 1902, 12,000 tons of coal passed through ; but in 1905 the amount had grown to 344,000 tons, or an increase of nearly forty-fold. Of corn 13,000 tons passed through in 1902, but in 1905 the amount had grown to 77,000 tons, an increase of nearly six-fold. Of miscellaneous goods 8,000 tons passed through in 1902, but the amount had grown in 1905 to 63,000 tons, an increase of nearly eight-fold. The total freight that passed through was 611,000 tons in 1902, but in 1905 it had grown to 2,368,000 tons, an increase of nearly four-fold. The number of vessels that passed through was 566 in 1902 which had increased in 1905 to 1,000, or an increase of 434 vessels. But I wish particularly to draw attention to this. On page LVI of the report of the Department of Railways and Canals for 1907, I find the following :

> In connection with the question canal versus railway transport of grain from the west, it may be noted that whereas grain and peas passed down to Montreal through the Welland and St. Lawrence canals to the extent of 404,935 tons, an increase of 63,504 tons, compared with the previous year, the quantity carried to Montreal via the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk Railways amounted to 386,963 tons, a decrease of 238,586 tons.

Showing that the traffic on our canals is increasing while on the railways, which compete with the canals, it is decreasing. From what I have said, it must be apparent that the days of canals are by no means over.

What about our sources of freight supply ? Will there be sufficient tonnage to supply these waterways when constructed ? It is important to note, and perhaps some members of this House will be astonished to learn, that Chicago has 45 miles of lake front, that its foreign traffic amounted last year to almost as much as the foreign trade of

the city of New York, and that the tonnage of Duluth exceeds that of the foreign trade of Liverpool and almost equals that of Liverpool and Glasgow combined. The question is: Should we not take advantage of this enormous tonnage and see that it goes to our own territory and has an exit in our own territory. These are things we should undoubtedly consider. We have many railways but we have only one grand system of through canals. We have only one Ottawa and French river water route, and that should be preserved to our people for all time to come. I do not believe in handing that over to any corporation to own and to run, but I believe it should be owned by our own government and people and run in the interests of our own people. Water competition is the most powerful possible regulator of railway rates which can be conceived far exceeding in that respect the power of any legislative bodies, even though they be the highest and most powerful in the land. We cannot bring our prairie provinces any nearer to the great lakes, but we can bring our waterways and seaports nearer to them. In constructing this canal we will bring the head of navigation a thousand miles inland and almost to the very heart of our Dominion, thus bringing the great wheat fields of the west that much nearer to the outside world, and, by reducing the price of transportation to the lowest possible point, add materially to the value of their products. It will bring Chicago, Duluth, Port Arthur and Fort William as near to Montreal as they are now to Buffalo. We have on this continent a great trinity of transportation. We have the wagon ways, the railways, and the canals. The wagon roads take everything to the canals and the railroads, and the railroads and canals are competitors but not so severely as some would think. For example, you must bear in mind that canals carry heavy freight, such as raw material, on which there is no profit and leave the other traffic to the railways. They carry such freight as coal, ore, lumber, stone, lime and all kinds of heavy goods, in respect of which time is not an important factor, and on which the freight must be very low in order to make the shipment profitable. They leave to the railways the great revenue producing goods, such as passenger traffic, express traffic and live stock. Thus they relieve the railways of the unprofitable portion of their traffic and leave them that portion which is most productive and remunerative, so that instead of being the opponents of the railways they are a great help to them.

This enterprise, when completed, will be a tremendous force in the interest of peace, concord and good will. Of all the great forces that undoubtedly tend to peace, the most effective is that of trade and commerce. That applies not only to the individual but also to nations. We have to the south of us, and extending along our border for 2,300 miles, one of the greatest nations this world has ever seen. Along this distance there is not a single military post, not a single gun mounted, threatening to make war upon us. For nearly a century we have lived in the enjoyment of unbroken peace with our American neighbours. Shall this continue or shall it be broken? I for one hope that the goddess of peace may smile on these two nations for all time to come. Construct this waterway, and another bond of union will then exist, binding these two great nations together in such a way as to make war between them almost impossible.

We should hardly call this waterway a canal for this reason, that there are really only twenty-seven and a half miles of locks and only fifty-five and a half miles of broken channel. The remaining three hundred and fifty-seven miles will be uninterrupted waterway. This will be a short route. The distance from Fort William to Liverpool will be 806 miles shorter than by the Erie canal.

I wish to call attention to the fact that in addition to being a short route in mileage it has this further advantage that vessels will be able to move at a rapid rate as there are no obstacles and the sides of the canal will be entirely different from an ordinary canal with earth banks. The canal portions of this route will be rock and through the greater portion of the route it will be open lake and river navigation, so there will be nothing to prevent the rapid movement of vessels. There will be no delay from adverse winds, since this is a sheltered route and the insurance rates will be low. Then to, the vessels can proceed at the same rapid rate night and day.

It must be remembered also that as this route is entirely within our own territory, there will be no foreign navigation laws to interfere with the transportation of freight. It will be a great water-power producer, and will unquestionably aid in the development of manufacturing industries.

Please bear in mind also that in the construction of this canal there will be developed one of the finest and most valuable water-powers to be found anywhere in the world. It will be far better than Niagara Falls because while the water-power will be about as great this power will be distributed over a distance of about 400 miles, which will be a great advantage. It is difficult to state just how many horse-power will be developed by the construction of this water way, but many capable engineers have placed it at at least 1,000,000 horse-power. This is exclusive of the vast amount of power that will available on the numerous great rivers that are tributary to this route from the north and the south. Furthermore it has been stated by so able and experienced an engineer as Mr. Wickstead, of Montreal, that the revenue which will be derived from these valuable water-

powers will be ample to pay the interest on the entire amount required to complete this important work. It will create power for manufacturing purposes of all kinds, making Ontario and Quebec the great manufacturing centres for the west, giving return freight to the trains and vessels which come east laden with grain, cattle and other products of our great fertile plains. We have in the country through which the waterways pass all the requisites to build up a great manufacturing and industrial centre. Three things are necessary to establish successfully great manufacturing enterprises: first, an unlimited supply of good and cheap raw material; second, an abundant and cheap supply of power and, third, efficient shipping and transportation facilities. In this district there remains only the question of the supply of raw material. Two of the chief requisites in this respect are wood and iron. In this northern country we have an abundance of wood of the best quality for structural purposes only awaiting the power and skill of the manufacturer to put it into shape.

We have here also immense deposits of iron ore. Many of them are known as refractory ores, which can be commercially refined only by electrical process. This process requires an abundance of cheap water-power which happily this waterway would give us.

The question naturally arises in this connection whether what is known as the hydro-electric process for smelting will ever be a complete and unqualified success. I wish to read to the House the summary of the results of the experiments made by Dr. Haanel, at the Sault:

1. Magnitite can be as economically smelted by the electrothermic process as hematite.
2. Ores of high sulphur content not containing manganese can be made into pig iron containing only a few thousands of a per cent of sulphur.
3. The silicon content can be varied as required for the class of pig to be produced.
4. Charcoal which can be cheaply produced from mill refuse or wood which could not otherwise be utilized, can be substituted for coke as a reducing agent, without being briquetted with the ore.
5. A ferro-nickel pig can be produced practically free from sulphur and of fine quality from roasted nickeliferous pyrrohtite.
6. The experiment made with a titaniferous iron ore containing 17.82 per cent of titanic acid, permits the conclusion that titaniferous iron ores up to perhaps 5 per cent titanic acid, can be successfully treated by the electric process.

This process is to-day being carried on commercially at Welland. The parties who have spent so much time in making the successful experiments at the Sault, have now undertaken to demonstrate that they can carry on the process commercially at Welland and we have no doubt that they will be successful in doing it.

There are still other advantages in this route. As it is far removed from our frontier, it would be a safe route in time of war. We all hope that difficulties of this kind are far away, but if such an event as war should unfortunately happen, this inland water-way would be of great advantage to Canada. It would undoubtedly help to build up our maritime trade and would furnish us with an abundance of hardy seamen with whom, should occasion arise, we could equip our men of war.

Nor must it be overlooked that this will be a cool route, admirably adapted to the shipping of flour, corn, rye and such products as are liable to be injured in warm climates.

I have here a clipping from the 'Free Press' of March 7, which I wish to place before the House. It contains an extract from an address by Mr. M. J. Butler, Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, who advised caution with regard to the Georgian bay canal. He was speaking in regard to the Georgian bay canal before the May Court Club in the Queen's Hall, and this is what he said:

I am fully convinced that if the largest lake vessels will be able to navigate upon it a solution of our transportation will be reached.

The speaker said that there were some enthusiasts who dreamed that the time would come when ships would be able to go from Liverpool to Port Arthur and vice versa, but that he was afraid it was only a dream.

Mr. KEMP. What is the date of that?

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. March 7, 1908. Now, I am one of those dreamers for I believe it can be done. I know that vessels are continually going through the Suez canal. They leave the great ports of Europe, go through that canal safely and successfully and so on out to Asia and the different ports in the east. If it can be done there why can it not be done here? But, I did not wish to set myself up as an authority in this respect and so I wrote to a gentleman in Montreal, Mr. Reford, inclosing this clipping and asked him to give his opinion on the subject. Will you allow me to read what he says?

March 13, 1908.

A. A. Wright, Esq., M.P.,
South Renfrew,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 11th instant and contents of same, with newspaper cutting inclosed re Mr. M. J. Butler's, Deputy Minister of Public Works, speech at the May Court Club, have had my best attention, and I quite agree with him in thinking that a work of such magnitude as the Georgian bay canal should not be gone into without the most careful consideration as to route, cost and mode of construction, and from what information I have been able to get I have reason to suppose that such is being properly attended to.

I am pleased to note that Mr. Butler understands the immense assistance that the Georgian bay canal would be of to the transportation of trade of Canada, and that he is supported in his views by the opinion of Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, who presided at the meeting. When, however, Mr. Butler speaks of those who think that the time may come when ships may be able to go from Liverpool to Port Arthur and vice versa, as dreamers and enthusiasts, I do not agree with him for the following reasons :

Steamers and sailing vessels have, in the past, made this voyage via the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, with immense drawbacks and expenses in shape of small carrying capacity, and expense and delay in having to unload a large portion of their cargoes at Port Colborne before passing through the Welland canal, and reload same at Dalhousie, and repeat this operation at Kingston or Prescott and Montreal. All of which, of course, killed the business, but which would be avoided if the Georgian bay canal were constructed of a size to permit the passage of the largest lake steamers through it without unloading or disturbance of cargo, as I understand is what is proposed.

I consider the construction of the Georgian bay canal a work which the Canadian government should undertake, and will be forced to undertake sooner or later in the interests of the country for the following reasons :

The future of Canada, as I see it, must be largly influenced by the right development of her great interior territory lying between the great lakes and the Rocky mountains, a territory half as large as Europe, and capable of supporting a population of one hundred millions of people, whose chief business will be agriculture, for which the country is specially fitted by soil and climate, and to make agriculture profitable and popular the agriculturist must have cheap transportation for all he wishes to export and import, which is just what would be achieved by the construction of the Georgian bay canal, as you will see by the following statement of facts, which you can easily verify.

Fort William and Port Arthur on Lake Superior, are now the outlets and inlets for the trade of Canada's great northwest, and likely, with other ports on Lake Superior 'yet to be opened,' to remain so, because at these points land and water carriage meet on good natural lines and the problem to be further solved is how to cheapen transportation between these ports and Europe, Great Britain especially, to which the great bulk of our western exports go, and from which much of the west's imports must come.

At present the average rate of freight from Port Arthur and Fort William to Georgian bay ports, and thence by rail to Montreal, Canada's nearest ocean port, or by all water via the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, may be said to be 6½ cents per bushel, and about 7 cents via Buffalo to New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and other nearest United States ocean ports, so giving the Canadian route a slight advantage, which is, however, counterbalanced and lost by cheaper lake carriage via United States steamers owing to their larger size and their being able to get better westbound cargoes.

Now, here is an important point which I wish to draw your attention to particularly and it has reference to the rates which will prevail when this canal is constructed. Mr. Reford takes a very optimistic view, much more so than I had taken myself, but he is certainly an authority on this point and I am pleased to have an opportunity of presenting it to the House.

Of the 6½ cents of through-freight from Superior ports to Montreal, and 7 cents to New York, the lake craft running to Georgian bay ports get about one-third of same, or from 1½ cents to 2 cents per bushel, the other two-thirds, or 4 cents to 4½ cents going to the Canadian railways from Georgian bay to Montreal, or to the United States railways from Buffalo to New York, Boston, &c., and this division of freight is, I think, a fair one as things now stand, considering the way the grain has to be unloaded from one conveyance to another in transit, and the long and expensive rail carriage. But all this would be changed by the construction of the Georgian bay canal of a size allowing the largest lake steamer to bring full cargoes, without breaking bulk, from Port Arthur or Fort William to Montreal, and there getting return cargoes which would put them on an equality with the large United States steamers on the lakes, with which the Canadian boats have to compete.

It has been clearly shown that grain could be profitably handled for 1½ cents to 2 cents per bushel between Port Arthur, Fort William, and even Duluth and Buffalo, and still more cheaply between these ports and where the entrance would be of the Georgian bay canal on the Georgian bay, and as the building of the Georgian bay canal would shorten the distance between Port Arthur, Fort William and Duluth and Montreal to almost the same mileage as to Buffalo, or say 865 miles, I see no good reason why vessels using the Georgian bay canal should not be built to carry cargoes of grain as cheaply to 'Montreal as is now done to Buffalo,' thus making a saving in freight of 4½ cents to 5 cents per bushel, all of which, or at least the bulk of it, should find its way into the pockets of the western farmer, and be of enormous help to him and the country.

Some will say a steamer cannot run as quickly and as cheaply on a canal as on an open lake, which is, of course, correct to a certain extent, but allowing an extra cent per bushel for such delays, there is still a saving of about 4 cents per bushel in the freight, equal on a hundred million bushel crop to four millions of dollars a year, or about enough to pay the interest on the cost of the canal, and do great things for Canada and the northwest, how great it is difficult to estimate, but I will mention a few of the possibilities.

I have shown above the possibility of saving four millions of dollars a year in freights on Northwest exports on a basis of one hundred millions of bushels, about the crop of 1906, but as the country grows, the crop and the exports should immensely increase, probably to two or three times this extent, with a similar gain to the farmers, the country, and the canal, with also an immense gain in saving of freight on all which the west imports. In other words, through cheaper transportation the interior of Canada would be brought so close to the markets of Europe

and the world as to make our great Northwest a favourite place of residence, and consequently enormously increase the value of every acre of land in it, also drawing towards it crowds of settlers.

Next, I would point out, that the Georgian bay canal would not only do great things for Canada's Northwest, 'but for Canada as a whole,' because the cheap and superior transit by it would be so much superior to anything that the United States have, or can construct in the future, as to force the bulk of the exports and imports of not only the northwestern states adjacent to the Canadian boundary, but of all the states bordering on Lake Huron, Michigan, and Superior, to use the Georgian bay canal, with enormous advantage to Canada, not only in the way of increased business, but in prestige as a country to live in, a thing of much consequence, and worthy of consideration.

By the canal United States ports on the above mentioned lakes would be brought nearly 500 miles nearer to the ocean 'at Montreal,' than is possible via Buffalo and the Atlantic ports of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, or Portland, Montreal and Canada's chief ocean port competitors, and this fact, coupled with the saving of freight would, I think, secure to Canada the carrying trade of the Northwest of both Canada and the United States.

Lastly, this letter being already longer than I intended, I may say that I think it would not be long, after the facilities of the canal became known, before an immense trade would develop via the canal, not only with Europe, but also with the maritime provinces, which have much that the west wants in the shape of coal, lumber, fish oil, and other produce, and require much that the west has to sell in the shape of food stuffs, thereby drawing the eastern portion of our country, and the western portion, together, in a way that nothing else will do, and which is very desirable. And back of all this is the benefit that would accrue to the great country now a wilderness, but known to be wonderfully rich in minerals, timber, farming lands, &c., also water-powers that would soon open up on all sides of the proposed Georgian bay canal route, but especially in the territory lying between the canal and the Hudson bay, which before long may be proved to be the richest portion of our Dominion.

I may seem to you optimistic in what I have written but I do not think I am, and I inclose you further a pamphlet on this matter, also on the Red Line Steamship scheme, which I prepared for, and which was read before the Mining Society of Nova Scotia last year, which may interest you, and give you information on some points not touched in this letter.

Everything that advertises Canada to the world and makes her known, is going to help not only the northwest, but every part of the Dominion, and it seems to me that the welfare of Ontario and Quebec, also the maritime provinces, is virtually bound up in the welfare of the northwest, and that we should consequently do our best in the building up of the same.

Any further information I can give you on this important matter will afford me great pleasure.

I am,

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) ROBERT REFORD.

To give a resumé. This is the shortest route from our great western lake ports to the sea. A deep-water through route, for large vessels. Hence a cheap freight route. A safe route, protected from winds. Hence securing a low insurance rate. A safe route in time of war, being far inland. Will build up our merchant marine, thus supplying us with hardy seamen with which to supply our men of war in time of trouble. Will be a great stimulus to international trade, hence a great peace promoter and preventative of war. A great water-power producer and an incalculable aid in developing manufacturing industries. The greatest known aid in the developing of our mines by supplying the electric current for smelting purposes. It is all under our own flag, hence no conflicting navigation laws. Will be a great regulator of railway freights, more potent than the edicts of the highest legislative bodies in the land. Will bring the head of navigation 1,000 miles inland, bringing Port Arthur, Fort William and all our western cities that much nearer the outside world. This is a cool route and will admit of carrying perishable goods that could not be taken by a southern route. An invaluable route, since the necessary water supply is entirely in our own territory and consequently completely independent of any neighbouring power. It is the cheapest possible known route and when constructed will put millions of dollars annually into the pockets of the farmers of the Northwest. As this will be a route of enormous capacity, it will be an unrivalled aid in relieving the freight congestion in the Northwest since it will be capable of carrying concurrently all the grain that half a dozen first-class railways could possibly bring to Fort William and Port Arthur. It will bring to the very heart of our country the great and inexhaustible coal fields of Nova Scotia and thus effectually relieve us for all time to come from being dependent for our supply upon the coal fields of the United States. That the natural tributary tonnage that even now lies waiting to pass through this unrivalled system of waterways is away and beyond in magnitude and value, that, that is tributary to any artifically constructed waterway in the world. This waterway is an absolute necessity because the railways are entirely inadequate to take care of the traffic that is now offering them and this class of work is increasing faster than railway facilities can possibly be provided. This route when completed will serve the interest of twenty-five millions of people covering an area of

two million square miles all tributary to the great lakes. A territory producing two and a half billion bushels of grain annually and which is increasing by leaps and bounds. It also produces two-thirds of the iron ore mined in America. It is furthermore the chief centre of growth of commerce, of population, of wealth and of universal productive force in the world. It is a much needed outlet for our already intensely congested traffic.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I can only hope that when the entire report of the engineers who have been engaged on this work has been presented to this House, the estimated cost will be such as to guarantee the government in commencing it at a very early date and of pushing it on to an early completion. It will bring to the very heart of our country the great and inexhaustible coal fields of Nova Scotia and thus effectually relieve us for all time to come from being dependent for our supply upon the coal fields of the United States. I may say that in a conversation with Mr. Ross, of the Dominion Coal Company, he informed me that he could undoubtedly compete with American coal on the great lakes should this canal be constructed. Let me give you one or two practical illustrations of what cheaper coal will do. For, construct this waterway and cheaper coal will come both from Nova Scotia and the United States. Freight from the American mines would be at once cut in two. Now note the results. At Sturgeon Falls, a thriving town on Lake Nipissing, there is a paper mill producing 50 tons per day. This new route would so cheapen the price of coal for this mill that they would immediately double their output. At Copper Cliff, near Sudbury, are located the richest nickel mines in the world and furnish employment to 1,500 men. These works represent an outlay of $2,000,000 and they produce more than half of the world's supply of nickel. They use annually 30,000 tons of coal, all of which is brought by rail from Buffalo. Half this freight would be saved and refining works would be at once commenced and carried on here instead of in the United States. The same thing applies to the Cobalt mines. Why should all this wealth which rivals even the wealth of Ormus and of Ind go to the United States ?

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln). I wish to say a word or two with regard to this question. Every hon. gentleman who has spoken so far seems to be convinced of the propriety of building this supposed waterway. I am not saying that I would not be of that opinion if I had more information, but as at present advised I am not sure that it would be a wise thing or at least the best thing to do in the interest of the country. I am heartily in favour of the motion, of course, because it is a motion for papers, and we desire all the information on this subject that we can get. But there is a splendid system of canals now in operation in the country, perfect in every sense except in depth and in size of the locks. I do not know whether many hon. gentlemen are very fully informed of the exact capabilities of the Welland canal. I apprehend that a good many have received from the secretary of the board of trade of St. Catharines a printed memorandum on the subject, but, as I am not certain that all have received that memo, and as it is very instructive, I think that I shall be doing a service to the country by reading it and so putting it on 'Hansard.'

Before reading this memorandum I would like to point out that between $30,000,000 and $40,000,000 has been spent on the Welland canal alone, which is the largest canal we have, but which is only part of the Welland-St. Lawrence system. Bearing this fact in mind, we should consider very carefully whether we should go into a new work at enormous expense instead of improving the work we have, which, if improved, would probably accomplish as much as the new work. It is with a view to bringing these advantages to the attention of the House and helping hon. members to form an opinion on the subject that I address myself to the matter for a few minutes this afternoon. I am not convinced that we cannot make the Welland canal do all that it is claimed the Georgian bay canal will do. Therefore, at present I am not in favour, from an economical standpoint, of the proposal which has been made and supported with apparent unanimity in this House. It seems to me that we can improve the Welland-St. Lawrence system to yield at least equal advantages at a very great saving as compared with the cost of the Georgian bay canal. The facts submitted in the memo. of the board of trade of St. Catharines have been very carefully gathered and very carefully compiled by able men. The work has not been done casually or hastily. The men who present these facts spent months in investigating the matter in order that they might be in a position to give the House solid information with regard to it. This memo. is not a mere argument, but is a complete, sincere and accurate statement of the facts. It is not designed to prevent the building of the Georgian bay canal, should that be found to the interest of the country, but it is only submitted in order that the people generally may consider the whole matter carefully before committing the country to a scheme of such enormous expenditure as this Geogian bay canal. Mr. Secord, who signs this circular as secretary of the board of trade, is manager of the Imperial Bank at St. Catharines. He has used every possible effort to get accurate information. There is no surplusage in the memorandum; it is like a statute in that every word in it has

its meaning and is there because it needs to be there:

Board of Trade, St. Catharines, Ontario.
John C. Notman, President.
S. W. Secord, Secretary.

February, 1908.

Dear Sir,—Proposed Georgian bay canal. I beg to call your attention to the proposition that is about to be brought before the House of Commons at Ottawa, and to ask your co-operation for the continuance of and enlargement of the present system of the St. Lawrence-Welland canal route, as being the most feasible, economical and desirable for the country at large, and much to be preferred to the proposed Georgian bay canal, and wish to draw your attention to a few of the advantages in favour of the St. Lawrence system. I also wish to call your attention to the fact that there are already boats on the upper lakes that could not pass through the locks on the proposed canal, and that it is absurd to start an enterprise of this nature that could not be completed for at least twelve years, and to have locks unable to accommodate the vessels at present on the lakes, shows that the estimate of cost as represented, if correct for the proposed design, is much too low for a modern canal. Our contention is that locks to meet future requirements should be 700 feet long, 75 feet wide, and have 25 feet of water on the sills, and that estimates should be based on these dimensions. In other words, the design of the proposed Georgian bay canal would be barely up to date.

The lockage on the proposed Georgian bay canal will be 200 feet more than on the present St. Lawrence system; a vessel would have to lock up 100 feet to the summit level, and then lock down 100 feet again to the Georgian bay level. The lockage on the proposed canal would be about one-half more than on the St. Lawrence-Welland route. The proposed canal would be a restricted channel for all vessels of 10,000 tons, and very little attempt at speed could be made.

The lighting of the proposed channel, the rock formation through which the canal will pass, the dangerous entrance to the French river, and the fact that the season will be much shorter, as the proposed canal will be frozen at North Bay before navigation closes at Montreal, are all instances in favour of the St. Lawrence route. There will be no return cargoes via the Georgian bay route, except such as can be obtained in Montreal, and these are common to both routes, whereas by the St. Lawrence-Welland route vessels can very often obtain return cargoes at Oswego, Buffalo, Erie, Cleveland, &c. Last year of the 12,673,000 tons of west-bound freight through the Sault canals 93½ per cent came from Lake Erie ports, showing conclusively that the return cargo route is by the Welland canal.

During the past several seasons the rate of freight to Georgian bay ports has been exactly the same as to the foot of Lake Erie, no doubt on account of there being return cargoes, and when at the foot of Lake Erie vessels are 70 miles nearer Montreal than when they are at the mouth of the French river, so for all practical purposes the St. Lawrence-Welland route is nearly 70 miles shorter than the Georgian bay route.

The proposed Georgian bay canal might be an improvement on the present canal system in some ways, as the latter was out of date some time ago, but with an enlarged St. Lawrence-Welland route we would have 200 feet less lockage than the Georgian bay and less than 20 locks, as against 27 on the latter. For a considerable distance vessels can run through Lakes Erie and Ontario and a large portion of the St. Lawrence river at full speed regardless of the weather, so there would be no saving of time by the Georgian bay route.

The cost of maintenance and operation should also be taken into consideration, and this we have every reason to believe would be reduced if our present system were enlarged, as the number of locks would be much smaller, but if the proposed Georgian bay canal were to go through it is safe to estimate that the cost to the people of the country would amount to about $1,000,000 per annum, an item that should be taken into consideration.

Yours truly,
S. W. SECORD,
Secretary.

I have thought it my duty to put this letter on record in order that all the facts might be before the House. On consideration of all the facts I am sure the House will be able to come to a better conclusion as to the wisdom of this proposed expenditure. For the present I am not in favour of involving the country in such an enormous expenditure in view of what can be done with the St. Lawrence and Welland canal route. I have at all times endeavoured to keep an open mind in reference to matters which may require consideration in this House, and of course, in this matter I am open to conviction. I am in favour of the present motion for papers because it will give us some of the information which is so much needed.

Motion (Mr. McCool) agreed to.

## RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny) moved second reading of Bill (No. 85) to amend the Railway Act. He said: When this Bill was introduced I made full explanations with regard to it and I am sure the House will have no objection to its passage. It embodies a principle which is the very essence of confederation. It is proposed to remedy certain grievances which the people of the province of Quebec labour under. The Bill, only applies to the province of Quebec. It purposes to compel railway companies, telephone companies, telegraph companies, or other public utilities to use in their transactions with the public in the province of Quebec the French language the same as they do the English language. The principle contained in this Bill is already found in the Railway Act in sections 243, 279 and 312, and my Bill simply proposes to extend that principle. For

instance, in the province of Quebec railway companies are now compelled to print the crossing signs in French and English, and likewise the regulations and by-laws of the companies have to be printed in French as well as in English. This Bill goes a little further and it compels the railway companies to have the Bills of lading in two languages, and their tickets, and the badges of their employees, and in the case of telegraph companies their contract or message form. I think the House will have no objection to the passage of this Bill. I may say that in the United States where the French language is not official, in the New England States, Rhode Island, Vermont and Maine, the French language receives from the public utilities there greater recognition than it does in the province of Quebec, It seems to me that the contrary should be the case. These railway companies are subsidized by this parliament and a portion of these subsidies are borne by the people of Quebec who now suffer the serious inconvenience of having to transact business with these companies in a language which is not the mother tongue of the greater portion of the inhabitants. I trust fully in the English majority of this House and in their sense of fair play that they will be the first to support the Bill and I am sure the members from the province of Quebec will offer no objection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On the whole I believe this Bill is well founded, but it seems to me that my hon. friend in some respects carries the principle to a considerable length. The object my hon. friend has in view is that the public shall have every facility possible to transact business, and I suppose all will agree that it is only right that those who are not conversant with the English language should have an opportunity to transact business in the language which they know. For instance, in the case of bills of lading, in the province of Quebec it would be of great advantage if they were printed in French and English so that shippers who are not conversant with the English language should know what the contract is and what obligations both parties undertake. But when my hon. friend requires baggage checks to be in French and English it seems to me he goes very far, because if I remember aright a baggage check contains simply the name of the station and the number of the check, and there is no French or English in figures.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. They have a contract at the back of the baggage checks which is generally in English.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That may be, but my experience is that these are metal checks which contain only a number and the name of the station. I have no objection at all that this Bill should be read a second time subject to what amendments may be made later.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When shall the House go into committee on the Bill ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Next sitting of the House.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. The opportunities to discuss this Bill in committee are getting very few, and if it does not go into committee to-day it may not go into committee at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is an important question for the railway companies, and I am sure my hon. friend understands that they should be notified to see if there is any objection to it. There is some good in the Bill, but I would not like to commit the government to the passage of such a measure without the railway companies being heard from.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. They have offered no objection so far.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the railway companies have no objection I certainly have none.

## SALE OF RAILWAY PASSENGER TICKETS.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville) moved second reading of Bill (No. 90) to amend the Passenger Ticket Act. He said : The first provision in this Bill is that the railway companies shall be compelled to issue books of tickets of 500 and 1,000 miles each at a rate not exceeding two cents per mile. I believe the railway companies do now issue mileage books but I think the rate is two and a half cents per mile. In the United States mileage books are good on any train, the conductor tearing out of the book the number of miles which the passenger intends to travel ; but Canadian mileage books are not good on the trains. The passenger who buys a mileage book must go to a ticket office and obtain a ticket from one point to another, for which the agent tears from the mileage book the requisite number of miles. This way causes inconvenience to the passenger. He may not know this distinction between the law in Canada and the law in the United States, and if he goes upon a train with only his mileage book, but without sufficient money to pay his fare, he may suffer a great deal of inconvenience. I think mileage books issued in this country should be on the same basis as those issued in the United States ; that is, a mileage book should be regarded as practically a ticket, which may be used on the trains. Then, I think the rate for mileage books should be two cents a mile.

There has been a reduction in passenger rates on our railways from three and one-third or three and one-half cents a mile to three cents a mile, but there has been no reduction whatever in the rate for mileage books. I think there should be a proportionate reduction. I also think that people travelling long distances should be given a little lower rate than those who travel short distances. There is an impression in the country—I have seen it mentioned in the newspapers—that I am attempting to make mileage books interchangeable on the different railways, but that is not my intention. My intention is that a mileage book for any particular railway shall be good only on that railway; but the second clause provides that a ticket purchased at a union station shall be good on any passenger train leaving that station. For instance, a person travelling from Toronto to Montreal who perhaps does not travel very often, and who has a ticket for the Canadian Pacific Railway, may by mistake get on the Grand Trunk train, which leaves at about the same time. It may be a case of sickness. It has been shown to me that persons who had made mistakes of that kind had not had the means to pay for a ticket through to Montreal, where the amount paid would be refunded. I fail to see that this would be doing any injustice to the railway companies. I would like to have this Bill sent to the Railway Committee, where it could be discussed thoroughly. I would be prepared to go into the matter more fully before the committee, with the hope of convincing it that the Bill should be adopted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry that the Minister of Railways is not here to give his views to my hon. friend on this question. For my part, I am not prepared to express an opinion upon it, and moreover my hon. friend has expressed his wish to have the Bill referred to the Committee on Railways. I will agree to the second reading on the understanding that the Bill be not now referred to the Committee on Railways, but be allowed to stand until the Minister of Railways can be present.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am agreeable to that.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

## MANUFACTURE AND SALE OF CIGARETTES.

On the order:

Resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Blain, that the object of good government is to promote the general welfare of the people by a careful encouragement and protection of whatever makes for the public good; and by an equally careful discouragement and suppression of whatever tends to the public disadvantage.

That the smoking of cigarettes has been proved by overwhelming testimony to be productive of serious physical and moral injury to young people; impairing health, arresting development, weakening intellectual power, and thus constituting a social and national evil.

That the legislation licensing and restricting the sale of cigarettes has not proven sufficient to prevent these evils, which will continue while the public sale of the cause of the mischief is permitted to go on.

That this House is of the opinion, for the reasons heretofore set forth, that the right and most effectual remedy for these evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes; and that it is expedient to bring in a Bill at this session to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes.

Mr. BLAIN. I am ready to go on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would ask my hon. friend to let this stand as there are some Bills on the paper which we can put through. I would ask Mr. Speaker to call order No. 8.

## GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 27) to amend the government Railways Act —Mr. Macdonald.

On section 1,

1. Section 29 of the Government Railways Act, chapter 36 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

29. When any cattle or other animals at large upon the highway or otherwise get upon the railway and are killed or injured by a train, the owner of any such animal so killed or injured shall be entitled to recover the amount of such loss or injury unless His Majesty, in the opinion of the court trying the case, establishes that the animal got at large through the negligence or wilful act or omission of the owner or his agent, or of the custodian of the animal, or his agent; but the fact that the animal was not in charge of some competent person shall not, for the purpose of this section, deprive the owner of his right to recover.

Mr. MACDONALD. This does not involve any new principle. It is simply applying to government railways, the provision of the Railway Act which applies to other railways.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the law with regard to private companies?

Mr. MACDONALD. This is practically a reproduction of subsection 4 of section 294 of the Railway Act, which applies to private companies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is an application to the government railways of the principle already established with regard to private railways by the legislation originally introduced by my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster).

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes.

On section 2,

2. Section 61 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor :

61. The cleared land or ground adjoining the railway and belonging to the railway shall at all times be maintained and kept free from dead or dry grass, weeds, thistles and other unnecessary combustible material.

2. Whenever damage is caused to crops, lands, fences, plantations or buildings and their contents by a fire started by a railway locomotive working on the railway, His Majesty, whether his officers or servants have been guilty of negligence or not, shall be liable for such damages: Provided that, if it is shown that modern and efficient appliances have been used and that the officers or servants of His Majesty have not otherwise been guilty of any negligence, the total amount of compensation recoverable under this subsection shall not exceed five thousand dollars, and it shall be apportioned among the parties who suffered the loss as the court or judge determines.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would move that the word 'property' be inserted in lieu of 'crops, lands, fences, plantations or buildings and their contents.' The corresponding section of the Railway Act was amended this session in like manner, and this will make the two exactly similar.

Mr. MACDONALD. I was going to suggest that it should be amended in that respect so as to make it agree with the amendment by the Railway Committee to the Railway Act this session. This Bill was drafted before that amendment was suggested.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

## DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 29) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a very important Bill, and I must say at once to my hon. friend that I would not be willing to accept it in its entirety. But I would have no objection to its being read a second time, the right of discussion being reserved.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read second time.

## FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 31) to amend the Fisheries Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

On section 1,

Mr. SINCLAIR. The object of this Bill is to take away from fishery officers the jurisdiction to try cases of offences against the Fisheries Act. I submit that that jurisdiction should never have been imposed on these officers. They should never have been given the power to act as justices of the peace. I am informed that there are about 180 of these officers appointed along the coast of Canada, each of whom has jurisdiction, by virtue of his appointment as a fishery officer, to try cases in the same way as a justice of the peace. I stated on the first reading of the Bill that I considered this practice inadvisable because the fishery officer is, to a certain extent, an interested party. He has to make an investigation in the first place, to find out whether a man is guilty or not, his duties being, in this respect, the same as those of a constable. He satisfies himself, from his investigation or from the reports he hears, that an offence has been committed. He summons the party to appear before himself, acting as justice of the peace, he tries the case, and, if he finds the man guilty, he imposes a fine. The defendant generally has the feeling that he does not get a fair trial before the fishery officer, and that it would be fairer to go before a justice of the peace and have the case tried in the usual way. There are many other statutes under which we appoint officers to enforce the law. For example, there is the Canada Temperance Act which is in force in a number of the counties in the maritime provinces. Under that Act an insepector is appointed whose duty it is to find out if an offence has been committed against the Act. If he finds that an offence has been committed, he does not try the case himself—such a system would not be tolerated. The officer must lay his information before a justice of the peace, a stipendiary magistrate or court of competent jurisdiction, and prove his case. The same principle should apply in the case of fisheries regulations. I asked a few days ago to what extent these fishery officers were exercising jurisdiction. The information I obtained is to the effect that, during the past year, there were 249 convictions for offences against the fisheries law, of which 176 were tried before the fishery officers. The fines imposed have been as follows for the years given :

| | |
|---|---|
| 1903.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $ 2,811 92 |
| 1904.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,934 10 |
| 1905.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 2,612 62 |
| 1906.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 2,227 43 |
| 1907.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 2,602 25 |
| Total for five years.. .. .. .. | 12,188 35 |

I asked as to how the fishery officers participated in these fines, and the information given me is that $6,083 of the amount

was paid to the fishery officers themselves. I believe that the amount is not paid directly to the officer who tries the case. It is done in this way: Some other fishery officer lays the information at the request of the officer before whom the case is to be tried, and the money is paid to the other fishery officer. Nevertheless, $6,083 has been received by the fishery officers from the fines that have been paid by defendants throughout Canada during the past few years, showing that these officers have too great an interest in these fines to justify us in allowing this system to continue. And there is not the slightest need for it. I have already instanced the Canada Temperance Act to show how these things are done in one case. I might point out the case of an Act passed last year to provide for the inspection of meats. In that case we appoint inspectors and officers. If one of these officers find that an offence has been committed he must satisfy two justices of the peace that an offence has been committed before he can fine the defendant. It is this principle I seek to apply in the case of these fishery officers. The section that confers jurisdiction on these officers is section 6 of chapter 45 of the Revised Statutes:

The Governor in Council may appoint fishery officers whose powers and duties shall be as defined by this Act and the regulations made under it, and by instructions from the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

2. Every such officer, who is authorized by the Governor in Council to exercise the powers of a justice of the peace, and for all purposes of this Act and the regulations made under it, be ex officio a justice of the peace, within the district for which he is appointed to act as such fishery officer.

A number of the other sections contain the words 'fishery officer and justice of the peace.' What I have done is to pick out these sections and provide by this Bill for their amendment by striking out 'fishery officer' so that the officer should not have jurisdiction to try cases.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is subsection 2 of section 6 ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. That section is where the jurisdiction is conferred.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not familar with the Act but I would suppose the Governor in Council is authorized to give such jurisdiction to the officer, and would it not go directly to the root if you take away the power of the Governor in Council to give such jurisdiction.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The first part of the section gives the Governor in Council power to appoint fishery officers whose powers and duties shall be as defined by this Act. I do not wish to take that power away from the Governor in Council because we must have fishery officers, and they must have certain defined powers. The subsection says :

Every such officer who is so appointed shall for all the purposes of this Act and the regulations made under it be ex officio a justice of the peace.

I propose to strike that out and he will still be a fishery officer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under what statute did the Governor in Council acquire power to appoint a fishery officer to be a justice of the peace ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Under this subsection 2.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN Is that the only authority?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The drafting of the present Act seems to be very poor, and it seems to be questionable whether there is the power to give a fishery officer jurisdiction as a justice of the peace. I cannot see in the Act where the Governor in Council derives his power to give the power of a justice of the peace to fishery officers, and if they have not got it perhaps the courts could decide on a quo warranto. I would suggest to let the matter stand because for my part I see no objection here.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member (Mr Sinclair) may be right that the only authority to appoint is to be found in the subsection of section 6, and that you must read that section as if it were couched in some such terms as this : Whenever the Governor in Council shall authorize a fishery officer to act as justice of the peace then such fishery officer shall have the powers of a justice of a peace for the purposes of this Act. If it means that, then the hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) is quite right.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is what I understand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it means something else, then his amendment to the Fisheries Act would need to go further It is hard to tell from the drafting of the statute what is meant.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will go on with it and not take it out of the committee to-day.

On section 2,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We are taking all this on faith. As I understand it only in connection with the prosecution of offences that any amendment is made.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is all.

On section 4,

Mr. SINCLAIR. Under the section as it stands a fishery officer can grant a warrant, and I am proposing that the fishery

officer may search, but a justice of the peace must grant a warrant.

Progress reported.

## MANUFACTURE AND SALE OF CIGARETTES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The only item on the programme is the motion of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain). Does he suppose he could dispose of this weighty subject in the twenty minutes before six o'clock.

Mr. BLAIN. So far as I am concerned I am prepared to ask the committee of the House to vote upon the question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I understood the discussion which took place the other day the opinion of the House seemed very much divided. Of course if my hon. friend wants to take up the matter now he is perfectly within his rights, but I do not think it can be disposed of before six o'clock.

Mr. BLAIN. My right hon. friend was not present and I think he does not fully understand the expression of opinion in the House. As far as I can judge the House was almost unanimously in favour of the motion and I presume that the position is the same to-day. Speaking for myself as the mover of the motion I may say that I think it was pretty fully discussed. It may be that some representatives wish to say something upon it and of course I do not wish to press my case too strongly, but I was prepared and am now to ask the House to vote upon the question because I think it was fully discussed. I would like, myself, to know the real expression of the members upon this question.

Mr. J. B. BLACK (Hants). Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not here when this question was up before as it is a question in which I feel very greatly interested and have for many years. I think there is no man who wishes the welfare of Canada—and the welfare of any country depends on the health and morals of its citizens—but must deplore the wretched habit of cigarette smoking among the children of this country. There is to my mind no more pitiable sight than the pale faced, round shouldered boy going around the streets sucking cigarettes. The poor fellow, of course, is imitating his elders and in that thinks he is doing a manly act. He is not sufficiently matured, he has not sufficient judgment to know that he is undermining his health, that he is destroying his intellect, that he is injuring his morals and that he is wrecking his future manhood. There is no doubt as to the results of cigarette smoking among children; there can be no question that it blunts the intellect, impairs the general health and demoralizes the individual.

Mr. SINCLAIR.

While we admit all this I think we must be consistent and I do not see how a full grown man, especially if he is the father of boys, can vote on this question while he is using tobacco himself. If a man will smoke the boy will follow. There is no such hero in the mind of the boy as the father. There is no doubt about that and while fathers smoke boys will imitate them. The cigarette, having less nicotine than the long used tobacco pipe, affects the boy less, nauseates him less quickly, he runs less risk of his personal feelings in the matter while he is satisfying his own desire to do a manly act and therefore he smokes the cigarette. That it is any more injurious than the pipe I do not believe. I never have believed it, but tobacco in any shape to the boy is a most injurious thing. I think that probably none of us have thought as much as we should have of laying the foundations of good health, good constitution and good morals in the boys of Canada. You cannot have healthy men, you cannot have vigorous men out of badly built, badly constitutioned boys. You cannot expect a vigorous nation, you cannot expect a manly nation to grow up from boys who have ruined their health, who have depleted their energies by cigarette smoking or using tobacco in any form. The cigarette may be less injurious than the pipe. It is less injurious than the pipe, I am sure, but as I said a moment ago, it nauseates the child so little that he prefers it to the pipe. There comes up a very puzzling question in this connection and I wish I knew how we could settle it. I think there is nobody who will hesitate about voting against boys or young people smoking cigarettes. I think we will all admit the injurious effect on body, mind and morals, but the great difficulty is to differentiate as to when you shall take away the right of smoking a cigarette. If my friend uses a pipe, if he uses a cigar, if he grows nastier still and chews tobacco, am I to deny him the right of smoking a cigarette as one of the forms in which he may indulge in tobacco? If a man smokes a pipe, if he smokes a cigar, have we the right to say that he shall not smoke a cigarette? I would like to see somebody differentiate between the justice of allowing a man to smoke a pipe and preventing him from smoking a cigarette. I think the great question lies in how to deprive our boys of the opportunity of smoking cigarettes. A law can be enacted and there is no trouble in enacting any law, but if that law can be carried out that will prevent boys or minors from smoking cigarettes we will have gone a long way in stopping the tobacco habit. I suppose that ninety-nine men out of a hundred learned to smoke when they were boys and some of them fortunately got sense when they were old enough to quit the habit. But few men began using tobacco after reaching years of maturity. It has all been with the manly intention of trying to be a man.

I would go any length to save the boys from the habit of cigarette smoking and I want to support this proposition, but the thing that puzzles me is: How are we going to allow a man to use tobacco at all and then say that he shall not use it in a certain form? If a man smokes a pipe I presume he has a perfect right to smoke a cigarette. If we have the right for the man's good to deprive him of the opportunity of smoking cigarettes, ergo, we have the right to deprive him of the opportunity of using tobacco at all. I do not think anybody will claim that the cigarette is worse than the pipe. I do not think it is more injurious. My whole sympathies are with any proposition that will stop our boys and minors from using cigarettes or tobacco in any form. It leads to vice, it leads to crime, it leads to bad health and it leads to bad morals.

Mr. D. A. GORDON (East Kent). Mr. Speaker, I rise to put myself on record on this very important question. I think sufficient, however, has been said to convince this House and also the country that drastic legislation is not only desirable but necessary. I believe in prohibiting the manufacture and sale of cigarettes and the enactment of such legislation as will prohibit the use of tobacco in this form by minors. I have had a considerable experience among boys and I must say with deep regret that I have seen the habit grow on those boys at an alarming rate, and I am satisfied that the most disastrous results will follow them through life. I fully realize that such legislation may mean a sacrifice on the part of adults, but I must confess myself as being decidedly in favour of doing whatever may be necessary to protect the boys until they reach mature years and are able to judge for themselves. I desire to put myself on record as being in favour of any measure that will bring about that result.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the debate when this subject was under discussion a few days ago. I wish to put myself on record in support of the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). I am sure that every father here will admit that it is easy for boys to become addicted to the habit of smoking cigarettes, much more easy than in the case of cigars or the pipe. It will be admitted I am sure by all fathers that the smoking of cigarettes is a very undesirable habit. Dr. Black informs the House that the boys' body is impaired by the use of cigarettes. He will be to some extent an authority in that regard, and I am sure that no father would like to have the health of his boy impaired by the smoking of cigarettes. The habit itself is filthy. It is expensive and leads on many occasions I am sure to other habits which do not tend towards the boy's good.

If it be a fact that all fathers would prefer that their boys should not acquire the habit of smoking cigarettes, is it too much to ask the fathers who are representatives in this House of Commons of the Canadian fathers to place a law on the statute-book that will prevent the importation, manufacture and sale of the article which is doing so much harm to the young boys of this growing nation. I think that every father present ought to take upon himself the responsibility of dealing with this matter in a frank manner. I quite realize the difficulty referred to by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Gordon), who spoke of the limitation as to the age of the boy. For my part, I think the fathers ought to forego the pleasure of cigarette smoking. If they will smoke let them smoke the pipe or the cigar. They ought to forego that pleasure and the fathers who are the representatives of the fathers of Canada in this House may very well support this resolution unanimously.

I realize that it is a difficult question to deal with as a party matter, and as far as I am personally concerned I would favour the idea of some gentleman introducing a Bill, not as a party question, but letting each gentleman on either side of the House vote on the matter as he considered in the interests of the boys of this country. I cannot support the amendment moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) because I think it is unfair to punish the boy who is a month under 18 years of age and let the boy who happens to be a month over 18 go scot free. It seems to me that is not the class of legislation that will advance the interests we all have at heart. The resolution that we require is for the fathers to undertake so far as they are concerned themselves, and as the representatives of other fathers, to say that they will banish the cigarette trade from Canada altogether. I realize that there will be some hardship. The manufacturers of this article will without question have a grievance, but we cannot in framing the laws of this country avoid occasionally striking somebody; in the endeavour to right a wrong injury may be done to some individuals. I have very great pleasure in endorsing the resolution moved by Mr. Blain and if a Bill is introduced with that end in view I shall have very much pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Loggie) point out to the House with more clearness and detail the difference between the smoking of a cigarette and a pipe or a cigar in relation to its injurious effects upon the health of boys?

Mr. LOGGIE. As a matter of fact, if you buy a dozen cigars they cost quite a sum of money, but a boy can go into a store and buy a dozen cigarettes for a very small sum. They seem an innocent kind

of thing and it is an easy way to be led into temptation.

Mr. P. H. MACKENZIE (South Bruce). Mr. Speaker, in common with many others who have spoken I would like to put myself on record in this matter. I feel very strong sympathy with the movement that has been inaugurated and carried on by many good women, professors, teachers and medical men in this country for the putting down of the smoking of cigarettes. I welcome the solution proposed at this time; it has my full sympathy. I think that the time has come when some action should be taken to put a stop to the ravages of the cigarette habit among our young people. I do not wish to detain the House at this late stage of the debate, but simply to say that I am strongly in favour of some measure of legislation to stop the smoking of cigarettes by the youth of this country. I realize that the solution of the question seems difficult but its importance calls for an earnest effort being made by the government.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am not quite clear—

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman spoke before.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman says that on this question I have already spoken. I direct your attention to the fact that this is not correct.

Mr. HENDERSON. A few moments ago.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I simply asked a question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Loggie) who was speaking. That question was in my opinion necessary.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 19, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 125) respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 128) respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—Mr. Michaud.

Bill (No. 129) to incorporate the London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Company.—Mr. Pringle.

Bill (No. 127) respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.—Mr. Gervais.

Bill (No. 126) to change the name and head office of the Anglo-Canadian Insurance Company.—Mr. Gervais.

Bill (No. 130) to amend the Naturalization Act.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

### QUESTIONS.

#### IMMIGRANTS AND BONUSES.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. How many immigrants of every kind arrived in Canada each year since 1896?
2. On how many immigrants has a bonus of any kind been paid in each year since 1896?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | 1896 | 16,835 |
| | 1897 | 21,716 |
| | 1898 | 31,900 |
| | 1899 | 44,543 |
| | 1900 to June 30 | 23,895 |
| | 1900-1 | 49,149 |
| | 1901-2 | 67,379 |
| | 1902-3 | 128,364 |
| | 1903-4 | 130,331 |
| | 1904-5 | 146,266 |
| | 1905-6 | 189,064 |
| | 1906-7 (9 months) | 124,667 |
| | 1907-8 (9 months) | 235,328 |
| 2. | 1895-96 | 4,484 |
| | 1896-97 | 2,432 |
| | 1897-98 | 8,664 |
| | 1898-99 | 4,588 |
| | 1899-1900 | 19,700 |
| | 1900-1 | 16,309 |
| | 1901-2 | 15,294 |
| | 1902-3 | 27,945 |
| | 1903-4 | 47,973 |
| | 1904-5 | 32,604 |
| | 1905-6 | 33,680 |
| | 1906-7 (9 months) | 14,070 |
| | 1907-8 (9 months) | 20,516 |

#### FORT WILLIAM RESERVE.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What portion of the Fort William or Mission reserve was acquired by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company?
2. When, in what manner, for what purpose, and on what terms were the said lands acquired by the railway company?
3. What was the total acreage acquired, and the price per acre paid by the company?
4. By whom was the land valued, when and by whom was such valuator appointed, and what is the date of his report?
5. What sum was paid the valuator for his services?
6. What was the amount of the valuation as found by the valuator?
7. Has the land been granted to the company? If so, when?
8. When and on what terms were these lands surrendered by the Indians, and who negotiated the surrender?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. A tract along the north part of the reserve.

2. On the 27th of January, 1906 ; by purchase ; for railway and especially terminal purposes ; cash payment.

3. 1,600 acres : 150 acres at $320 ; 250 acres at $160 ; 300 acres at $80 ; 700 acres at $40 ; 200 acres at $20.

4. Mr. S. Bray, chief surveyor of the Department of Indian Affairs ; on the 7th of January, 1905 ; by the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs ; 13th of March, 1905.

5. No other remuneration than his regular salary.

6. The total valuation of land and improvements amounted to $244,574.

7. Yes. On the 27th January, 1906.

8. The lands were not surrendered ; they were acquired under the provisions of section 46 of the Indian Act, chapter 81, R.S. C.

MAIL SERVICE—EGYPTE AND ST. EPHREM D'UPTON.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the government renewed the contract for the mail service between Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton?

2. For how many years has such contract been renewed?

3. Is the contract renewed at the same price or at a different price? If the present price differs, what is it according to the terms of the new contract?

4. Has the contract for the mail service between Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton been renewed without public tenders being called for?

5. Is it the custom of the department to renew the contracts for mail service without calling for new tenders?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. A renewal has been offered the contractor.

2. Four years from 1st April, 1908.

3. The same price.

4. Yes.

5. As provided by statute, contracts are renewed without tenders when in the opinion of the Postmaster General a satisfactory service has been performed under the expiring contracts and conditions are advantageous in the public interest, and the contract price has been previously fixed by public tender.

SUTHERLAND RIFLE SIGHT COMPANY.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Has the government entered into a contract with the Sutherland Rifle Sight Company for the purchase of additional sights?

2. If so, what is the number of sights to be purchased, and at what price?

3. When will these sights be delivered?

4. Was there a previous contract between the government and the Sutherland Rifle Sight Company?

5. If so, for what number of sights, the price and time of delivery?

6. Was this contract carried out?

7. On what rifles are these sights to be placed?

8. When will this change be made?

9. Is it the intention of the government to make an advance payment on the purchase price of these sights to the company remanufacturing the same? If so, what will be the percentage advanced?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. There has only been one contract entered into by the government with the Sutherland Rifle Sight Company for the purchase of 36,000 sights at $1 each, to be delivered between September 15, 1906, and March 15, 1908.

6. Not yet. The price has lately been increased to $1.20 each, and the time of delivery extended to the period between March 15, 1908 and September 15, 1909, by order in council, dated March 7, 1908.

7. The Lee-Enfield.

8. As soon as the sights are received from the manufacturer.

9. It is not the intention to make advance payments. There is no provision in the contract for advances.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES AT RANCHVALE, MANITOBA.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. How many entries for homesteads were made at the subland agency at Ranchvale, Manitoba, each year since the opening of the agency?

2. What were the total receipts of the office during each year?

3. How many applications for patent were received each year?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Homestead entries :

| | |
|---|---|
| 1st July, 1904—30th June, 1905 | 13. |
| 1st July, 1905—30th June, 1906 | 38. |
| 1st July, 1906—30th June, 1907 | 31. |
| 1st July, 1907—29th Feby., 1908 | 46. |

2. Total receipts :

| | |
|---|---|
| 1st July, 1904—30th June, 1905 | $187 60 |
| 1st July, 1905—30th June, 1906 | 399 25 |
| 1st July, 1906—30th June, 1907 | 455 00 |
| 1st July, 1907—29th Feby., 1908 | 645 50 |

3. Applications for patents :

| | |
|---|---|
| 1st July, 1904—30th June, 1905 | 35 |
| 1st July, 1905—30th June, 1906 | 28 |
| 1st July, 1906—30th June, 1907 | 29 |
| 1st July, 1907—29th Feby., 1908 | 47 |

## ICE FOR THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

1. Who has the contract for supplying ice to the Intercolonial Railway Department at Truro?
2. What is the contract price of same?
3. What quantity was supplied for the year 1907?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. J. A. McDonald, has the contract for supplying ice at Truro for season of 1908.
2. 39 cents per ton loaded on cars at Piedmont Siding.
3. 385 tons—1,450 pounds was supplied in 1907.

## ROSS RIFLES AND NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Where, when, and by whom, was the first consignment of Ross rifles manufactured that were issued to the Royal Northwest Mounted Police?
2. If not manufactured by the Ross Rifle Company at its factory in Quebec, were the component parts assembled and put together there?
3. Where were the component parts of the rifles made that were furnished by Eley Brothers of England, for the Royal Northwest Mounted Police?

Rt. hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. 60 rifles were shipped from Quebec to Regina on the 30th of June, 1905, and 929 on the 5th of August.
2. The Department of the Mounted Police understood and assumed that they had been manufactured at Quebec.
3. The Department of the Mounted Police purchased no rifles and no parts of rifles from Eley Brothers.

## COST OF EASTERN DIVISION OF NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. Has the government, and especially the right hon. the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Finance, made any recent estimates of the cost of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway?
2. If so, what are such estimates, and on what are they based?
3. If no such estimates have been recently made, when will the government be prepared to furnish them?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I cannot answer for the Finance Minister, as to myself, I have not recently revised my figures.

Mr. OLIVER.

## BOOK-KEEPING SYSTEM ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to refer to a matter of privilege. The press gallery seldom makes any mistakes so far as I am concerned, particularly on the wrong side. But on this occasion, by some inadvertence, a despatch has been sent to the 'Daily Telegraph' of St. John, New Brunswick, adding the sum of $300,000 to the answer given by me in regard to the cost of reorganizing the auditing and book-keeping system of the Intercolonial. The despatch says:

> They not only reorganized the system of accounting, but spent a year and a half instructing and assisting the railway staff in the proper carrying out of the system in question so that the results expected might be obtained. The work was done at scheduled prices, and totalled $343,084.

The real figures I gave were $43,084. The head-lines also say 'Nearly $350,000 cost of reorganizing book-keeping system of railway.' I have given the right figures.

## WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding, that the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Any one who listened on Tuesday to the plain unvarnished tale that I had the honour to expose in this House with reference to the increase of taxation and expenditure in this country, might very well have been led to ask, whither are we rushing? To find taxation raised from $27,700,000 in 1896 to about $73,000,000 in 1908, to find the expenditure raised from $42,000,000 from the first mentioned date to $110,000,000 in the year just ending, with a probable and almost certain extension to $130,000,000 or more in the year upon which we shall soon enter,—this I say might well have led an interested listener to ask the question I have stated.

But, Sir, if the question may be asked with reference to the taxation and expenditure of the country, another question, equally as important, may be asked with reference to the trade and fiscal arrangements of the country. If the word 'rushing' were not used in the latter case the word 'drifting' might very well be used. You will have noticed with what modesty the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) touched upon the question of the trade conditions of the country. Generally he devotes a good deal

of time, or has in past years, to that subject. Never in the history of Canada was it more necessary that the country should sit down and, through its business men in parliament and out of it, take stock of the conditions of the country, its obligations, its dealings, its payments now due or nearly due and of the complex questions which enter into the business and trade operations of a country as great as is the Dominion of Canada. I say that if ever there was a time when this should be done it is now. Yet, in this day of laissez faire, the business men of the country and the generality of the thinking men of the country seem unfortunately to have left it in the hands of a committee of the country, called the cabinet or ministry, and to have busied themselves with their own work, thinking it was the sole duty of these fourteen gentlemen to deal with the complex question of the trade and business of the Dominion of Canada. Just one thought to show that the people of this or any other country should never sit down and let the great affairs of the country with reference to its business be so disposed of. Taking the fourteen gentlemen who occupy the front benches of this House, or who are the ministers of the present cabinet, how many amongst these are bankers of great repute, or have had a large and varied experience in the business of the country so as to understand its currents, to know something of its sources and to mark out the channels in which it may run if left to itself, and in which it may be directed by happy and prudent guidance? How many have had great experience, or would have commended themselves in a private capacity in that respect to the country at large? If that is true of the present administration, it may be said to be almost equally true of every administration that we have had in this country. I am not imputing it as a weakness particularly of this government, but I am only pointing out the fact that it does come so to be that in the general rush and hurry of affairs at the present time it is left to a committee and a very small committee of the country, to look after these matters. These gentlemen, if you will think of it, have nothing to guide them but their own small experience in business matters, or the advice of friends who may be more or less interested in having a particular drift or tendency given to the trade development of the country, or the disinterested advice that they sometimes get from papers in opposition to themselves, or at least independent papers who advise them from time to time as to what seems to them, in their different areas of observation to be necessary for the well-being of the country. And yet, when you take this all into account, we find that the business of the country, so important and varied as it is, comes, in the end, to be looked after and to be directed in the main currents, in so far as legislation can do it, by such a body of men not in our country, at least, the best fitted to at any time or in any government to undertake such very large and varied interests and conduct them prudently and well. So I desire to make this remark simply that it might call, if possible, the attention of the business men of the country to the desirability of their being constantly on the alert and on the watch and of taking up every question that is likely to come to the front, so that, after having given it their best consideration and come to their wisest conclusions, they may give their advice to public men generally, to the ministry, to members of parliament, to all concerned, in any mode of communication that may be chosen in order that the wisest judgment and the best conclusions may be reached. Just at the present moment, and I come back to that particular thought, it is a very opportune time for this country to sit down and take stock of the general conditions, and to ask whither we are drifting.

Now, I propose, in the first place, very briefly, to advert to the policies, if we may call them such—the principles we can scarcely call them—which have dominated the government since they came into power in 1896. We all know the tortuous course of the members of the government and of the party that supported them in the long period of twenty or twenty-five years when they were seeking to change their status and to come into a ruling and governing position in this country. There is no necessity at all for me to bestow very much time upon this. Suffice it to say that almost every year they sought, wooed and successfully won some new and resplendent policy. Just as quickly in a year or two they threw it overboard and went in quest of another, and so it went on from absolute free trade to continental free trade, to revenue tariff only, to unrestricted reciprocity with discrimination against Great Britain and British countries, to anti-protection, to mutual preference with Great Britain, to reciprocity, especially with the United States of America, but in the last and final result it seemed to settle down into three phases of policy: First, reciprocity in any case with the United States of America; secondly, as promised by the right hon. Prime Minister himself, a mutual preference between Great Britain and Canada if it could possibly be brought about by the efforts of himself and party; and, thirdly, the stern and unwavering determination to eliminate the principle of protection from the whole fiscal policy of the country. Am I right or wrong in stating this as the conclusion of the whole matter? I do not propose to read many statements in proof thereof. Let me, however, recall to the mind of my right hon. friend the plank in the 1893 platform, where the party pledged itself that:

The tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government,

that it should be so adjusted as to make free or bear as lightly as possible upon the necessaries of life and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world.

And closing with these words:

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, unjust to the masses of the people and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any satisfactory relief to the trouble under which this country labours.

Afterwards Sir Wilfrid Laurier declared:

If the Liberals are successful they will cut off the head of protection absolutely and trample on its body.

Sir Richard Cartwright declared:

Our policy is death to protection; our policy from first to last has been to destroy this villianous system of protection which had been grinding out the vitals of the country.

Sir Louis Davis, then a trusted lieutenant of my right hon. friend then declared:

We are attacking this policy year after year. This is an accursed system, a system accursed by God and man.

And the Hon. Wm. Paterson whose genial face I see directly in front of me, at the Ottawa convention he declared not only to that convention, but in tones which reached the whole country:

You declare for freedom of trade against restrictions of trade.

In 1893 on that platform in Ottawa Mr. Laurier said:

We will tax for revenue but not one cent for protection. When we are in power we will free the people from protection which is a fraud, and a delusion, and a robbery.

There is not much necessity for me to amplify statements of this kind; I could give them to this House in quantity and take up a vast expanse of 'Hansard' in recording them but I spare the feelings of gentlemen opposite.

Nor is it necessary for me to say that reciprocity with the United States and preferential trade with Great Britain were also incorporated in the Liberal platform, and in the discussions of the questions by the leaders of the party and more particularly by the present Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Sir Charles Tupper advocated a mutual preference with Great Britain; and, Sir Wilfrid Laurier leading the forces of the opposition, not to be behind hand, declared that he was just as good a friend of mutual preference as was Sir Charles Tupper. In May, before the elections he said:

My hope is, nay my conviction is that on the 23rd of June the Liberal party will be at the head of the poll and then it will be the Liberal party with its policy of a revenue tariff that will send commissioners to London to arrange for a basis of preferential trade.

On what basis? Taking up Joseph Chamberlain's discussion of the question in the old country he said:

Under this policy we would have for our goods a preference which would not be given to the goods of other nations.

It was not to be a one-sided preference, it was to be a mutual preference, and he declared:

What would be the possibility of such a step if it were taken? We sell our goods in England; we send our wheat, our butter, our cheese, all our natural products to England, but there we have to compete with similar products from the United States, from Russia, from other nations. Just see what a great advantage it would be to Canada if the wheat, the butter, the cheese which we send to England could be met in England with a preference over similar products of other nations. The possibilities are immense.

Can there be any doubt as to what that meant to the people who listened to him or his words? Again he declared:

We would be in a far better position to obtain this boon (a preference for Canadian goods in the British markets) for Canada, than Sir Charles Tupper because he has a protective tariff whereas mine is a revenue tariff pure and simple, and Mr. Chamberlain says that that is all that is needed in order to obtain it. England does not expect that we should take her own system of free trade such as she has it, but I lay it before you that what the English people would expect in return is that instead of the principle of protection we would adopt a revenue form of tariff pure and simple. These are the conditions on which we can have that boon.

There was first the reciprocity plank of the platform of 1893 and there are the promises made by the leader of the party in words which are absolutely explicit and plain.

Well, how was it with reference to reciprocity? With reference to reciprocity the present Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) leading in the Eastern Townships declared:

If my leader comes into power it would not be a rash prediction to say that within six months from that day by a scratch of the pen a treaty of reciprocity would be put in force between Canada and the United States.

And the Hon. David Mills said:

If the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House cross to the treasury benches I can promise there will be no difficulty in obtaining trade with the neighbouring republic.

And so, in similar expressions all through this country they declared their determination and their ability to get reciprocity with the United States and they used that

as a very strong and powerful canvass. Well, Sir, these gentlemen came into power and what happened ? They had not been in power six months before Sir Wilfrid Laurier went to England, and instead of sending a commission or making a single move towards getting a mutual preferential tariff, he declared to the Cobden Club, and he declared to the Duke of Devonshire, and he declared to the people of England : We are going to give you, yea we have given you a tariff by which you get a preference ; we do not ask you for anything in return ; that is a free gift ; I would not have you abandon your free trade principles, protection is a bane and a curse and it has been such to Canada. And, Sir, to-day that right hon. gentleman posesses, whether he wears it or not, the Cobden medal for that act of his in giving up his promises to the people of Canada and going back upon his pledged word.

Well, what happened with reference to reciprocity with the United States. These cock-sure gentlemen went down to Washington, took their strongest men, put on their sweetest smile, used their most honeyed arguments and they came back without a shred of a treaty, without the promise of a treaty, having expended some $35,000 of the people's money and having had a very good time. And they came back to parliament and declared that after all they did not think the people of Canada wanted reciprocity with the United States. That was what took place with reference to these two planks of their platform.

What took place with reference to the elimination of protection? They brought down their tariff in 1897. Was it or was it not—I ask my right hon. friend—was it or was it not based on the principle of protection ? Had it protection in it or was it a simple revenue tariff ? Well, Sir, the proof of the pudding is in the eating of it, and the written and printed tariff which stands on record shows that it bears all the marks of a protective tariff. There were your specific duties against which they had argued ; there were the ad valorem duties running up to thirty-five per cent ; there were the rebates against which they had thundered ; there were the bounties against which they had declared, and there as the result of the working out of that tariff in the succeeding year was an average duty of 29·90 per cent upon all goods that came into this country. Is there any proof necessary after that ? That these gentlemen swallowed their principles if they had any, went back on their promises and went to work and put up a tariff on the principle of protection, and have kept it to this date upon the principle of protection and on no other. Then they thought they would do a world stroke of business. These gentlemen of talent in their first tariff inserted a clause not even a one-sided preference with Great Britain; they themselves disclaimed it, the Minister of Finance disclaimed it, the Minister of Trade and Commerce at that time disclaimed it—what they brought in was a world reciprocity tariff.

They said to any country in the world that went a certain length in its tariff with reference to the importation of goods from Canada, that they would put it on a preferential basis. They did it. Great Britain took advantage of it. Thirty-eight other countries had an equal advantage with Great Britain. That condition of things remained in force for one year, and at the end of that year these gentlemen had to pay back the duties which they had presumed to put on the imports from all those countries—paid them back with Canada's hard cash. They had received a notice from the British government saying : If you want to give Great Britain a preference, you can do it by special legislation, naming Great Britain; but if you keep this kind of a clause in your tariff, you have to let in at the same rate every country in the world that has the most favoured nation clause. There is where they came to the impasse; they had to repeal the legislation they had boasted about, or give a preference to Great Britain and to Great Britain only. These gentlemen saved their face by doing at the end of the year what they declared in the beginning they would not do—they gave a preference to Great Britain alone. First, they gave a preference of 25 per cent; afterwards, in a fit of loyalty, about the time of the Boer war, they raised that to 33⅓ per cent; but lately their ardour has cooled off, and the British preference has been diminished by special legislation by the intermediate tariff, and now by the French treaty, until to-day there is very little life in it if it is not alogether dead, and other countries come in on the same favoured basis that Great Britain does on very important articles.

That is the course of these hon. gentlemen with reference to their policy. What has it been ? Simply a matter of expediency, of opportunism. Their tariff is full of contradictions. On the one hand, they try to have a low duty for iron, and on the other hand they put their hands into the peoples' pockets and pay out a bounty to help the manufacturers of iron. They abolish or lower the duties on binder twine, on oil and on other things, and then they pay a bounty to the producer so as to be on terms of expediency with each—saying to the consumer, we have reduced the customs duty; saying to the producer, we are protecting you by bounty. It is wrong, they said, to tax a cent which would be taken from one man's pocket and put into another; and yet with their bounty system, running up now to $3,000,000 or more a year, they are doing the very thing they denounced all over this country. They say, we want to encourage the manufacturers of

agricultural implements—they are dear to us. Then they turn round and say: The farmers want their agricultural implements cheaper; so we will make it easy for both; we will give to the farmer 2½ per cent reduction in the customs duty, and we will give to the manufacturer a rebate which amounts to more than the 2½ per cent. Thus their tariff goes from change to change and from absurdity to absurdity. When once the intermediate tariff was put on the statute-book, all certainty with reference to British capital and British trade with this country changed into uncertainty. Your man in Great Britain who wanted to lay the basis of enlarged preferential trade with Canada knew in 1906 that he had a certain basis on which to go. The intermediate tariff came on in 1907. Now what does he know? He knows simply this, that though at any present time he may have a certain preference, within forty-eight hours an order in council may go out from the Canadian government which would let countries which compete with Great Britain into the Canadian market on terms which would destroy all trade which he might attempt to build up on that preference. And what has happened with reference to the French treaty? You have it; we have discussed it; it is now the law of the land; and we will see what comes out of it. But let me tell my hon. friend what he has had to pay for it. You have a small list of articles on which you get the minimum treatment in France; but in that list you find very few articles with reference to which you have to-day any entrance into the French market at all. I think half-a-dozen will almost exhaust the list, and the rest for the most part are articles on which the protection is so high that it will be impossible for Canada to overleap the barrier when free trade countries like England, asking more than we can produce, open their ports without any barrier of customs duty at all. What more? You have opened a destructive competition with some of the producing interests of this country having a very low rate of protection, and it remains to be seen how that will work out. You have sacrificed $400,000 or $500,000 of revenue; you have pledged yourselves to a subsidy to keep up the direct service, without any co-operation from France in the matter at all; you have lowered the British preference; and, worse than all, you have let twelve countries of the world into the Canadian market on the same reduced terms you have given to France, which proposed to pay something at least for it, and you have not got from one of these countries a cent's worth of advantage in their markets. That is what you pay for the French treaty; we will see how it works out. My own opinion is that it will not be found to work out as satisfactorily as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance thought it would.

Mr. FOSTER.

So much with reference to general policy. Now, let me come to the trade returns, and what is the first thing we notice as we scan them? The first thing is this, that a great deal of the boasting about the figures of trade is absolutely foundationless; it is misleading in this way, that the values as they are given in the trade returns are not an indication of the volume of trade which is carried on by this country. I call attention to this fact. The Liberal Conservative party is liable to criticism and gets criticism between two conditions. In 1890 the prices of commodities were the highest they had been for a long series of years. In 1896 the prices of commodities had gone down to the lowest figure they had ever touched in a still longer series of years. From 1896 to 1906 or 1907 there has been a rise in prices to a point which overtops the prices in 1890, and which is the highest point that prices have reached in a long cycle of years in this and other countries. Now, what happens? You take the trade returns, which are based upon values, not upon volume—in 1890, so many millions; in 1896, so many more millions. But in the meantime the prices of commodities have fallen 22 to 30 per cent, and the disadvantage is shown in the values; but the volume of business is a very different matter. When you take the returns for 1906-7, and show an export of so many millions, and contrast that with the value of the exports in 1896, there again the basis is fictitious, so far as the volume of trade and the development of the country are concerned.

For instance, a bushel of wheat sold for 55 cents in 1896 and for $1 in the fall of 1907. It cost just as much capital, labour and energy to produce a bushel of wheat in 1896 as in 1906, but if 30,000,000 bushels of wheat had been exported from Canada in 1896 at 50 to 55 cents a bushel, and if the same quantity had been exported in 1907 at $1 a bushel, you would have had in 1907 from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000 more in value, figuring in your trade and navigation report, and that without any more business development or energy. Thus it is evident that when you take the values as an index and not the quantities you are not stating the whole case. Let me show how this works out. In 1896, according to the Bureau of Statistics in the United States, the values of all commodities had fallen compared with 1890 an average of 22 per cent. But in 1905 the values had risen 28 per cent as compared with 1896. There was, therefore, a difference of 50 per cent between 1890 and 1905 in values. See what variation that would make when you figure out your trade by dollars instead of by quantities.

In 1896 our imports were $105,300,000 and our exports $112,900,000, making in all $218,-

200,000. But if you take exactly the same trade and estimate it according to the values of 1905, the imports become $134,-800,000, the exports $144,500,000 and the total trade $279,300,000 instead of $218,200,000. Exactly the same volume of business, exactly the same development, energy, enterprise and labour, and yet there is that difference simply because the values have risen by that amount in the meantime.

Apply the same calculation to 1905. In 1905 the tables show the merchandise imports $251,600,000 and the merchandise exports $201,600,000, making altogether $453,-100,000, and they point to that as showing the expansion of Canadian trade. See what our policy has done, they exclaim. But translate that into the values of 1896 and your imports become $181,200,000 and your exports $145,000,000, and your total trade $326,300,000 instead of $453,100,000. Thus there is a difference of $126,800,000, which these gentlemen take credit for as the result of their policy and administration, when it is simply due to the world wide rise in prices and nothing more.

I have had with some care the exports of 1896 and the exports of 1906 of this country carefully analysed. Take a part of the exports in 1906, $165,263,000, and apply the values of 1896, and you will find a difference of $38,300,000. If you apply the same rule to the whole exports of $235,-483,000—calculate them at the values of 1896, you would find that they would be only $182,000,000 instead of $235,000,000. That is not due to a difference in the quantity exported and imported. It is a difference due solely to the increase in values.

There are some very significant items which show the rise in prices. What are the sources of our large exports? They are the forest, the field and the mine. We export more largely from the field than from any other source, and our exports from the mines are large and increasing. Take copper, in 1896 it was worth 5½ cents a pound and in 1906 16 cents a pound. The gain in copper alone, taking the same quantity in 1896 as in 1906, would, at the rise in values, amount to $4,700,000. In 1906 we exported $7,148,000 worth of copper. Apply to that export the prices of 1896, and instead of an export of $7,148,000 you would only have an export of $2,136,000. Take lead ore, the price went up from 2 cents to 3½ cents. The price of mica increased from 10 cents to 15 cents. Nickel increased from 7 cents to 9 cents, and the gain on nickel alone would be half a million dollars. Take codfish, and the gain would be a million dollars owing to the rise in price. In lobsters alone the gain is $1,300,000, due solely to the increased price, because the fishers are receiving 27 cents per can when formerly they received only 15 to 25 cents. Take the great staple of lumber. I have grouped together a large part of the exports of lumber, and I find, if you take the export of 1906 and apply to it the prices of 1896, your trade returns would show $5,500,000 less than they do. That is on exactly the same amount of lumber as exported in 1896. Take agricultural products, butter has gone up from 17·9 to 20·9, so that you make a gain in butter of $1,000,000. There would be $1,000,000 less in your trade and navigation returns if you figured out the exports in 1906 at the price of 1896. Then cheese has gone up in price from 11 cents to 18 cents, making a gain of $6,000,000, due solely to the rise in price.

Mr. PATERSON. That is $6,000,000 more cash in the pockets of the cheese producers.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, we will take that argument. It does not affect the argument I am making, and my right hon. friend must meet the argument fairly, for what I have stated is a matter of common reason and common knowledge as he himself is aware. But I might as well deal with this other side of it now. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) says that there is so much more in the pockets of the producer. But there has not been a rise on one side of the account alone. All commodities have risen together. If the people get more for what they sell, they have to pay more for what they buy, and it is the balance that decides the thing. I challenge my hon. friend to take the prices that make up the cost of living in 1896 and put them side by side with similar prices for 1907-8 and see whether the consumer gets any benefit. Bacon and hams, for instance, counted on the basis of the prices of 1896 diminished by $3,700,000 the values of 1906. And so all the way through, nearly all these articles show appreciation in that way. Before we can say whether or not Canada is making the progress that she appears to be making, we must get behind the values and understand the actual volumes in the business which is being transacted.

Now, leaving that point, I wish to take up another phase of the matter. I have here a table which shows the imports and exports of merchandise for home consumption. I think this is a very important table. It may be that I think it more important than it really is. We know that the preacher, even though he has to take a text a hundred and four times a year, yet is very apt to think the actual text on which he may be preaching the most important that can be found in scripture, so strongly is it impressed upon his mind. That may be my case in the present instance. The following gives a comparison of our total imports of merchandise for home consumption :—

IMPORTS OF MERCHANDISE FOR HOME CONSUMPTION.

| —— | 1896. | 1906. | Increase. | Increase |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $ | $ | $ | p.c. |
| Total | 105,300,000 | 283,200,000 | 177,900,000 | 169 |
| From Great Britain | 32,800,000 | 69,100,000 | 36,300,000 | 110 |
| From United States | 53,500,000 | 168,700,000 | 115,200,000 | 209 |
| From other countries | 18,900,000 | 45,200,000 | 26,300,000 | 149 |

EXPORTS OF MERCHANDISE.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 112,900,000 | 246,600,000 | 133,700,000 | 118 |
| To Great Britain | 66,600,000 | 133,000,000 | 66,400,000 | 100 |
| To United States | 36,400,000 | 88,000,000 | 51,600,000 | 141 |
| To other countries | 9,200,000 | 24,400,000 | 15,200,000 | 165 |

These are figures that we may well ponder. What are the lessons they teach? In the first place, there is the preponderating rate of increase in imports over exports—169 per cent increase in imports and only 118 per cent increase in exports. Then there is the preponderating increase of our trade with the United States as compared with our trade with Great Britain—increase in our imports from the United States, 209 per cent, compared with an increase of our 110 per cent in our imports from Great Britain, an increase in our exports to the United States of 141 per cent as compared with an increase of only 100 per cent in our exports to Great Britain. In 1896, the balance of trade against us in our business with the United States was $17,100,000; in 1906, the balance of trade against us in our trade with the United States was $80,700,000, an increase of 392 per cent. Another lesson is the moderate increase of the favourable balance of trade with Great Britain—$33,800,000 in 1896 and $63,900,000 in 1906, an increase of only 89 per cent, while the adverse balance of trade with the United States increased in the same time by 392 per cent and is still going up. Another lesson is the rapid increase in trade with all other countries—for, though small, it is rapidly increasing, being $28,100,000 in 1896 and $69,600,000 in 1906, an increase of 149 per cent. But note also the increasing adverse balance of trade therein, which was $9,700,000 against us in 1896 and was $20,800,000 against us in 1906, an increase of 114 per cent and the proportionate decreasing power of production in Canada in relation to the wants of Canada, as is shown by the figures which I have given to the House. Following out that subject, I have prepared three tables, one, the trade between Canada and Great Britain in merchandise which is as follows:—

Mr. FOSTER.

TRADE IN MERCHANDISE BETWEEN CANADA AND GREAT BRITAIN.

| Year. | Imports from Great Britain. | Exports to Great Britain. | Favourable balance. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Under Conservatives. | $ | $ | $ |
| 1890 | 43,277,009 | 48,353,694 | 5,076,685 |
| 1896 | 32,824,505 | 66,689,253 | 33,854,748 |
| Under Liberals. | | | |
| 1897–1906 (Average yearly). | 48,452,949 | 109,553,700 | 61,100,751 |

That shows the condition with reference to Canada and Great Britain. Now take the trade in merchandise between Canada and the United States, and it is a startling table:

TRADE IN MERCHANDISE CANADA AND UNITED STATES.

(UNDER CONSERVATIVES.)

| Year. | Imports from United States. | Exports to United States (Canadian products.) | Adverse balance of trade. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | $ | $ | $ |
| 1890 | 51,365,661 | 33,291,207 | 18,074,454 |
| 1896 | 53,529,390 | 34,460,428 | 19,068,962 |
| Average of 1890–1896 | 51,705,080 | 32,773,471 | 18,931,609 |

(UNDER LIBERALS)

| Year. | Imports from United States. | Exports to UnitedStates (Canadian products.) | Adverse balance of trade. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | $ | $ | $ |
| 1897.. ..... | 57,023,347 | 39,717,057 | 17,306,285 |
| 1898..... | 74,824,923 | 34,361,795 | 40,463,128 |
| 1899..... | 88,467,173 | 34,766,955 | 53,700,218 |
| 1900..... | 102,080,177 | 52,534,977 | 49,545,200 |
| 1901..... | 107,149,325 | 67,983,673 | 39,165,652 |
| 1902..... | 114,744,696 | 66,567,784 | 48,176,912 |
| 1903..... | 128,790,237 | 67,766,367 | 61,023,870 |
| 1904..... | 143,010,578 | 66,856,885 | 76,153,693 |
| 1905 ..... | 152,431,676 | 70,426,765 | 82,004,961 |
| 1906..... | 168,798,376 | 83,546,306 | 85,252,070 |
| Total..... | 1,137,320,453 | 584,528,464 | 552,791,989 |
| 1887–1896... 10 y'rs Conservative. | 503,201,174 | 335,359,783 | 167,841,393 |
| Increase in Liberal 10 years.... | 634,119,279 | 249,168,681 | 384,950,596 |

In 12 months ending June 30, 1907, the imports from United States were $206,715,-914, the exports to the United States, $82,-194.661, and the adverse balance of trade reached the enormous sum of $124,521,253.

Now I think that is a somewhat startling showing. This adverse balance of trade has to be met, it has to be met every month, every three months, every year. You cannot run credit for that adverse balance of trade, it has to be adjusted through the banks and through the business of the country. Now let me point out that in this statement I have simply taken the exports of home products, because I wanted to show the exact relation of trade as regards the export of Canada's own produce, to the foreign produce we were importing. Now if you deduct the foreign produce also exported to the United States in that period of ten years, it amounts to $30,000,000. Subtracting that, taking both the home and foreign products, the adverse balance of trade against us in those ten years, with the United States, was $522,000,000.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. If we have lost that money in the last ten years, where do the people get their accumulated savings ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell my hon. friend in a little while. Now let us take the trade between Canada and the world in relation to merchandise, and here another striking fact presents itself.

TRADE IN MERCHANDISE, CANADA AND THE WORLD.

| Year. | Imports. | Exports. | Balance of Trade. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | $ | $ | $ |
| 1890. | 112,000,000 | 91,000,000 | 21,000 000 Minus. |
| 1896. | 105,000,000 | 113,000,000 | 8,000,000 Plus. |
| 1902. | 197,000,000 | 210,000,000 | 13,000,000 " |
| 1903. | 225,000,000 | 225,000,000 | |
| 1904. | 244,000,000 | 211,000,000 | 33,000,000 Minus. |
| 1905. | 252,000,000 | 202,000,000 | 50,000,000 " |
| 1906. | 283,000,000 | 247,000,000 | 36,000,000 " |
| *1907. | 345,000,000 | 241,000,000 | 104,000,000 " |

*12 months.

Here another striking fact presents itself. In 1890 our total imports were $112,000,000 and our exports $91,000,000, leaving a balance of trade against us of $21,000,000. In 1896, still under Conservative administration, and after hard times, our imports were $105,000,000, our exports $113,000,000 with a favourable balance of trade of $8,000,000. Now, how was that done ? By exporting more and importing less, we brought about a change of $29,000,000 in that period. Now whether we all have the same theory and the same explanation or not, these are figures which strike one, and they deserve something better than a laugh, something better than trotting forward an old and exploded theory, something better than calling up Russia or calling up Switzerland. You have to judge every country absolutely by its own conditions and its own connections. There is no rule which will suffice for all countries. Take Switzerland, for instance ; Switzerland will be handed out as a country that has an adverse balance of trade and yet prosperous. When you take the statistican's work and find that in Switzerland there is every year expended by tourists from different parts of the world, and chiefly from Europe and the United States, for natural scenery, attraction and enjoyment, an amount which comes up to about $9 per head, for every man, woman and child in Switzerland, you see that Switzerland is in a very different position from Canada. Scenery, travel, attractions, natural beauty are all exportable products and are paid for by tourists of the United States and other countries in millions of dollars which is spent in Switzerland upon its scenery and attractions. So much then in reference to these figures.

Now, before going any further with that I will revert to the point I made that the producing power of Canada seems to have failed to keep up the ratio of increase as regards the call upon it by the consuming necessities of the country and consequently the imports have very largely increased. That may be due to two reasons. If the producing power in Canada is not able to satisfy increasing demand, or if conditions are prevailing to-day which favour this great import from abroad, each of these

influences keeps down the production which would otherwise call for the employment of the labour of the people of this country. One or other or both of these may hold in reference to this. But here are the figures and they are important:

PRINCIPAL IMPORTS IN 1896 AND 1906.

| Imports. | 1896 | 1906 |
|---|---|---|
| Breadstuffs.. .. .. .. .. | $ 6,417,767 | $10,955,499 |
| Brick, clays and tiles.... | 261,000 | 1,220,913 |
| Carriages.. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,410,473 | 2,525,177 |
| Cement.. .. .. .. .. .. | 252,882 | 1,003,022 |
| Cocoa, chocolate and preparations thereof... ... | 1,049,433 | 4,462,095 |
| Twine of all kinds.... .. | 261,032 | 2,013,091 |
| Cottons.. .. .. .. .. .. | 5,229,059 | 10,745,206 |
| Earthenware.. .. .... .. | 568,393 | 1,674,817 |
| Fish and its products.. | 947,088 | 1,996,527 |
| Flax, hemp, jute and manufactures thereof.. | 2,745,582 | 5,212,231 |
| Gloves and mitts.. .. .. | 636,618 | 1,167,094 |
| Hats, caps and bonnets.. | 1,485,742 | 2,690,839 |
| Leather and manufactures.. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,243,113 | 3,031,569 |
| Brass and manufactures. | 542,874 | 1,938,169 |
| Copper and manufactures.. .. .. .. .. .. | 295,054 | 3,102,736 |
| Agricultural implements. | 469,875 | 1,615,123 |
| Iron and steel manufactures.. .. .. .. .. .. | 10,203,052 | 44,975,607 |
| Metals, minerals and manufactures thereof.. | 14,550,251 | 59,839,930 |
| Paper and manufactures | 1,002,434 | 3,176,955 |
| Provisions.. .. .. .. .. | 1,228,041 | 3,189,704 |
| Vegetables.. .. .. .. .. | 298,861 | 936,154 |
| Wood and manufactures of wood.. .. .... .. .. | 2,904,196 | 8,656,370 |
| Manufactures of wool.. | 8,773,857 | 17,892,398 |

With regard to breadstuffs here in Canada, a country rich in its soil, intelligent in its agriculture and producing power and yet there is an increase of from $6,000,000 to $10,000,000 in this period from 1896 to 1906. Gloves and mitts will shortly come under the most favoured nation clause of the French treaty and then the foreign manufacturers will get in their work. The duty will be reduced and competing countries in Europe will bring in these articles at a lower rate. With reference to agricultural implements, during nine months of 1907 the importation was $1,845,648 while in the preceding year it was $1,615,125. From 1896 to 1907, $19,907,105 worth of agricultural implements have been imported into this country. What is the reason that Canada cannot make her agricultural implements of all kinds? What is the reason that foreign labour should, to such an extent as this, monopolize Canada with reference to these always used implements? Then take iron and steel manufactures; we imported $10,203,052 worth in 1896 and $44,975,607 worth in 1906. There you have the direct result of the lowering of the tariff to the United States on certain kinds of steel and iron and manufactures thereof. Go to great expense, boast of our unrivalled deposits of iron, put on a tariff to cause manufacture in this country, work it out for twenty years and then give it up

Mr. FOSTER.

and allow in one single period an immense influx of iron and steel manufactures to come in as indicated by the figures I have given. Now, these are the figures which are taken from our returns and which explain the immense percentage in the increase of our imports. Is it best that that kind of thing should continue? Is it best, with reference to the mere financial part of it, that our ratio of exports should fall and our ratio of imports should be continually rising? Where will come the balance to pay the bill for the bill must be paid? Is it better as regards the development of the country? The cry that is made is that this government shall not import labourers or skilled mechanics to be put in competition with our union men. The cry is listened to and the government trembles in its boots every time it sees a protest of the labour unions against the importation or the immigration into this country of skilled mechanics. What does it matter whether you bring in a skilled mechanic to compete and take the labour away from the skilled mechanic here, or whether you hire the skilled mechanic over in Europe, pay him his wages there and let his goods come into this market to take the place of the product of the labouring man in Canada? In the one instance you would have the money spent in this country, the families founded in this country, the prosperity built up in this country; in the other case you are building up families and towns and prosperity in foreign countries. Now, these things are vital to this country. They demand more attention than they have received at the hands of the Finance Minister and the government. We are fast coming to a condition of things when the people will wake suddenly at the point to which we are inevitably tending if this sort of thing goes on. Why, it is simply astounding that the balance of trade—Canada against the world—should run up in four short years from nothing to $104,000,000 in the last calendar year. You commenced in 1904 with $33,000,000; it went up to $50,000,000, then it went up to $36,000,000 and in 1907 to $104,000,000. Every one of these balances is against Canada. Each one of them has had to be met. To find out the bite you have to add them all together and say that in four years the adverse balance of trade has been close up to $225,000,000 against Canada. Well, Sir, what has happened? One of the most diffused and one of the most important manufacturing industries of this country, the woollen industry, has been reduced to its last legs. The woollen industry is a vanishing quantity in Canada. Did you notice the twine that was brought from abroad—$200,000 worth of twine that might be manufactured in this country and now it is not. But we take our money and pay the labourers of the United States and of Scotland who manufacture that twine for

us and bring it in at the increased price of the material and the labour and the profits that are put upon it. Is it best for us to have the labour, the profits and the employment within our own country or not? These are points which we must consider if we do not wish to carry on a laissez faire policy. But there will be a day of reckoning as sure as fate, and what I say is that these gentlemen opposite have not lifted a hand and not tried a single experiment to mitigate that kind of thing, but have gone on in a haphazard way and they are face to face now with these startling conditions and facts with regard to the trade of this country.

I hesitate to attack the question of the balance of trade. If I were going to approach it I would want a great deal of time to treat it, but even though fools may rush in where angels fear to tread I am going to state a few of my views with reference to that. The balance of trade—why, says the member supporting the government from Prince Edward Island, I will dispose of that balance of trade business for you. How? Why, here is a Canadian vessel lying in the port of Montreal; she loads up with Canadian material, crosses the Atlantic and sells out her load in Liverpool, making 50 per cent profit; she buys another stock of goods, puts it on board, goes to South Africa, sells it at 50 per cent profit; she loads up again with goods from South Africa and goes to Bombay and sells out again at 50 per cent profit; she loads up again there, takes it over to Yokohama, sells it out there again at a profit; she loads up at Yokohama and comes back to Victoria, B.C., and sells out again at a large profit. That is what is going on—yes, in the imagination of my hon. friend, but nowhere else. Business is not done that way by Canada. Watch the ports of this country from the opening of navigation to the close and name me the Canadian vessels that are doing that. That is what was written in the books long ago, that is what the old theorists of free trade England have written volumes and volumes about, and these gentlemen take up these worn out old theories, which may be true with reference to England, the great carrying nation of the world, but are not at all true with reference to Canada.

Now, what I think about the balance of trade is this: That the balance of trade in the first place must be settled presently. It is not as if I could go to my friend here and borrow $100 from him and give him a note for three years and pay him interest. These international balances are not arranged in that way. They have to be adjusted every month, every three months, every six months at the longest and they are so adjusted, and the banks are the mechanism which we use for that adjustment. That is the first point I make. We have got to pay our balances; we cannot run credit from year to year on them. Now, they can only be paid either in goods or in gold, and whichever it is it is our export trade which in the final analysis has to pay our bills and we have nothing else to pay them with. Well, so far as trade and navigation figures go you may call that a trade balance if you like. That is the visible trade of the country. You might so far as that goes balance one by the other, or be in debt, or have a profit. But it may be said: That is not all that is coming and going between the countries; there are invisible exports and imports. And that is true. But yet it is absolutely true that in the end, even the actual international balance has got to be settled by exports from the country that owes and it can be paid in no other way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Export of scenery, for instance.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly, the export of scenery measured by the expenditure of tourists. Now, in four years the figures I have given work out in this way: In four years $223,000,000 is our adverse balance of trade, but you have got to add to that the charges on the imports. If I mistake not, we have a different plan from that pursued in Great Britain. Here in Canada I think our import value is the fair market value in the country where these goods were bought. Am I right in that?

Mr. PATERSON. Well, the invoice. That is the invoice value and it may be adjusted.

Mr. FOSTER. I know, but that is the basis of it. That being the case, the invoice value does not show us the cost that importers have to pay. They have to bring these goods from the place of origin to the port of entry into Canada and you have to add to all the imports that come into this country the freight charges and insurance from the place they are bought until they land in the port of entry. That will wipe off a good deal of the profits we get from our exports, but that has to be borne in mind with reference to our imports. And how much is that? Australia has in her tariff an enactment that a level charge of 10 per cent will be made for charges, insurance and freight, and added to the invoice for custom purposes. I have not taken that here; I do not know whether that is too much or too little.

But if you take only 7 per cent—and I imagine that it will take 7 per cent to carry them—then on the four years' importation of $1,124,000,000 from which that adverse balance comes you get $78,000,000 which has to be added to the price of those imports as the cost to the importer who takes them out in entry here. How are we to meet that? We are to meet it by the profits on our exports. In that period our exports were $901,000,000. What will a business man on the other side give me as the probable average profit on our exports?

I suppose it is almost impossible to get the figures, but here are some facts. In the first place, all exports are not profitable. Your lumberman sometimes makes a bad loss; your cheese buyer sometimes makes a bad loss; your apple buyer sometimes makes a bad loss. Every large dealer in this country has to make his losses as well as his profits; and I imagine that when profits and losses are tallied up together, if he makes 10 per cent net profit on all that he exports, he is doing a pretty good business. If Canada did the whole business of this country through one man I think he would be content to make 10 per cent profit upon it, and I doubt whether the export business of this country makes that. The profits pay for the adverse balance of trade? Take a profit of 10 per cent on $901,000,000 and what does it come to? $90,000,000. But your adverse balance of trade was $223,000,000. Your profits are all swallowed up, and you have still an adverse balance of trade of $130,000,000. Your profits evidently will not pay it. But here is another point in the profit business. A great many people in the old country have their agents in Canada who buy large quantities of Canadian goods. They sell them in Great Britain, and they make the profits, not the Canadian producer. How much of that is done I do not know, but a great deal of it is done, so business men have told me. There are a great many of these British agents in this country. Another source consists of carrying profits. How does Canada stand with reference to that? Great Britain carries from 70 to 80 per cent of the whole trade of the world. That is where she makes her invisible exports—where she gets in money as a return, and helps to tidy up the balance of trade against her. To what extent is Canada a carrying power? How many Canadian vessels cross the Atlantic, and how much of the capital in these vessels is Canadian capital? Study the facts from the best sources you have, and you will find that the bulk of the capital in these vessels is British or foreign capital, and the bulk of the profits earned by them go to the capitalists who furnish the money. So that where we do a carrying trade, our own men do not get the return to a very great extent.

These are some of the thoughts which have been running through my mind in reference to this matter. Let us come to what are called the invisible exports—instruments of credit, Canadian lendings, stock, bonds and debentures. Is that a large item in Canada? It has been very small. The amount of lending we do in foreign countries is very little. We are a borrowing country, not a lending country. The amount of money we invest in foreign stocks is very small. These investments do not pay sufficiently to induce us to put our money into them, if we had the money to put in; so that we are not investors abroad in stocks, debentures, instruments of creidt, &c., from which dividends and interest might flow invisibly towards this country, helping to set off our adverse balance of trade. Take the scenic and travelling attractions. Some hon. gentlemen may think that is worth laughing at; but it is a most important element in modern adjustments of balance of trade. I have not exact figures, but I have gone pretty thoroughly into them, so far as one can get them, and it simply astonishes one to see what an immense amount of money from America is spent in France in Germany and its woodland mountain regions, in Switzerland and in Italy. Millions on millions of dollars every year from the earnings of the people on this American continent are spent in paying for scenery and attractions in European countries. This is as valuable and real an export for Switzerland as though she had sent out so many dollars' worth of cheese and got in so many dollars in return. The travel from France, from Great Britain and from Germany in the little country of Switzerland and the summer country of Italy is a most important factor in rectifying the balances of trade and adding to the prosperity of those countries. What have we in Canada? Great scenery, but very moderately exported at the present time. I take it that Canadians spend more money in travel abroad than people from abroad spend in travelling in Canada up to this time. Some time we hope it will be different. Some time we hope that people from abroad may know what a magnificent country for scenery and sport and travel we have, and may spend their millions here. But to-day, I think I am right in saying, the balance is against us in that respect. London has up to the present time made a rectification of the balance of trade against her by her brokerage commission and transit business. London has been the mart of the world. At one time mercantile transactions absolutely centered in London, and they do to a large extent yet. Millions of pounds have been made in Great Britain in that branch of industry. To-day this is being distributed among other financial centres, and England is not making to-day out of her commission and transit business what she used to make. With Canada that business is almost a negligible quantity. In the last analysis we get borrowings from abroad. When driven from every other resource, hon. gentlemen will say, but we are bringing money from the old country. The Finance Minister has not been doing that lately. He has been taking it out of the earnings of the people of Canada to the extent this current year of $73,000,000 in taxes alone.

He has not been getting that money for capital expenditures in the old country. He told us yesterday he had spent $129,000,000 out of our taxation for capital expenditure in this country. He got that out of the

yearly earnings of the people and did not bring it from abroad. He was afraid to go abroad during the troublesome times we have passed through; and only by working in a little from Paris and London at a very high rate of interest has he been able to keep himself afloat at all. But the Canadian Pacific Railway have been bringing in capital and the Grand Trunk Pacific and the other corporations. If they had not, the government, having collected all it could and spent all it could, would not have been a factor in keeping up the credit of this country. It was not due to any action of the government but to the importation of capital from abroad by the corporations that we managed to pass safely through the late crisis.

Let me say a word regarding borrowing. Two things follow on the heels of the borrower. In the first place, the moment the money comes in, the interest begins; and in the second place, the debt remains and ultimately has to be paid. So far as you invest your borrowings in unproductive works there is no return to enable you to meet the interest and still the interest has to be met. Of course you have the use of these unproductive works; you have the beauty of them. But what would you think of this proposition? Suppose we were to borrow about $20,000,000 from some great financial firm in London and spend that money beautifying our parks, building a Grand Trunk Pacific hotel for that company, constructing armouries and other public buildings and improving our wharfs and harbours, and then when your lender asks you for his interest, you simply say to him: Look on those beautiful buildings; gaze on them as you please; satiate yourself with the beauties of these parks, and pay yourself in that way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is exporting scenery.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but it is paying mighty dear for it. Where will you find any one who will buy it from you at that rate? You may be soft enough to take that kind of a bargain but you will find no one else who will do it. Let us now consider the other side of the question. We must remember that Canada is a borrowing and not a lending country, and that on the capital she borrows, she has to keep continually repaying interest and instalments on the principal. Where does that borrowed capital go? Some of it into very useful and necessary work, which may not give a direct return, but which will ultimately prove profitable. But a good deal is put into works which will not give any returns for a long time to come. And while the interest runs on, the capital has to be paid some time or other. What information do we get from our government statistics in this matter? We have statistics in the Customs Department and in the Trade and Commerce Department and we have an independent statistical branch, and what do you find in every one of them? Chiefly duplication and multiplication. Take the large volume of Trade and Commerce and it gives you almost exactly what you find in the trade and navigation reports, only in a little different shape. Then you have your statistical yearbook which is simply a culling, and a very indifferent and unsatisfactory culling, of the figures from the different departmental reports. Would not my right hon. friend be doing something really valuable if he would organize a statistical branch whose duty it would be, in the first place, to take hold of that great question, which every statesman ought to be informed about, namely, the amounts and the currents of home trade. We spend hours talking about the infinitesimal portion of our trade which is shown in the exports and the imports whilst that trade is overtopped a hundred times and more by the immense and diversified home trade of our country. How much do we know about that? The United States has a most elaborate system of statistics. It knows its home trade and is able to put before its publicists statements which cannot be got elsewhere. Take the indebtedness of this country abroad, its investments abroad, and the different kinds of foreign investments in this country. I hope that some time some government will shake off its lethargy in this matter and give us an adequate statistical department. We need that in Canada more than anything else. I have to sweat almost drops of blood in trying to get scraps of information. I write to Montreal to the biggest business men and strongest brokers there and I say: Please give me the amount of capital which Great Britain has invested in industries in your city. And I have been constantly met with this reply: There is nothing we know that will give that information; here is a scrap to which you are welcome. But what is a scrap, compared with the immense amount of information we have not got?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. How long would you talk if you got it?

Mr. FOSTER. That interruption is cheap enough and one I never heard coming from a statesman. And I beg leave to say it has not been made by a statesman now. Take the Canadian Pacific Railway, which in the course of this year will have paid out more than $20,000,000 in dividends and interest. To whom is that paid? The Canadian Pacific Railway is our own pet organization. We look up to it as a wonder and we are proud of it as a national asset. How much of that $20,000,000 remains in Canada? How much of the stock of that company is owned in Canada and how much abroad? How many

of its bonds are owned in Canada and how many abroad ? I do not know its business, but I venture to say that seventy-five per cent and more of its capital stock is owned outside of Canada, and seventy-five per cent to eighty per cent of all its profits are disbursed to people outside of Canada. There are our own borrowings for which the minister has to send out to London, in one shape or other, $8,000,000 a year to pay interest on the debt we owe there. Our exports must pay this, though that does not appear in the trade returns. Then, take the provinces—how much do they owe in Great Britain ? Take the municipal corporations, take the mining and industrial companies—how much of our exports has to go to meet the demands of the investors in these securities ? Though it does not appear in the trade returns, as I have said, yet it is sure that this must be paid, and the only way it can be paid is out of our exports. As I have said, I cannot give more solid ground for my argument because of the lack of statistical information. But let me point out how we are to deal with this rapid, this galloping increase in our unfavourable balance of trade. It seems to me there are only four ways by which it can be met. We must import less into this country. In order to import less while keeping up the business activity and development of the country, we must produce more of our own products. If, instead of importing $100,000,000 of products which can be made in Canada either out of Canadian material or out of material partly or wholly imported, we produce these goods in Canada that would mean $100,000,000 less of imports and a diminution of the adverse balance of trade. Then we must make greater exports. And larger exports come from larger populations. If there are 100,000 farmers busily engaged in producing things for the market, and you can add 100,000 more farmers, you will produce twice as much and perhaps more than twice as much. You will never find a country that is a great exporter of home products that is not a great consumer of home products. Then, we must have greater economy in expenditure. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) used to think about that; he thinks nothing about it now. No matter what the industrial weather portents may be ; whether there is only a cloud as large as a man's hand or whether the whole sky is obscured, he seems to think of nothing but adding a little more to the construction of this or that work, listening with ready ear to supporter or lieutenant, and to party supporter as well, and holding out promises which afterwards come to fulfilment. That is a course which the right hon. gentleman started out to avoid, but to which he seems to have abandoned himself. And the same is true of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). The Finance Minister of any country must be a self-denying man. It is impossible for him to do his duty to the country on any other basis. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) threw away the key of the position when he launched into extraordinary expenditures in his own county and his own province. He gave it to his supporters to say : You do not deny yourself anything, why should you deny us ? There is the history of it. Instead of having a check upon every spending department, the hon. gentleman seems to have had no influence at all—even if he ever tried to hold any of the departments in check. If the present vast expenditure exists in spite of a check put upon the outgo by the Minister of Finance, the demands made must have passed imagination. Once more, I say, Canada must improve her balance, for that balance must be met either in goods or gold, and this trend of the last five years ought to set us seriously seeking how this condition of things is to be remedied.

But hon. gentlemen opposite meet all this by saying : Oh, well, this is a government that does things. That is the word that is thrown from tongue to tongue—'our government is a government that does things'. It does things—with a vengeance. Look at your own county, Mr. Speaker (Mr. Marcil), if you do not believe it. Take your own pronunciamento to your constituents in the general election which took place not long ago ; look over the arithmetic then deployed in most ingenious and convincing manner before the people, and see whether or not what I have said is true. And what is true in your case, Mr. Speaker, is true of every one who has sufficient pull.

Let us take just a few examples of what this government has done and see whether these things reflect great credit upon it or not. The first that comes to my mind is the old attempted Yukon Railway deal. This was unconstitutional from the very start. Parliament was about to meet, and the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his ministers were to face the representatives of the people. But, just before parliament met, the government made a contract with certain parties, made it behind closed doors, without tenders and without publicity, for the construction of a railway from the Stikine river to Teslin lake, a distance of 150 miles, for 25,000 acres of land per mile to be selected by the builders almost without restriction from the gold area of that country. This meant a total of 3,750,000 acres of land, to be given on one quarter the regular royalty. And not only was this bargain made just as parliament was about to meet, but the contractors got their orders to go ahead with the construction. Then the government came before parliament and because of the opposition in this and the other House they were saved from this mad scheme.

But what happened afterward? Why, $294,000, or thereabouts, of the people's money had to be paid out for this useless attempt. Was that good statesmanship on the part of the Finance Minister? Would it not have been better for him to wait not only until he knew that it was a good scheme, but until parliament had authorized it, before he allowed the work to go on in a fashion to incur this enormous sum of damages. For, though, shortly afterwards, the government got a majority in the Red Chamber, as they have it here, they have never made the semblance of a move to put through what they had talked about so much as a 'national necessity'.

There was the Crow's Nest Pass business. The Liberal-Conservatives were about to have the Crow's Nest Pass Railway built for a loan of $20,000 a mile to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that would amount to $6,600,000, secured by a lien on all their property and for a subsidy of $5,000 per mile, which would have been $1,650,000. The Canadian Pacific Railway was to pay 3½ per cent, we got money then for less, and would have made on that loan during its pendancy at least ½ per cent on the investment, and the security was as good as the Bank of England, to quote a familiar phrase. They didn't choose to do things that way. They went to work and gave a subsidy of $11,000 a mile equal to $3,630,000, which was an absolute loss to this country of $2,000,000. What did they get for themselves and the people? They got a promise that rates would be lowered at two distinct times, rates which would have been lowered if there had been no undertaking at all, and were actually lowered many months before the agreement called for it, and are to-day lower. But they made money for somebody else. Their well known friends and strong financial supporters got hold of a charter with 3,500,000 acres of coal lands attached to it, sold out the charter, as I am informed, for a tidy sum of money to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, gave the Canadian Pacific Railway 250,000 acres of those coal lands or thereabouts, and saved all the rest of the coal lands for themselves, which they valued on the first report, then just beginning to be developed, at a very large sum of money. I have not the prospectus here, but I think it was estimated by them as worth, according to their first statement, about $13,000,000 as an asset. Though Liberal members in this House rose and protested, Mr. McInnes especially, and I think the present Minister of the Interior, strong then in his sturdy independence; they were bowled down and thrown out by the 'Globe' and by the interests it represented, and it passed through this House and became an accomplished fact. What has British Columbia lost as a result of the haste and of the lack of prudence in making the subsidy? My right hon. friend was asked to disallow that Bill. Sometimes he is very keen on disallowance, he was not keen on disallowance then, his friends did not want disallowance, and that is where the matter stands to-day. But that aside, $2,000,000 were lost to this country, and all that the government has is 50,000 acres of coal lands which they have not developed, and which I suppose they never will develop. Well, that is one thing they have done which I think it would have been better if they had not done in that way.

There was another thing they did in the purchase of the Drummond County Railway —$64,000 a year for 99 years, present worth of that, as calculated by the Finance Minister, $2,094,192, a great profit to the sellers, as was shown by the amount they had paid for depreciated stock and the large amount for which they sold it. That was done by this government. They came to this House, and Her Majesty's loyal opposition opposed the scheme, fought it tooth and nail. It went to the Senate and it was opposed. Mr. Blair, the Minister of Railways, came back the next year with a modified bargain by which this country saved, between it and the former Grand Trunk arrangement, over $750,000. That sum would have been an absolute loss if these gentlemen had carried out their first scheme, which the strength of the opposition in this House and in the Senate prevented them from carrying out.

Next, there is an old property called the Intercolonial. These gentlemen have had charge of that since they came into power, and what have they done with it? First let me premise this fact. On every other point they are very strong. They say: See the good times we have had since we came into power. But when we talk about the Intercolonial, they do not press that argument. What is the fact? They have had charge of the Intercolonial during the ten most prosperous years in the history of Canada. They have had charge of it when your Canadian Pacific Railway has shown its immense progress, your Grand Trunk has made its great appreciation, when every great road in the United States has had its period of prosperity and of large and paying dividends. Yet what have you in this Dominion railway during that period of prosperity? These gentlemen have managed the road in such a way that it has come out with an absolute deficit, despite the fact that they charge to capital what we formerly charged to revenue, despite the fact that they have used eight times as much money in capital upon that road during the period they have had it over an equal period when we had charge of it. With all that favourable area, favouring traffic, prosperous times, increased passenger travel and everything of that kind, and all the multiplied improvements in trade they are for ever talking about, still they have come out with a deficit. Let me point you to the record:

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY DEFICITS.

| Years. | Minister. | Net Deficits. | Average Yearly Deficit. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | $ | $ |
| 1893–1896 (4 years) | Haggart (Con.). .... | 25,354 | 6,438 |
| 1896–7... | Blair (Lib.)..... . | 59,940 | 59,940 |
| 1898–1903 (6 years) | " ..... | 350,000 | 58,040 |
| 1903–4... | Blair and Emmerson (Lib.) | 900,751 | 900,751 |
| 1904–5... | Emmerson (Lib.).... | 1,725,303 | 1,725,303 |
| 1905–6... | " ..... | *61,951 | *61,915 |
| 1906–7... | " ..... | *218,139 | *218,139 |

*Surplus.

You see there that in 1903-4 Mr. Blair and Mr. Emmerson had a deficit of $900,751, though it was one of the most promising and prosperous years in the history of Canada. It was a promising year because it was an election year, and that may account somewhat for the deficit. In 1904-5 it was in charge of Mr. Emmerson, the Napoleon of the Intercolonial and of railway management, slated, it is said, for the Railway Commission. He had it all to himself, and he rolled up a deficit of $1,725,303. Then followed two years of apparent small surpluses. Now, I challenge these hon. gentlemen to name the appropriate committee and to go into an examination of the way the accounts have been kept under the Liberal-Conservatives and under this government in reference to charges to revenue and capital accounts, and they will find that these surpluses that they claim are surpluses they have obtained by changing the methods of keeping accounts. In the last four years of the Conservative administration the net deficit was $25,354; in the last four years of Liberal administration the net deficit was $2,755,940. In the ten years preceding 1897 the Conservatives earned, in the gross, $29,500,000, they had a deficit of $3,000,000, and spent only $3,815,266 on capital account.

In the ten years succeeding 1897 the Liberals earned $52,000,000, they had a net deficit of $2,974,000 and they also spent on capital account $23,269,000. This is the government that does things. This is what it did with the Intercolonial Railway. Why? The right hon. Prime Minister told the reason why. He told the people of Toronto in 1904 what the reason was. In combatting the proposal to place the Intercolonial Railway under a commission his argument was this: Mr. Haggart had charge of it and Mr. Blair had charge of it and both of them were competent men; it is not the fault in either case of the man who had charge of it; the fault is to be found in the vicious system which had been carried on in reference to the Intercolonial Railway. Yet, he sat all these years and he sits there to-day and the same vicious system is kept in operation and with the same damaging effect.

Then, there was the Grand Trunk Pacific. I have spoken a little in reference to it and I do not care to take up very much time, but let me say this that I think this House deserved a little more of the explanations of the Finance Minister in reference to that great work with its increasing obligations than he gave us. What were we told? The Prime Minister, I do not think, will deny what I was going to say, but it is better to quote 'Hansard' and then you have it exactly. He spoke during the debate of 1903 on the Grand Trunk Pacific. I have read that speech through and I have notes of it here. I have collated every financial argument in it and the only thing I can get to tie to is this one statement:

> The sum total of the money paid by the government for the construction of the line of railway from Moncton to the Pacific ocean will be in the neighbourhood of $12,000,000 or $13,000,000. Now, Sir, what is $12,000,000 in the year 1903? It is about the surplus of our revenue over our expenditure. The surplus of this year will pay for the construction of this road.

That was an absolutely explicit and unqualified statement. Any one else may go to work and give an explanation out of his imagination, but the man in the country who had that quoted to him took no other idea than that they were making such a favourable bargain with this company that we would get out of it with an expenditure of simply $13,000,000 for construction account—one year's surplus. That was the argument used and that was the argument which told. He made another calculation. He declared, against the argument that they were going to compete with the Intercolonial Railway, that this was to shorten the route by from 120 to 140 miles. Here are his words:

> We have to follow the line of the state of Maine, and following that line, we believe we can abridge the distance between Moncton and Lévis by from 120 miles to 140 miles.

What was the next calculation?—$13,000 a mile for the prairie section. Mr. Schreiber came back from the west a few months ago and the first statement he made was that this road was going to cost from $24,000 to $26,000 a mile. What was the cost as stated between Moncton and Winnipeg?—somewhere about $28,000 a mile. The opposition declared at that time that it would be $40,000 but $28,000 was their contention. What has happened? This has happened in reference to both of those sections: On the eastern section west of Winnipeg, 245 miles have been let and it figures out at a cost of $54,000 per mile, and west from Quebec, 150 miles at $35,310 per mile. Between Winnipeg and Moncton 862 are under contract according to the last answer given

in the other House to Senator Ferguson. It figures out at $45,000 per mile and that does not take in the terminals, the rolling stock, the stations, the sidings, the right of way or the general expenses. At that rate the eastern line will cost altogether $84,000,000 for an incompleted road with very much still to be done to it for the carrying on of the business of the road. Add to that $84,000,000 the interest for five or six years during which it will be under construction. Interest at what percentage ?—what you are paying for money now; that is 3½, 4 and 4½ per cent and you may have to pay that right along for some time. You will have to pay interest for eight or nine years, and that means at least $12,000,000. Then it is to be handed over to the Grand Trunk Pacific and the country has to bear the interest burden for an additional term of years and then, if everything works out as you expect, you will get three per cent upon your investment. The total cost will not fall short of $120,000,000. It has been gone into, the people have approved of it, the country must now stand under it and see it through as the country proposes to do. The government did it but there was a very different thing and a better thing that they might have done. The Prime Minister had the offer of the Grand Trunk Pacific in his pocket and he did not bring it down to parliament for nearly a year and a half. That offer was to absolutely build from the great lakes west at a moderate subsidy of about $15,000,000 and enter into an argreement with the government to hand over all their eastern freight to the Intercolonial Railway in the city of Montreal. But, the government did it.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many miles did they save between Moncton and Quebec ?

Mr. FOSTER. If there is any saving between Moncton and Quebec it may be five or six miles. I think that is the maximum of the saving.

Now, Sir, I have not time to mention certain other things and I come to one simple point.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. FOSTER. I had intended to mention another thing that the government has done. It has created an absolute paradise for middlemen. You cannot turn a corner without running into one. You cannot analyse a public transaction without finding one. You cannot take up any large business that the government is carrying on but you have got the middleman either as an individual or company or corporation. Let me give you some examples. The minister is the trustee of the funds of this country. We remember that when the Kentville property had to be bought a boon companion and supporter of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) got a happy inspiration as to the exact area and place in which it was. Another companion of the minister, having also got an inspiration, got busy, bought some land, sold it at an advance of $1,500 to the first one whom I have mentioned and the first one unloaded it on the minister. The price he asked was how much ? He paid $7,000 for it and the modest price he asked was $23,684. He did not expend a cent on it ; I doubt if he put up a dollar on it ; I think if it were looked into it would be found that notes carried the thing in the meantime. He had the audacity, presuming on the good nature of the Minister of Militia and Defence, to ask $23,684. The department offered him—knowing that he had bought it at $6—$20 an acre. That ought to have been pretty good. It never should have been paid. The minister should have had that land for the cost price paid for it to the original sellers and a fair commission for the purchase. That is the proper method to pursue. But this gentleman asked him $23,684 and it was sent to a referee kind hearted to the party, and before that referee, the party and the sellers arranged their own matters, and that referee allowed them, how much do you think ? He allowed them $38,408.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It was not referred to a referee ; it was referred to the judge of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, suppose I say that the next step was that the judge referred it to a referee. Who recommended the referee to him ; who recommended the lawyer that did not prosecute the case for the government, and that lawyer a mere boy, compared with the able men employed by Dodge ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is a base insinuation against a judge of high standing who has now passed away and is not here to defend himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Who ever recommended the referee—I tell you it was either the minister or the government that put McIlreith to condition their case.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It was not.

Mr. FOSTER. McIlreith was your own agent there.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. McIlreith was not the man employed by the judge.

Mr. FOSTER. McIlreith was not the man employed by the judge—who said he was ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. You are talking about the referee.

Mr. FOSTER. I am talking about the referee and I am talking about the lawyer who did not carry out the case properly before the referee.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not at all. The hon. gentleman said the referee had been appointed and recommended by the government or by me. I say that the re-

feree was appointed by the judge, and the hon. gentleman has no right to make insinuations of that kind against the character of one of the best judges we ever had in this country and who has now passed away.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying two things: first, that I spoke about the referee; then, I spoke about the lawyer.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, you got into the wrong box when you spoke about the referee.

Mr. FOSTER. I said with reference to the referee that he was a man who had a soft side towards the party. Will the minister deny it?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Had the judge a soft side?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I do not think so.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. But a judge and every one else likes to know pretty well what is the mind of the government and the party——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not a bit of hesitation in saying, that. Well, Sir, the referee with this stripling lawyer who did not defend the government case awarded $38,000. But the opposition got busy and it was brought before this House and some of the colleagues of the Minister of Militia got busy and it was sent then to the courts to fight it out, and in the end—

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It was appealed before the hon. gentleman ever mentioned it in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The case was appealed from the first judgment before the hon. gentleman ever mentioned it in the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I doubt that very much.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I know.

Mr. FOSTER. I doubt that very much, but I will look into that. I think my memory is nearly as good as that of my hon. friend, but if I am wrong I will fix that part of it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. All right.

Mr. FOSTER. And in the end he got $12,462 or $20 an acre for land that he only paid $6.60 an acre for or thereabouts.

Well, Sir, there is Mr. Pearson and the Minister of Finance knows Mr. Pearson. Where was the Minister of Finance, where was he, the guardian of the treasury, when the Intercolonial wanted some land. When the Intercolonial wanted some land from Mr. Pearson of Halifax; when two warnings had been given to the Minister of Finance in the Lodge cases in Moncton previously; when the inspiration got down to Mr. Pearson in some wonderful way as to the very tract and quantity of land that was required by the Intercolonial, and under cover of a Conservative he carried through a deal and he bought for $18,588 what he turned over within three months to the government for $45,400; and he himself pocketed a cheque for $14,600 odd dollars. What explanation is there from the Finance Minister after the warnings he got. What explanation is there in the first place that the Minister of Railways should do a thing of that kind, and in the second place that the Minister of Finance could not have had some check with reference to it. In the third place, after it was brought up, from that day to this we have not heard the Minister of Finance apologize for that transaction yet. And yet there was $28,392 of the people's money that went to the middlemen of whom Mr. Pearson, a very strong supporter of the government, was one. Then there was the Lodge transaction in Moncton. The Intercolonial wanted some land. It got to a companion and friend of the Minister of Railways that such was the case, and he immediately optioned it for $5,075 and within three months he turned it over to the government for $13,000, taking a profit of $8,805 or 170 per cent. Where was the Minister of Finance when that transaction went through? Warned by that, why did he let a second transaction go through in which this same Mr. Lodge got for $8,300 just what the minister wanted and turned it over to the minister for $10,490, making $1,940 on the transaction or 27 per cent; making on these two little transactions $10,445 or 70 per cent of a profit. Am I not right in saying that there has been a paradise formed for the middleman.

Let us take Merwin—picked up on the street, the minister met him on the street, he had no business, he had no financial affiliations of any kind, he had no manufacturing processes at all, and yet before a year was out $404,000 had been paid to Merwin without a tender or a contract or anything of the kind.

Mr. BERGERON. And an American citizen.

Mr. FOSTER. After a great deal of trouble and a great deal of fighting in the Public Accounts Committee we found fifteen articles which he sold to the government for $18,000 and which he simply ordered for $11,838 and told the men from whom he ordered them simply to send them to the government, and on that purchase of $11,000 he made $6,173 out of the government, or 52 per cent. And yet $404,000 was paid to that man during that fiscal year, or very nearly that fiscal year, without tender Am I right in saying they formed a para-

dise for middlemen? And Merwin is there yet, and he is supplying the government yet. These articles were certified to the government as at fair and reasonable values and the men who certified them are still in the employ of the government. Not one step has been taken by the Minister of Justice or by any one else to make these men disgorge their ill-gotten gains which were taken out from the public treasury through the laxness or connivance of men who ought to have known enough to have prevented transactions of that kind. And so I might go on step after step. Take the Falconer case, developed partially in the Marine Department and yet to be developed in the Railway Department—$95,000 given to Falconer for expert book-keeping work.

Who is the middleman who does the work? To-day we are trying in the Public-lic Accounts Committee to get to the bottom of it, and we have got this far, that whereas accountants' wages in the city of Montreal, for men infinitely superior in every way to Mr. Falconer, are at the schedule rate of from $20 to $25 a day, he charged $75, $30, $40, $50 or $15 per day, and according to his evidence paid to those he employed a mere moiety of the amount he charged to the department. And so I am right in saying that this has been a paradise for the middleman.

But I leave this point and come to another. There are two duties of a Finance Minister. One is to carefully collect the people's taxes and earnings, and to see that they are honestly and economically expended. The Chancellor of the Exchequer is not simply to look after his own department. He ought also to hold some check over the other departments; it is his duty to do it, and he can do it if he wishes. Maybe the minister does it more than we know, but if so, the effect is not very apparent as the years go by. But the Minister of Finance has another duty, he is the guardian of the public franchises and properties, and it is his duty to see that these are administered for the benefit of the country just as much as the public finances. Now, let us see what has been done with reference to the public franchises and properties. First; there is the Saskatchewan Land Valley sale of 250,000 acres of land stretching along a running line of railway for 115 miles, after a government report that it was good land, when other land not as good or certainly no better was selling for $5 per acre—sold to this favoured company for $1 per acre, one-half payable in scrip. To make a long story short, these gentlemen sold those lands for about $2,000,000, paid the government $250,000 in scrip and cash, and pocketed $1,750,000 gain on the transaction. Contrast that with Mr. Whitney's conservation of the public franchises in Cobalt. Under Cobalt Lake lay what was supposed to be good mineral ground. Previously there had been a mere parcelling out of mineral lands for very small fees. Mr. Whitney said: This belongs to the people; if there be value there, I will put it up to public tender, he did so, and in three months he received and put into the public treasury $1,087,000 for the mineral rights under Cobalt lake. Whether it be with timber leases, grazing leases or coal lands you will find the same thing has been going on. More than that, wherever you scratch a company you will find a member of parliament behind it. You have the Imperial Pulp Company dealing with the government with fictitious names, and when the bubble is burst, who is inside the globule? Theodore Burrows, M.P., who sits behind hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Let me ask my hon. friend one question. Does he not know that that company was formed before Mr. Burrows became a member of parliament?

Mr. FOSTER. There are lots of things we do not know. We do not know much more about that than we do about the North Atlantic Trading Company, to which the Minister of Finance paid out about $400,000 of the country's money. To this day we do not know, if he does, who that company is, but we all know the little service we got from it.

But it seems that this government is not content with giving away agricultural lands, timber leases, grazing leases, coal lands and other mineral lands, but it has now put a blanket, exclusive right on the largest and best fishing areas in the great Northwest. I hold in my hand a statement with reference to these. Coffee & Merritt have an area comprising Cumberland lake, 166 square miles; Cedar lake, 285 square miles; Namew lake, 66 square miles; Moore lake, 552 square miles; Antikang lake, 90 miles, and Cormorant lake, 141 square miles. They get the exclusive fishing rights for all this vast area for the magnificent sum of $300 a year. F. W. Markey has Nelson river and tributaries from West river to its mouth on Hudson bay, Nelson river, 100 miles by 3 miles; Hays and Pigeon rivers in Keewatin, two large tidal rivers entering Hudson bay, and Great Slave lake, with an area of 10,719 square miles; all for 21 years, absolutely exclusive, and for the magnificent sum of $10 a year. J. K. McKenzie gets Lake Athabasca with an area of 2,842 square miles, and Lesser Slake lake, with an area of 480 square miles, gets the exclusive right of fishing in these lakes for five years for the magnificent sum of $10 per year. With reference to that I have a copy of a paper from Edmonton which goes over these leases and says this:

We are informed that the people who control the 3,322 square miles of fishing rights on

the Athabasca and Lesser Slave lakes, and for which they paid the pittance of the sum of $10, disposed of their rights for about a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. Archibald McNee, a newspaper man has James bay from North Bluff to Moor's island, 100 miles of shore line three miles out, including all tidal rivers entering James bay, and gets the exclusive fishing right for sixteen years for the magnificent sum of $10 a year. The Capital City Canning Company gets net fishing for salmon in tidal waters of Cowichan river and bay, inside a line from Serpentine point to Cowichan head, and gets exclusive fishing rights for nine years for the magnificent sum of $50 a year. These favoured four or five have thus tied up to them for the magnificent sum of $380 a year nine fishing lakes, with an area of 15,000 square miles, hundreds of miles of seacoast extending out three miles from the shore, thousands of miles of rivers, and some 2,000 miles of lake coast—in fact, have bagged the main fishing resources of the great northern country for their exclusive use or sale.

In closing up these remarks, I think I may be allowed to give the words of an eminent statesman, who has had a long and varied career in this country, Sir Richard Cartwright, taking the liberty to substitute a few words here and add a few words there, and address them to the Finance Minister as follows :—

So long as the till is full, that is all the hon. gentleman (the Finance Minister) feels bound to regard. It is no concern of his, it is no concern of his colleagues, it is no concern of his colleagues' paymasters and bottle holders, how the mass of the people fare. This policy of excessive taxation and expenditure,

——of graft and timber limits——

I grant you suits certain interested parties and suits them well. These persons control the government of Canada, these sustain the government of Canada; the thing is a fair equation, as the hon. gentleman would say; the government gives these interested parties the power to plunder the people, and in return they are always ready—and why should they not be?—to tithe the plunder for the purpose of keeping the hon. gentleman and his friends in power. And so, Sir, with cash in hand, plus graft and gerrymander Acts, plus Franchise Acts.

——plus public lands——

railway subsidies, harbour works and all that depends thereon, everything goes merrily as a marriage bell, in the hon. gentleman's opinion. And to quote Mr. Lowell:

"Each sturdy protectionist (New Liberal) gets what he axes,
And the people, their annual soft sawder and taxes.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

Mr. FOSTER.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Mr. Speaker, before considering the statements made and arguments used by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) who, for the last two days—with a day intervening—has been addressing the House, I desire to express some thoughts that have passed through my mind with reference to the length of the hon. gentleman's speech, and which I think it would not be improper at this time to mention. Suppose that we had a session of this House lasting, in leap year, for 366 days, and if the House sat on every one of those days except the 52 Sundays, and worked from three until six and from eight until twelve every day, that would be seven hours' work a day. One hour of that time, on the average, would necessarily, be taken up with routine business, such as reading and receiving petitions, asking and answering questions, reading reports of committees, and so on. In a session of that kind, there would be an average of nine hours of the time of the House for each member. Of course, all members of the House are on an equal footing, each with his perfect right to his full share of the time. We know that it would be inconvenient to have a session lasting the whole year, or to have a session when the House would work every day. If you were to have a six month's session—and that seems to be pretty long—during which, the House sat every day except Sunday, there would be, on the average, something less than 4½ hours of the time for each member. But if you had a six months' session, with the House sitting, as we do now, five days in the week and working for the hours I have mentioned, this, with committee work in the morning, I think would be regarded by the country as giving full value. In such a session, the time for the members on the average would be three hours and forty minutes. I do not think I am at all uncharitable then, when I say that the hon member (Mr. Foster) who last spoke would have recognized only what is due to the House had he endeavoured to curtail his remarks more than he did. The hon. gentleman spoke five hours and twenty minutes on this subject, thus using up in this one speech almost the whole time of two members for the session. I am not going to deny that it is possible there are gentlemen on the other side who might be willing to give their time, or a portion of their time, to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) considering the position he occupies in this House. That is a courtesy that is often extended by one member to another where there is a limit set to the length of speeches. It is quite possible that some hon. members opposite might be willing to yield a share of their time. But we

must remember that it is not only during the last two days of this discussion that the hon. gentleman has been on his feet. I have not gone into it carefully, but I should think that at least the time of six members of the opposition has been occupied by that hon. gentleman. I do not know who the six may be. I trust that the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is not one of them. For we on this side think that the leader of the opposition has ideas as good as those of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster); and we think it is a little more pleasant to listen to him than it is to listen to the hon. member for North Toronto. The hon. leader of the opposition has not the inveterate habit of our friend from North Toronto of speaking for the sake of speaking, repeating and repeating, and repeating until the repetition becomes tiresome to members on this side of the House—I think I detected signs of weariness on the countenances of some hon. gentlemen opposite. And I do trust that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) may not have given his time to the hon. member for North Toronto. For it is very evident concerning my hon. friend from East Grey that thoughts within him burn at times and seek expression in words—and he is generally kind in gratifying those thoughts with words for their expression. We do not want the hon. gentleman's time curtailed. And I hope that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) has not given up any of his time. We should like that hon. gentleman to throw the limelight on the canvas, and give us a picture of the timber limits of the northwest. And our friends from Prince Edward Island too —I do not know that they have not a perfect right to tunnel in and take a part in debate. What conception, then, has this hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) of his importance and standing in this House when he coolly uses that time, if it is not courteously given him—of course, if the time has been given him, by members on that side, I humbly bow to their will. But if they have given the time, I hope they will not try to recoup themselves by taking from the time of hon. members on this side. I have noticed in the debates in this House, especially when we are in Committee of Supply, that hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to resent it if any member on this side ventured to make a remark or even ask a question. I beg to remind such hon. members—if such there be, and I think there are—that every member on this side has just the same right, the same duty is incumbent upon him, to have a thorough understanding of the estimates and of the votes he is called upon to give as hon. gentlemen opposite; and, when he seeks information, he ought to have it. The reason why they do not take up more time in this part of their parliamentary work is because, having asked a question, and received a full answer, they are satisfied, and do not repeat, and repeat, and repeat the same question only to receive the same answer. Now, this question of the occupation of the House, I think, is worthy of consideration.

But let me go on now to glance at some of the statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). He led off by saying that he would take as his text a quotation from a speech made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) which he read. It seemed to me a text that took him an awfully long time to explain, for he was working at it for over an hour, and, when he got through, the text stood in all its strength just the same as before. The Minister of Agriculture gave that hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) several nuts to crack, and the hon. gentleman does not seem to have made much of a success of the cracking. I suppose he has been pondering over that speech ever since he was down at Stanstead. No doubt he wrestled with it there and he wrestled with it here for an hour or more, and with what result?

Why, simply that when this government came into power it applied business methods to the administration of its affairs, and times mended and have gone on mending ever since. That is a patent truth to every man, and to explain that away cannot be done in an hour, if there is any excuse for the five hours' speech of the hon. gentleman trying to do the impossible task that he set himself to do. Now, I do not often read extracts or make campaign speeches in the House, but I will give you one gem of the hon. member for North Toronto—who, by the by, would, I think, have been as courteous to me as I was to him, if he had not wearied himself quite so much, and would have been present to hear me after addressing so many of his remarks to myself. But when I am quoting what he has said at a meeting, I would rather he were here so that if there is any mistake about it he could put me right. This was at a meeting at Mimico. I was not at the meeting, but I arrived there within a night or two, and I took up the 'Mail and Empire,' which, of course, might not be an authority on all matters, but would be accepted as an authority by the gentlemen who spoke in the Conservative interest on that occasion. Here was the gem of the speech that struck me:

> The people of the country had seen the exposures made against the Laurier government, the reckless and extravagant expenditure with which they had afflicted the country, and as was shown by the recent by-elections, the people were tired of such administration, and were everywhere sending Conservatives to parliament to support Mr. Borden and his friends, and to eradicate the evils that had been brought on by the Laurier administration.

Well, there have been thirty-nine of those by-elections, and thirty Liberals were re-

turned and nine Conservatives. Now, here is the dilemma we are in. If the hon. member for North Toronto spoke the truth—and we are not at liberty to impugn his statement—we have this other difficulty staring us in the face, that in this House are thirty Liberal members that were sent here as Conservatives to turn out Laurier and put in Borden, and they don't seem to know it. Now, which horn of the dilemma shall we take? Are those men in a right position now in supporting the government? If they are, how will they characterize the statement of the hon. member for North Toronto? Of course, I am not at liberty to doubt him, because if he said it was so, Mr. Speaker, we have to accept his word.

Now, coming down to the argument he made, attempting to explain away that patent truth that he read as his text from the speech of the Minister of Agriculture. He said that we kept in the background the fact that we came in when times were good, and that there had been some years of depression before they went out. Well, if that be true, our Conservative friends came in in a favourable time, for from 1874 to 1878, when the Liberal government were in power, there was a period of depression throughout the whole world which Canada did not escape far more intense than any depression there was during the latter years of the Conservative administration. They came in then when times were mending, when times became good. He says we are not willing to admit the progress that was made under them. I am more than willing to admit all the progress they can justly claim, and I do admit there was some progress, and the more progress than he proves was made under Conservative administration the better it will please me, because I intend to institute a comparison between the record of this government with the high standard obtained by these hon. gentlemen opposite. Progress was made, as shown by the trade of the country, progress was made during their last eleven years, when the foreign trade of this country increased by $50,000,000. Compare then the eleven years of the Laurier administration. Have we not made progress in foreign trade, when during the same length of time in which trade increased $50,000,000 under Conservative rule, it increased $350,000,000 under Liberal rule? These are facts that cannot be denied, and a man may speak five hours and twenty minutes if he likes trying to disprove them, and they still remain facts. During the eighteen years they were in power their progress was $80,000,000 against the $350,000,000 during the eleven years of Liberal rule. How can you account for it? Have we been favoured more than they were with natural resources waiting for development? No, Sir; the wealth was in the ocean, the lakes and the rivers when the Tories were in power; the forest wealth existed then as it does now; the farm lands, rich treasure of a favoured people, were here in all their length and breadth and fertility under Tory as well as under Liberal rule; the mountains and the hills were filled with mineral wealth when the Tories were in power as they are now. Where are the natural advantages we have which they did not have? Things are equal as far as that goes. The hon. gentleman, in one sentence in his speech, I think, gave the only solution that can be given to such a record as this when he said: Providence helps those that help themselves. Under precisely the same advantages enjoyed by Tory and Liberal, if you find seven times the progress under one administration that you do under the other, what is the irresistible conclusion? That the Liberal party have known better how to avail themselves of the bounties of a kind Providence than the Conservatives did.

To glance now at the expenditure, to which he devoted so much time, I will dispose of about thirty or forty minutes of his specious remarks in which he engaged in reading what was said by prominent Liberals about expenditures away back in the years that have gone—happily gone in so far as mis-government is concerned. I dismiss those things and for these reasons; not that I object to have them repeated, not that I object to have them read that the former leader of the opposition, Sir Richard Cartwright, and others had said that they were spending money too fast, that $38,000,000 was too much for them to spend. I do not object to that because that gives you a picture of the country under Tory rule at that time. We said it was too much to expend simply because they were not able to raise revenue enough to pay the ordinary expenses of government and any capital expenditure they made they had to borrow in foreign countries and add to the debt. I do not object to them reading it. It gives to the younger generation an idea of what it was possible to come to under Tory rule. The statement then made was that if the revenue is not to exceed $38,000,000 you must keep beneath that for the country is on the highway to ruin when it cannot pay its ordinary running expenses, using all the taxes that the people pay, and when, for any improvements that have to be made, the money has to be brought from abroad. These were the circumstances under which these statements were made and they were well made. But, I dismiss them, because, where is there a man possessed of an ounce of brains or intelligence who, when that question is brought before him, and weighed and reasoned, will not say: Are the circumstances the same now, are this government able to raise revenue enough for the ordinary running expenses of the government? Yes, raise it and have $16,000,000 or $19,000,000 a year of a surplus. Well, then, any man of ordinary intelligence will say: What is the use of

bringing up questions of that kind? The expenditures by this government have been large.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. 'Hear, hear,' an hon. gentleman says, and if he thinks he taunts me by an expression of that kind I can only tell him I glory in it.

Mr. BENNETT. And the steals too?

Mr. PATERSON. What is that?

Mr. BENNETT. The steals of public money as well.

Mr. PATERSON. I glory in the expenditure——

Mr. BENNETT. And the steals.

Mr. PATERSON—having been large. I have not found any steals yet. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means. Does he mean that they have been giving things away on easy terms to their friends?

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman asks me I will answer his question now.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. He wants to know about the steals?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. I will commend him to the case the other day of the man who was assigned to the duty of locating immigrants in one of the ridings of Kent and who admitted that he had defrauded the government out of $500.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. I will direct the hon. gentleman to another case.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BENNETT. If hon. gentlemen do not want to hear about it——

Mr. PATERSON. I had no objection at all to the hon. gentleman going on. In administering nearly $100,000,000 with a great many officials I am not going to say that there have not been any errors or mistakes made. But, I am going to say that there have been very few that have been even suspected, much less proved in reference to this administration. You do right to call attention to them and it will be our duty to attend to them. I suppose there were things of that kind even with an expenditure of only $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 by our friends opposite. While I glory in the expenditure being large I would not glory in it if we had raised the rate of taxation upon the people in order to get that money to expend. I would not have gloried in that expenditure if we had had to go abroad and borrow that money and add to our debt, but when, during the past ten years, we have carried on improvements and developments in all directions and in every province, when we have expended millions and tens of millions on capital account, when we have enlarged our canals, when we have developed our railway system through the aid of bonuses, when we have deepened our harbours, improved our St. Lawrence channel and cheapened transport in every direction and when we have done all this with a lowered rate of taxation and without borrowing a dollar, I glory in the expenditure. My hon. friend says that the expenditures have been very large. He was seized with a fit of depression as he thought upon them. Maturing loans! Loans that have had to be renewed! Loans, I fancy that were contracted when our friends opposite were in power; some of them at least.

Mr. FIELDING. All of them.

Mr. PATERSON. A fit of depression seemed to have seized him. He seemed to have been afraid; did not know what was to become of the country at all. He spoke of the enormous expenditure, the additions to the debt and all that. What will be the addition to the debt of this country when hon. gentleman opposite carry out the Halifax platform and buy up all the railways? That is something to talk about. What will be the annual expenditure when they are charged with the working of all the railways, telegraphs and telephones? How much will that be a year? Would it come up to about a thousand millions? What are you going to do about it? Are you going to back out of it? We have not heard much about the Halifax platform lately. We have seen them rather trying to get back and say: We will not go on with it. Well, yes; that is all very well. You, Mr. Speaker, I dare say have noticed on the streets of a city a mother going along with her little boy. She wants to go in a certain direction, he does not want to go and he shouts lustily that he won't go, but he is going all the time. His mother has got him by the hand, and I very much fear that William of the 'World' has got these gentlemen by the hand. Bleeding the people white with your taxation, he says. Taking all this money out of them! Marvellous people, the Canadian people! Bled in the direction of taxation, as the hon. gentleman has pictured, and yet they are adding by tens of millions to the deposits in the savings banks and in every home there is increasing comfort. They are a remarkable, strange, fortunate people; bled, borne down under this burden of taxation and I do not know what; yet, all happy, all doing well and adding, adding by the millions and the millions and the tens of millions to the savings in the banks of this country. Let us look at the rate of taxation about which he talked.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Where is it ?

Mr. PATERSON. I wish the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) were here because I would like to say this to his face—it is possible that he may in the future be appointed Minister of Finance in a Conservative government; when it comes in. But if he wants to have his chance made good for that, I would ask him to modify his views and his expressions. When a man who may be called upon to administer the finances of this country solemnly tells the people that because there is an increase of revenue it is proof positive there has been an increase in the rate of taxation, that man is an unsafe man to trust with anybody's business. Surely he ought to know better than that when he undertakes to reply to the Minister of Finance and takes five hours and a half to answer a speech of an hour and a half. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has the evidence before his eyes in the Post Office Department. No better illustration than that could be had of the fallacy of the hon. gentleman's statement. In 1896, under the Conservatives, the tax that was imposed on the people for carrying their letters gave a revenue of $3,000,000 but to-day the post office revenue is $6,000,000 or double what it was in 1896. And according to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) this increase of revenue is proof positive that the rate of taxation for carrying a letter has been increased. But the fact is that the postal rate has been reduced from 3 cents to 2 cents in one case and from 5 cents to 2 cents in another case and yet we have doubled the amount of revenue. And so it is with the customs. We have lowered the rate of customs duty but more goods come in, the people are better off and can buy more goods, and so the customs revenue has increased while the rate of taxation has diminished, and the revenue has increased in a measure because of the very fact that the rate of taxation has been reduced. Any man should be able to comprehend that, and the man who does not comprehend it has fiscal follies in his head so great that no nation should entrust him with the administration of its finances. And yet, these gentlemen opposite get up on the platforms and they say to the people: look at this government; when we were in power we only took $20,000,000 in customs taxes but these men are taking $60,000,000 that they have wrung out of the pockets of the people, and they twist their arms and distort their gestures when they use the word 'wrung.' Did we wring the extra $3,000,000 out of the pockets of the people in the increased revenue of the post office? No. The postage rate has been reduced. Did this government make any man, woman or child write two letters when they only wrote one letter before ? No. Does this government make any man, woman or child go into a store and buy $2 worth of goods when they only bought $1 worth before? There is only one thing the government does in standing between the people and the purchases they make, and that is when they say how many cents on the dollar shall be paid by the importing merchant into the treasury before he can get his goods to sell. For that the government are absolutely responsible and for that they must be judged, and if this government imposed a higher rate than was imposed before, then we have to answer for it. But what are the facts ? The average tax that was paid under these gentlemen opposite in 1896 was $18.28 on every $100 worth of dutiable and free imports for consumption that came into this country, but in 1906, ten years later, it was only $15.73 or a reduction of $2.55 which is equal to a reduction of 14 per cent in the rate of taxation. An yet, money flows into the treasury of the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) spoke about the debt, and in doing so he laid down another maxim that I think would not be approved by the people of Canada and that was that all our capital expenditure we should borrow abroad, add it to the debt and pay the interest upon it. We do not think so. We have had surpluses under my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in varying amounts running up to many millions of dollars. These surpluses could have been applied to the reduction of the public debt if it were thought wise. But it was deemed more prudent to take this money, raised under a lower rate of taxation, and to use it in developing the resources of the country and thus make it a means of reproducing wealth itself. Now, in this connection I might mention one of the things that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) charged as a scandal against this government, and that is the Crow's Nest Pass Railway and the bonus we gave to have that railway constructed. That is rather amusing in the light of the fact that those of us who were in the House at the time know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) himself voted for that scandal.

An hon. MEMBER. Did he ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, but that does not prevent him shouting 'scandal,' and it has just about as good a foundation as all their other scandals so far as we can see. Now, what did we do in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway ? We took $3,300,000 and we gave it to the Canadian Pacific Railway and said : Open up that boundary country, there is mineral wealth there, develop it. The Canadian Pacific Railway took the money, and they opened up that country. But what more ? We said to the Canadian Pacific Railway : in giving you this bounty which is larger than we give to many, you have to agree to reduce your freight rates, not on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway alone but over your entire system, to the extent of 3 cents on every 100 pounds of wheat you carry out of that

country, and more than that, you have got to give us 50,000 acres of coal land that you got which we will keep to be the property of the people of this country and if you raise the price of coal above $2 per ton we will open up these mines and work them ourselves for the benefit of the people. And that is what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) calls a scandal. I call it good business and a sample of the business methods of this government. Why, that 3 cents reduction on the wheat freight rate and the reduction on the price of coal, has in five years placed back in the pockets of the people of this country more than the total amount that was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that is a benefit that is to go on for all time to come.

What more? A country opened up; towns and cities built up; representatives in this House, grand men, like the men who worked the mines there. These are consuming centres for the manufactures of the east and are producing wealth in the country. The hon. gentleman ventured to call that a scandal. I wish we had more of them. He spoke about the Yukon—a desparate thing, he said. If there is anything hon. gentlemen opposite ought to be ashamed of it is their conduct with reference to that Yukon railway. What did we do? We made a bargain with a responsible firm that they would build 150 miles of railway in order that we might reach that distant part of our country over Canadian territory—for what? How many millions of dollars? Not one cent of the public money, but for alternate grants of land—gold-bearing, possibly. If it had been, all the better for the government; the richer the gold the better—why? Because we would get a royalty on it when it was taken out. Hon. gentlemen fought that measure in this House. They had influence enough in another House to defeat it. From that day to this we have had to reach that portion of our territory by passing through the territory of another nation—friendly, no doubt, but with a customs barrier, and giving advantages to Seattle, Tacoma and San Francisco in the trade of that country which might have been secured for our own cities. That is the history of the Yukon, and these hon. gentlemen say it is a scandal. The hon. member for North Toronto said tonight that though the upper chamber threw out that measure, there was now a majority in the upper House favourable to the government, and we would never venture such a proposition again. No, we never have done so. Where can a syndicate be found in Canada to-day to undertake what that syndicate agreed to do, even if we offered them everything we agreed to give the other syndicate, and a million dollars besides? I do not believe a syndicate could be got in Canada that would do it. The hon. gentleman the other night, when speaking about sending the 'Arctic to the northern waters to raise our flag and assert our sovereignty, said he did not believe in that kind of thing—he would trust to diplomacy. I believe in trusting to occupancy. The Americans took advantage of occupancy at Skagway. What might have been the result of the Alaska boundary arbitration if we had had an independent highway into the Yukon territory I will not venture to say; but our chance is gone, and the loss has been ours. The land is there yet, every foot of it, which we agreed to give; is there a man opposite who will give $100 for the whole of it? Why don't they form themselves into a syndicate and try to get it under the same terms and conditions? The hon. member for North Toronto was kind enough to give his advice to the hon. the Finance Minister, who was averse to increasing the public debt beyond what was necessary for the purpose of a great undertaking like the Grand Trunk Pacific, which of course we undertook with our eyes open. He knew that money would have to be borrowed for that; but all other great capital improvements he has faith in being able to provide for out of the revenues of the country. Here it is worth while to note that while our Conservative friends during their last eleven years spent $80,000,000 on capital account, they had to borrow $62,000,000 of that and add it to the debt, and we are paying the interest on it now. My hon. friend the Finance Minister in the same length of time has spent $127,000,000 on capital account, and has to borrow only $5,000,000, and if it had not been for what has already gone towards the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific he would have absolutely reduced the debt below what it was when we came into power. The hon. member for North Toronto said: You seem to be anxious not to increase the public debt; that is your idea of Finance; my idea is that we should spend none of the revenues in the construction of capital works, such as enlargements of canals, bonuses to railways, &c., but you should borrow abroad. Tax the people enough for ordinary expenditure and borrow what you want over and above that. Well, my hon. friend the Finance Minister says he has a more excellent way than that. He says he will build out of the surpluses he has, and will get these surpluses by reducing the rate of taxation instead of increasing it. That is the difference between the two policies. The political economy of my hon. friend from North Toronto is this: You have great revenues coming in; they come through increased imports; increased imports are a sign of the decay of the country; a revenue of $60,000,000 is an indication of a higher rate of taxation. Then logically his remedy would be to put the rate up to 100 per cent, which my hon.

friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) advocates, and shut out imports altogether, and thus get no revenue. The Finance Minister says: No, we lower the rates as far as we can, consistent with raising the revenue and having regard to the established industries of the country, and by doing this promote the welfare of the people; if there is more than enough to provide for the ordinary expenditures of government, we will spend it on capital account in developing avenues of transportation by which to reduce the cost of transportation, and thus every dollar we spend will go directly back into the pockets of the consumers of this country. There is the difference between the two systems.

Now, I am not going to speak five hours and a half, although I might be expected to take a longer time in answering a speech of that length. I sat for two and a half mortal hours this afternoon ready to jot down any new matter that was brought up by the hon. member, but I found that his speech was but a repetition of what he had said before. The importation and exportation of scenery and the invisible profits he talked about, and I was lost in wonder what manner of man he was who could see into the invisible.

Then he reiterated that absurd statement that the Prime Minister had said that the Grand Trunk Pacific would be built for $13,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. He did say so, and his words are on Hansard.

Mr. PATERSON. Any man who believes that must be devoid of common sense. You take a sentence out of the context and then say that is what the speaker meant, when the whole context shows the contrary.

Mr. TAYLOR. Read his speech.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the hon. gentleman needs to read it. No man in the House who heard that speech, ever so understood it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Everybody so understood it.

Mr. PATERSON. Then why was it not taken up on the spot? Why did not the leader of the opposition at once emphasize the fact by pointing out that the First Minister had said the cost of construction would be only $13,000,000? Is it possible for any one to sink so low as did the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) when he made such a statement? That hon. gentleman does not care what he says, but no member of parliament ought to venture on an assertion so absolutely contrary to the facts. Why, if he would not give credit to my right hon. leader for honesty of purpose, surely he would not say that the leader of this government ever committed himself, to the proposition that 1,800 miles of railroad and the guaranty of the bonds and the hundreds of miles of the prairie section could be all built for that amount. The hon. gentleman knows very well what the First Minister was talking about. He knows that my right hon. leader detailed the bargain that was made, showed how we were to build the 1,800 miles of railroad ourselves and guarantee the bonds on the mountain section, and how, for seven years after its construction, we were to pay the interest on these bonds, and how after that the Grand Trunk Pacific were to take the road over and pay us an amount annually equal to the interest on the money that was borrowed to build the road, so that after the seven years we would no longer have to find the money to pay the interest out of the pockets of the people because the Grand Trunk Pacific would pay it. And he estimated that the accumulated interest during the seven years might possibly amount to the sum of $13,000,000. That is what he said.

Mr. WARD. Does my hon. friend believe that that $13,000,000 will cover the cost, even as he has stated it?

Mr. PATERSON. I think that the First Minister and the Finance Minister both were very good judges, and I was inclined to believe at that time that that amount invested would cover the cost. If there has been extra cost, that may increase the amount. Will my hon. friend allow me to put him a question since I have answeed his frankly? How much more than the $13,000,000 does he think it will cost the country?

Mr. WARD. If my hon. friend will calculate it, he will find that it will cost more than double that amount.

Mr. CONMEE. Have you calculated it?

Mr. WARD. It is impossible to calculate it until the railway is finished.

Mr. PATERSON. How then do you know?

Mr. WARD. If you will take the expenditure up to the present, you will find even now the expenditure will more than double that amount.

Mr. PATERSON. I should not like to agree with the hon. gentleman off-hand; but if he has worked it out, and if I had his figures and could corroborate them, I would not object. But he will not forget this point, that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) seeks to create the impression that what he estimates is going to cost $129,000,000, the leader of the government said could be built for $13,000,000.

Mr. WARD. No.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, and I say such a statement is not to the credit of any public man. It is only worthy of a newspaper—

if one such could be found—that has sunk so low it does not care what it says. It is certainly not worthy any public man. But that is what they seek to fasten on the Prime Minister, namely that a road which they estimate will cost $129,000,000 he said could be built for $13,000,000.

Mr. WARD. What did Mr. Blair say about it ?

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Blair talked of the cost of construction, but the Prime Minister never talked about the cost of the construction of the road.

Mr. WARD. I am quite well aware of that.

Mr. PATERSON. That is quite an honest admission and one I like to hear, and I trust the press will take note of that and contrast it with what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has stated.

As far as I am aware, I have noted all the points made by the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Foster). I took them down at the time. You may say that I did so in a very short time, but the hon. gentleman kept repeating the same thing over and over again. That is what spun his speech out so long. It would have been better for him if he had been content to make the one speech for in my opinion —and if the hon. gentleman were present I would like to tell him so to his face rather than have to do it behind his back—he did not treat the House with proper courtesy. The other night, at ten o'clock, after he had spoken for two hours, he asked the First Minister, as a matter of courtesy, to allow him to adjourn the debate as he wished to speak on another branch of the subject which would take three quarters of an hour longer. The hour was not very late and we were anxious to get on with business, but my right hon. friend, thinking after all that the hon. gentleman would not take up much time when the debate was resumed, consented. We adjourned then at ten o'clock, and to-day my hon. friend took up the subject again and occupied the time of the House the whole afternoon. Occupied it in doing what ? In repeating the same old slanders and the same old statements he had made on the previous occasion. He talked of the Yukon Railway, he talked of the North Atlantic Trading Company, he talked about the Ross rifle—he talked about all these things on Tuesday, and he is back at them again to-day. He made a statement which was contradicted by a minister of the Crown who was in a position, as minister, to know the facts ; and, instead of accepting the correction which was made, and which was true, instead of accepting it and manfully apologizing, he tried to persist in his statement, even to the length of stating that an honoured judge of this country was susceptible to influence. That is not the way to conduct debates in this House. Any man may make a mistake, any man may be misinformed ; but when the mistake is pointed out, a frank acknowledgment of the mistake and an apology will carry with any body of gentlemen. But don't, when you have made a statement that is wrong, and that has been pointed out as wrong,—don't persist in ignoring a statement of an hon. member of this House, and especially do not carry it beyond these walls.

Now, if the House is not tired, I want to refer to something in the platform of the Liberal party which was spoken of by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). I refer to the party plank on the trade question, which, the hon. gentleman said, we had departed from. In fact, hon. gentlemen opposite have so often repeated the statement—even the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), I am afraid, has so far forgotten himself as to repeat it—that there is not a single plank of the Liberal platform that has not been broken by this government since it came into power, that so often that they really seem to believe it. My view is entirely different. We have carried into effect every plank of that platform except one, and discussion in this House and in the other chamber show that that plank, the reform of the Senate, has not been abandoned but that, in spite of the difficulties involved, we seek to carry it into effect also. Now, what about this trade policy plank of the platform ? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) did not read it all. But I will read it all, and I will give you my reasons for believing that that plank of the platform has been carried into effect by this government. I was the one who seconded that plank in the platform when my honoured leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved it, and I spoke on that occasion. The hon. member for North Toronto quoted some words—I do not know where he got them. He can get the book in the library and read what I said on that occasion; and what I said on that occasion, I say now and stand by. The hon. gentleman says that we advocated free trade as it is in England. But that is not a plank in our platform—they cannot find it anywhere. They say, and it is true, that the leader of the Liberal party expressed admiration of free trade as it is in England and said that he would be glad if we could have the same here. I do not know but that that is the opinion of the Prime Minister to-day, and that he would like to have free trade as they have it in England if our circumstances were the same as those existing in England. But these hon. gentlemen do not tell us that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said at the same time that there was no hope of having that policy in Canada for years and years to come, for our revenue would have to be raised by customs and excise in the future

as in the past. The views of Liberals on this question seem to have varied, just as, I observe, the views of hon. members opposite vary. Some of them, for instance, thought the French treaty all right; so, after speaking against it, they voted for it; while others thought it was wrong and actually voted against it. But at least this is true: The Liberal party did not recognize any one man as the man to lay down a platform for them. They summoned a convention of representatives of all sections of the Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific. And those representatives came, thousands of them, and they adopted a platform. And the bounden duty of the Liberal government, whatever may have been the previous opinion of its individual members, was to give effect to that platform when it had been endorsed by the vote of the people. Here is the trade plank of the platform :

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service; that the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations. It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property it has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of the few; it has checked immigration; it has caused great loss of population; it has impeded commerce; it has discriminated against Great Britain.

In these and in many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

That was declaratory. Now we come to the operative part.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people; that to that end the tariff should be reduced——

That recognizes a tariff. It does not say that there shall be free trade, which would mean that there was to be no tariff at all.

—to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government; that it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States. We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined. The government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection. We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours. This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

Now, I have read it all. This is appended to the campaign literature of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is very shortsighted on their part, because the very reading of this gives the denial to statements the hon. gentlemen are making on the platform. The people will read this and see that the Liberal party declared for a tariff, but a tariff without the protective principle and reduced to the needs of the country. I hope that that plank has been carried into effect. I was a party to putting that plank in the platform, and I believe that, the party having been returned to power on that platform, it was the duty of the government to carry it into effect. I was a party to moving the resolution, and I was a party to framing the tariff to carry it into effect. We recognize that the revenue must be raised by customs and excise as before, but we were to put the tariff on a revenue and not on a protective basis. What is the principle of protection ? Here you have imports increased from $100,000,000 to $300,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite, if they had their way would increase the tariff—make it 100 per cent, as the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says, if necessary—in order to shut these goods out. But we say, No; so arrange your tariff so as to secure the necessary revenue, and you will then have, of necessity, protection to the extent of the tariff for the local market, but do no injustice to any class and recognize the conditions of the country. And so the tariff was lowered.

What result has it accomplished, judged by its fruits? $249,000,000 of trade with all the other nations of the world under their protective tariff, and under our revised tariff, $640,000,000. Has not trade been made freer ? Has the tariff not been reduced ? In all the hundreds of items that were in their general tariff, scores of them were reduced in rate, and only, I think, four articles were raised in a slight degree in the general tariff. One-third of that amount was deducted from all the tens of millions of imports that came from the mother country into this country. Sir, what has been the result ? Trade from England has doubled, enriching the producers of this country. Freer trade? Yes, three times the trade that we had before. If based on the protective principle you would not have

had it, if the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite had been carried out. These imports are increasing, they are an injury to the country, they say, pass a law, raise your tariff and shut them out. We did what the platform told us to do, we lowered the tariff. We had consideration for the different industries of the country, we promoted freer trade, we have accomplished it with Great Britain to a marvellous extent We tried to get reciprocity with the United States, they were not ready to concede it, and it takes two to make a bargain We are not dependent upon them, we might have benefited by reciprocity, and so might they. But when it came to the point that we had to agree to their proposition with reference to the Alaska boundary before we could negotiate on trade matters, we were unable to go further, and the negotiations were broken off. So trade remains as it was before, with this exception, that in common with the imports from all other countries, there has been a proportionate reduction on many goods coming from the United States, a reduction in the interest of the people of Canada. Trade has been made freer with them than it was before, and to the benefit of the people of this country.

So I go through the different planks of the platform. Hon. gentlemen remind us that we 'viewed with alarm the increase in the public debt, and in the annual expenditure.' So we did at the time the platform was adopted, when the government were not getting revenue enough to pay the ordinary expenses of administration, to say nothing of the interest account that had to be met. We put an end to that by reducing the rate of taxation and making trade freer, with all its enriching consequences. The imports increased, money flowed into the treasury to such an extent that we were able to expend $127,000,000 on public works. Another plank was the liquor question. But we did not get prohibition into effect they say, it was not in the platform that it should be put into effect. The minds of the people had to be ascertained first, and the question then considered. Land for the settler was another plank. Hon. gentlemen opposite say, Ah, there is another of your planks gone. The land for the settler? Yes, sneer as they like and jibe as they like in an endeavour to make people believe that is not the case. They talk about the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. But you know that the cardinal principle of that sale was that these men were bound to put settlers on the land. Did they? They could not have got it otherwise. So the land was for the settler, even in that case. Land for the settler—how has that plank been carried out? Hear the record for ten years:



Statement re homestead entries granted since July 1, 1895, to June 30, 1905, together with the total area of same.

| | |
|---|---|
| July 1, 1895 (to December 31, 1895) | 962 |
| December 31, 1896 | 1,857 |
| " 31, 1897 | 2,384 |
| " 31, 1898 | 4,848 |
| " 31, 1899 | 6,689 |
| June 30, 1900 | 7,426 |
| " 30, 1901 | 8,167 |
| " 30, 1902 | 14,673 |
| " 30, 1903 | 31,383 |
| " 30, 1904 | 26,073 |
| " 30, 1905 | 30,819 |
| Total | 135,281 |

Note the increase. I want to say here that the settler has been brought to the land and the land has been given to the settler, because a statesman was chosen to administer the affairs of that country who has done more than any other man to promote the prosperity and development of the Northwest. This marvellous increase took place after Clifford Sifton was made Minister of the Interior, and bent his energies to the peopling of the fertile plains of our Northwest. I have given the homestead entries to 1905 inclusive. The record of the next year will show 40,000 more settled upon the land. And yet, Mr. Speaker, you have heard what these men opposite have said. They ought to know better, they ought to think of the estimate that people will put upon their intelligence when they talk about the Saskatchewan land. Why, its fundamental clause was to put settlers on the land, that was its basic principle, and in one year alone 40,000 men have taken out homestead entries on other lands in the Northwest. How can these venture hereafter to make the statement that we have not carried out that plank in the Liberal platform? It was our duty when we came into power to stand upon the platform that the Liberal party had laid down for us. I was a party to that platform, and I have tried to carry out its principles. I stand here to say that so far as the fiscal policy of this government is concerned, I believe we have carried out that platform in its entirety, and the results that have been achieved furnish abundant proof of the fact.

Mr. WM. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). I have listened with a good deal of pleasure to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) who has just taken his seat. He has delivered quite a vicious attack upon my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on account of the length of his speech. Well, I am not here to deliver a five hours' speech. But if the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has not spoken long, we must admit that he has spoken loudly. However, there are a few questions he has alluded to which I propose to devote a few

moment's attention. About fifteen minutes ago the hon. member for Simcoe called the attention of the minister to the steals, and the minister said he did not know of any; I think that is what he said. What did he say in answering a question yesterday in regard to his own department? He apparently does not remember it, so I will read it. This question was asked by myself:

1. Is one Donald Fraser still subcollector of customs for the port of Huntingdon, British Columbia? If not, when was he dismissed from the service?
2. What was the cause of his dismissal, and was a thorough investigation made as to his conduct?
3. What was the nature of the settlement arrived at in his case?
4. What was the total amount of his defalcation?
5. If any restitution was made on his behalf, what was the amount of money refunded?
6. Was any prosecution instituted against said Fraser? If not, for what cause?

The hon. gentleman answered that yesterday and I will give his answer:

Hon. WM. PATERSON. Upon inspection of the outport of Huntingdon, British Columbia, by Mr. Inspector Clute, in September, 1905, irregularities were discovered——

Note the word 'irregularities.'

—and Mr. Donald Fraser, the subcollector, was thereupon placed under suspension by the inspector. A thorough investigation of the outport was then made, and deficiencies to the amount of $4,241.46 were found to exist, which amount was paid by Mr. Fraser to the inspector of customs at that time.

When the report of the inspector was received by the department, an order in council was passed dispensing with Mr. Fraser's services. No further action has yet been taken.

An hon. MEMBER. That is a big thing.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It may not be considered big by those hon. gentlemen who are accustomed to taking hundreds of thousands of dollars, but here is the case of an individual taking $4,000 odd and his rebuke is that he has been asked to send in his check and no further action has been taken. Yet the hon. gentleman knows of no steals. He cannot remember from yesterday until to-day.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I can remember that there were a great many cases of stealing under the late government.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. You can remember 18 years, but you cannot remember 24 hours. We could give the hon. gentleman a good many cases along that line, but I am not proposing to take any five hours to answer the arguments of the hon. gentleman, but I am proposing to take him to task with reference to this $13,000,000. I am proposing to read the statements in the House and I will take 'Hansard' for it. It is very nice for these gentlemen to endeavour to forget these statements which have misled the country, but there can be no denying the fact that the words were used. We do not say that we believed these statements and we never did believe them. The hon. gentleman denies that we believed them; that is not the point. The statements were made. At page 7691 of 'Hansard' of 1903, the following words appear as having been uttered by the right hon. First Minister:

The sum total of the money to be paid by the government for the construction of that line of railway from Moncton to the Pacific ocean will be in the neighbourhood of $12,000,000 or $13,000,000, and not a cent more.

Are these or are they not the words of the right hon. gentleman? Further he says:

Now, Sir, what is $13,000,000 in the year 1903? It is about the surplus of our revenue over the expenditure. The surplus for this year will pay for the construction of this road.

The hon. gentleman says they did not believe it; that they never used it, that they never tried to use it, and that they never deceived the people in that way. Let me show him a pamphlet which I have here. Does he recognize that as a pamphlet which was used in the election of 1904? It is entitled 'A Progressive Policy,' 'Record of Liberal Government,' 'Conservative Fallacies Exposed.' And when you turn to the statements with reference to the Transcontinental Railway what do you find? Right at the top of the page, the main heading of the page, you find this: 'A transcontinental railway for $13,000,000,' issued by yourselves and you say you never used it, Mr. Minister of Customs. I would not trust the hon. gentlemen across there by sending it over because I might not get it back, but if any of them will step across here I will be pleased to show it to them. I will now read from the body of the pamphlet.

Mr. BUREAU. An original document?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Yes, this is an original document issued by the Liberal party.

Just now they are indulging not only in fanciful criticisms but positive misrepresentations and falsifications. The feature of the bargain in regard to which most of this is done is the financial arrangement. It is an actual fact, an indisputable fact, that $13,000,000 will cover every cent of the country's expenditure in connection with the railway and that if $8,853,502 cash were invested today with an insurance or investment company it would have grown enough by the time the railway is completed to actually pay all the expenditure that the country will have to make.

The Finance Minister has asked us for $41,000,000 for that road. You may make

all the explanations you like to the country, you are welcome to it, but you made the statement that this road could be built for $13,000,000, you have asked for $41,000,000, and before you are through you will be obliged to accept the estimate made by the former Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) who went out of this government rather than stand for such a fraud. His statement was that it would cost $120,000,000, and that was a fair, square honest estimate. We never believed in your statement. We never claimed that we believed your statement, but we say that you misled the country and I have read to you your own literature showing that you did it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is that the opinion, may I ask, of the Minister of Customs ?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not think the country is as easily misled as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I was not misled ; don't you believe it. I estimated it at $150,000,000, and Mr. Heyd, who was running against me, admitted in a joint debate that it would cost $81,000,000. So much for the argument of the hon. Minister of Customs. I do not think that he has told anything new in regard to that. His own department, it has generally been supposed, is purity itself, but I have given the hon. gentleman one case, we know of a few others and we may be able to bring them to his attention before the session closes. I have been informed that in his department there are fraudulent entries and under valuations. I believe that favours are granted to certain ones. We would like to find out why it is in connection with that immense tunnel crossing from Windsor to Detroit everything being brought in from the United States to be used on the Canadian end of it is coming in free of duty under an order in council. Was that done in order to benefit some friends of the government ? If so, who are they ?

Mr. PATERSON. That privilege was given because this parliament, the hon. gentleman included, passed an Act saying that it should be done and that Act is in force.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It was done by Act of parliament ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. My information is that it was done by order in council.

Mr. PATERSON. That would show that it would be safer for the hon. gentleman, especially before he throws out the insinuations that he does, to learn the facts. If he will look at the tariff he will find an item to which he agreed directing that what has been done in this case should be done, and what the department has done has been to carry out the law as passed by parliament.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman does not say what or where the Act is.

Mr. PATERSON. In the tariff.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. This particular case was not mentioned in the tariff.

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly it is mentioned in the tariff.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. This particular tunnel ?

Mr. PATERSON. Any tunnel.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Any tunnel, but not this one. I am speaking of a special tunnel. The hon. minister may squirm but he cannot prove his case. I said I believed other matters had been done irregularly in the department. I am told there is a very large amount of stoves—and stoves should be manufactured in Canada if anything is—that have been entered in the city of Winnipeg a long way below what they should be entered at. It is not an easy matter to get at the information about that because I have moved for returns which I have not obtained, and so I cannot speak definitely at the present time. But in turning up the trade report I find that half a million dollars worth of stoves have been brought into Winnipeg. I think the stove is called the 'Majestic' which is a very high sounding title but I do not think that they paid a majestic duty; I am told they were very much underestimated. At any rate half a million dollars worth of stoves were brought in by one firm I believe, and the matter may be investigated before very long, but until I get definite information I am not prepared to say positively to what extent if any that entry was made. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) drew attention to the absence of the prominent members on this side of the House, notably the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the leader of the opposition, and when the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) entered the House he directed his finger at him and said: here comes another. Let me direct his attention to his own side of the House now. When he was speaking the Liberal benches were all filled but now not ten per cent of the members are present and of course the hon. gentleman will say I have talked them out of the House. Well, I am quite ready to believe that, for they cannot stand very much of the truth at a time and as soon as they begin to hear the truth they desert the House and leave the benches empty. The other day the hon. gentleman taunted me with not being able to convert the government on the French treaty, and the Finance Minister repeated, with what I considered a great deal of acidity that was quite uncalled for, a certain remark with reference to myself. When he was referring to the

deputation that waited on him the day before I asked hom:

Does the new French treaty have any effect on the trade.

That is not just exactly as I put it but it is near enough, and he replied :

No, the new French treaty is not yet in operation, but if I had any occasion to mention it I should recall the fact that my hon. friend condemned the treaty and voted for it.

Was I not in fairly good company in voting for the French treaty ? It is the first time in four years I have been so foolish as to vote with this government. I admit it may have been a foolish thing to do, but what does the Finance Minister think of these men who sit behind him and vote with the government when graft and greed and all manner of filching from the public treasury has to be defended. There was no graft in the French treaty and I voted for it; no graft except what the two ministers got who went across to Paris, and if the reports are correct they certainly lived fairly high; one of them drew over $8,000 I believe and the other $4,000 to negotiate this beautiful treaty. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) accuses me of being foolish enough to vote for the government.

Mr. FIELDING. Wise enough.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Foolish enough. The hon. gentleman has never criticised any other vote I have given in the House and I assume he thought I did a foolish thing.

Mr. FIELDING. No, a wise thing.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I admit that if I did vote with the government on any of these great questions I would be doing a foolish thing, but I have only done it once and I will promise that I will try and not do it again.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, yes, you will.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I will try not to. The Minister of Customs dwelt at great length upon the question of the balance of trade and he pointed out that we have now reached a volume of $640,000,000 of trade in the twelve months. These are large figures, but I may point out now as I have pointed out before that a large part of that is the buying of this country and not the selling. Hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavoured to take the edge off the fact by saying that the balance of trade to the extent of $120,000,000 against us is a matter of very small moment. In fact the member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. J. J. Hughes) stated that the difference between the imports and the exports was the measure of our profit, and that consequently we have made $120,000,000 out of the deal this year. If that logic is sound would it not be better that the whole trade of the country should be a purchaser and that we should have purchased $644,000,000 and exported nothing. According to the reasoning of the hon. member we would then have made $644,000,000 out of the transaction. There is no country in the world situated as Canada is that is pursuing such a foolhardy course as to have a balance of $120,000,000 a year against it on its trade. In the United States for the last ten years their exports have exceeded their imports by an average of $500,000,000 per annum, the excess of exports over imports being $517,000,000 for 1906. That is a country that knows how to do business. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) told us that the United States felt the financial pressure worse than we have felt it. I am not so sure of that. It is true that the United States answers to the financial barometer a little quicker than we do and their crises are more acute but they are not so prolonged, and the hon. gentleman knows that well in spite of his announcement to-night that Canada is as prosperous as she ever has been. He knows right down in his heart that that is not a fact. Has he read the newspapers this winter ; has he read his newspaper, the Toronto 'Globe.' Has he seen upon the front page appeal after appeal, day after day and week after week, for the starving people of the city of Toronto. Did he see it stated only this week that 2,000 men had marched to the parliament buildings and that 1,000 had marched to the city hall in Toronto demanding work. And yet he has the hardihood to get up here to-night and tell us that the prosperity of the country is as great if not greater than it ever has been. Does he think anybody will believe that statement. What has happened in Toronto has happened in every other city and town in Ontario; his own town of Brantford had 700 men out of work and 200 of them appealed at the Brantford city hall the other day for work or relief. Every town and city in Ontario has had its charitable institutions taxed to the utmost this winter, and I say it now and I say it without fear of contradiction that there has been more intense suffering in the province of Ontario this winter than has ever occurred since it was a province. And that is under your great prosperity as you call it. The Minister of the Interior is largely responsible for that because he has poured into the province of Ontario distressed immigrants who are knocking at the door of Toronto and saying: Food or we starve, give us work or we will die; and there are hundreds and thousands of the people every day that are suffering from the policy of this government. The hon. gentleman may say to me : Oh, you are a blue ruin artist. I have been accused of that before and I am not afraid of being accused of it, but I have 'Hansard' here for 1893, 1894 and 1895 and I find some fairly good reading from that standpoint in these books. I have read

some of the speeches of Sir Richard Cartwright who, if there ever was a blue ruin artist in Canada, was the man. But this government seized upon and kept him in office long past the time when his usefulness was gone. The Minister of Customs and the Finance Minister are both on record as well. They were content in those days to put the public debt, as it was, at about $200,000,000 or $225,000,000. How did Sir Richard Cartwright figure up the public debt? By taking the public debt of Canada, and adding to it all the bonds of railways that had been sold in England, all the money borrowed for industrial purposes in Canada, and then saying: In round figures your indebtedness is from $800,000,000 to $1,000,000,000.

The hon. Minister of Customs has told us that this government has reduced the taxation of the people. That is an old cry of his; we have heard it many times. I am going to quote to him an eminent authority on that point. I would ask his attention to these remarks, in 'Hansard' of 1894, at page 356:

> I would ask those hon. gentlemen to turn to page 11 of the Trade and Navigation returns, prepared, not by Mr. Laurier or by the member for South Oxford, but prepared by the government themselves, and what is that statement? One of the columns shows the amount of customs duties paid per head of the population. That is the way to measure your taxation. Take the taxes of 1878 and see how much was paid by the population then. You will find it was $3.13 per head. Take the sum this last year, and it was $4.26 per head. That only gives an idea of the taxation levied that went into the revenue.

Who do you think was the eminent authority I am quoting? The Hon. Wm. Paterson, Minister of Customs. But tonight he repudiates the per head basis altogether; he says the proper basis is the percentage on goods. He dilated at length on this miserable little $4.26 per head; but now he excuses the $11 per head which is being taken from every man, woman and child in Canada by this government. Surely the hon. gentleman must have forgotten that he uttered these words.

Mr. TAYLOR. Get up and apologize.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. This government is taking double per head from the people of this country what was taken in 1896 when the Conservatives were in power; and yet the hon. gentleman has the hardihood to get up and assert that the taxation to-day is less than it was then. Surely the hon. gentleman has gone a little wide of the mark in endeavouring to prove that estimates amounting to $119,000,000, according to the government's first estimate, is less than $46,000,000 which we spent in 1896. In addition we have been asked for $3,000,000 for seed wheat, and the other day supplementary estimates to the amount of $5,000,000 odd were placed on our desks; so that up to the present time the government estimate for an expenditure of about $127,000,000; and the hon. Minister of Customs glories in it, after vowing that they would reduce taxation by several million dollars. They have never reduced it one cent, but they have been steadily increasing it until it has become a load under which this country is staggering, and the Finance Minister admits that we are face to face this year with a deficit of $12,000,000 and another next year of probably $19,000,000; and still the hon. gentleman tells us that we are more prosperous than ever.

With regard to the loan which the Finance Minister made to the banks of this country in order to move the grain of the Northwest, he explained to us that he had found it necessary to break into the strong chest of this country and take out some $5,000,000 of the reserve, contrary to the Currency Act; but he said that it was a crisis, and he thought he was justified in thus doing what he knew to be wrong, and he said that all the money had now been returned except about $900,000. Whatever others may think, in my opinion this is a strange example for a government to set the financial institutions of this country. Many a banker has had to go behind the bars for no greater offence. The Finance Minister according to his own statement, has taken $5,000,000 out of the reserve of this country which by law should not be touched, and for doing that he has to obtain a special Act of indemnity from this parliament. The crisis to which he refers was brought largely by the government themselves. Last year they claimed to have a surplus of $15,000,000. If they had, why could they not have invested a portion of that, instead of taking $5,000,000 from the reserve? It is a deplorable example set to the leaders of our financial institutions, and it is not to be wondered at if the commercial moral tone of the country falls in the face of an Act of that kind committed by the government of the country. The Quebec bridge bargain is another beautiful item. Of all the bargains made by this government, there is none, for the size of it, more deplorable than that they made with regard to the Quebec bridge, and, as might be expected, the results were even more deplorable than the bargain itself. The history of the whole thing is one of the most disgraceful of any we have had since confederation. The company was started with a capital of $65,000 and that company got a contract from this government—for how much, do you suppose?

Mr. MACDONALD. In what year was that company incorporated?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It does not matter when it was incorporated. Its capital stock only amounted to $65,000 and whe-

ther that was all paid up or not, I am not aware. The date of its incorporation makes no difference.

Mr. MACDONALD. Do you know when it was incorporated ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. member for Pictou has a habit of butting in when things are getting rather warm. It was incorporated under this government. They got a subsidy from this government, another from the province of Quebec and another from Quebec city, the whole amounting, in round figures, to about $800,000. Then they got a guaranty of their bonds from this government for $6,800,000. The company may have respectable names on its directorate, but when a company with a capital stock of only $65,000 undertakes to make a contract for over $6,000,000, I say it is a fake company. No company with only $65,000 capital is capable of taking up a contract involving an expenditure of $6,000,000 to $10,000,000. Still this government made a bargain with this company involving $10,000,000. Why did they do it ?

Mr. BENNETT. Graft.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It was expected that there would be a big graft, and they formed a side company to take the graft. But as it turned out the bridge collapsed and the graft disappeared, and the company have not the money to bear the loss, nor can they be called to bear it under their bargain. Their bargain with the government was : Heads we win ; tails you lose. The bridge went down, eighty live were lost, and now the Minister of Finance tells us that the government may find it necessary to take over the bridge. But the bridge is in the bottom of the river, so that it is a pretty good stretch of the imagination for the hon. gentleman to say that the government will take it over. To have been exact, as a Finance Minister should be, he should have said that the government will have to take over the wreck. Who is going to provide for the widows of these eighty men whose lives were lost ? Who is going to bear this loss of nearly $5,000,000 on the bridge ? and who is going to construct the bridge because we have to begin over again ? As was pointed out by the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) the other day, this Quebec bridge alone, with its span about two miles long, will cost as much as these gentlemen told us it would cost to build the Transcontinental, namely, about $13,000,000. And the contract for a bridge of that kind was given to a company with a capital of about $65,000 ! Yet these men have the assurance to tell us that they have never heard of deals. Why, this contract between the Quebec Bridge Company and this government was one of the biggest preparations for a gigantic graft that will be found on record in any country. There was just but one hitch to prevent the



success of the scheme and the enrichment of the schemers, and that hitch was, the bridge went down, a lot of lives were lost, and now the Finance Minister has to take over the whole concern. And these gentlemen will still tell us that they have never known of any wrong doing by the government since it has taken office.

Mr. MACDONALD. What about the French treaty ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have been twitted because I voted with the government on the French treaty. I will tell you why.

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes, explain that.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is known as one of the two Macs who are leaders of the obstructionist club on the government side. He has asked me to give an account of that vote. Well, I did give an account of it but the hon. gentleman was not here. I have no objection, however, to stating the grounds for voting as I did. Besides I had the example of the right hon. the First Minister as a precedent. When the French treaty, which had been negotiated by Sir Charles Tupper in 1893, was brought before the House, the right hon. gentleman criticised it, as I did the treaty this session, but he nevertheless voted for it. I did not think the treaty submitted to us this session was beyond criticism. There were many items in it which should not have been there, but the First Minister told us that we had to take it as it was or not at all, and I accepted it on the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread. I can cite also the precedent set by Sir Richard Cartwright in 1893. He likewise criticised the treaty introduced by Sir Charles Tupper, but that did not prevent his voting for it.

I am now going to tell the hon. gentleman about two or three votes I did not give for the government. Let me remind him of the famous Autonomy Bills introduced in this House during the first year when I had the honour to be a member. These Bills were to give self-government to the great Northwest provinces. We had a debate lasting for two months on this question. When the debate was over I certainly did not vote for these Autonomy Bills. And I believe that a great many members on that side of the House, if they had to do it again, would not vote for these Bills. Let them consider what has happened in the Northwest. The effect of these Bills was to take the lands of these provinces away from the people to whom they properly belonged. And our leader has declared that, if he is returned to power, he will restore those lands to the people to whom they belong. Those Bills professed to give a constitution to the new provinces. And with what result ? Elections were held under the constitution as provided for by

these Bills. After the election it was found that fraud had been practised in a number of cases, and thirteen protests were entered against men who had been returned. But when the complainants came into court the judges who sat upon the cases declared that there was no machinery in the Autonomy Bills by which political rascality could be punished, and so these thirteen protests were thrown out. That constitution was good enough to destroy the election laws that had existed, but it was not good enough to give the people new election laws. A vote in favour of these Autonomy Bills was one vote that I certainly did not give. Nor did I vote to justify the bargain made with the North Atlantic Trading Company, which took between $300,000 and $400,000 out of the pockets of the people for which no value was given. Nor did I vote in favour of the expeditions of the 'Arctic.' That vessel was sent out, loaded with delicacies, to discover the north pole. She was sent out for three years and returned in one, bringing back very few of the goods. The people aboard had a jolly time. They enjoyed their visit with the Eskimo. They smoked their cigars and drank their spirits and had a good time. The government sought for justification of this expenditure of between $200,000 and $300,000 for a jaunt of this kind. I certainly did not vote for that. Nor did I vote for the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, with its deals, nor for the Imperial Pulp Company with its deals, nor for the Merwin enterprise, nor in favour of any of these things that hon. gentleman opposite put through in this House and put through in a way that should bring the blush of shame to the faces of those who have voted for these expenditures.

Now, I propose to deal for a few moments with something connected more especially with the budget speech itself. We have had a statement concerning the financial stringency that has existed in this country. We know that the stringency has been very severe and that the effects of it have not by any means passed away, nor are they likely to pass away in the near future. We know that the outlook, in spite of the prophecy of the Minister of Finance, is not any too good; that industrial conditions in our main centres are not bright; that many factories are running on short time, or with short staff, that labour is very largely unemployed in all the business centres of Canada, and that imports of goods from the United States and from Europe are displacing the products of our own factories. We know this last has been going on steadily and that the future outlook of this country is not good. Take, for instance, agricultural implements, which we can manufacture for outside markets. Yet, as shown by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), we have imported one and three quarter million dollars worth. Stoves I have already mentioned—an import of three-quarters of a million dollars. So I might enumerate other articles, for the manufacture of which Canada is supposed to be headquarters, in the production of which we are up to date in every respect and are able to produce goods as good and as cheap as any country in the world. And yet we are importing large quantities of these goods which should be manufactured in this country, employing the hands that are now walking the streets and that are being brought in from outside countries. Throughout our western provinces a large quantity of agricultural implements are being imported. We are also importing great quantities of woollens that are displacing the products of our own mills to the great detriment of this industry. Only two days ago we read of a large factory in Montreal closing down. I was told by a gentleman in the corridors of this House only yesterday that since this government came into power 108 large factories had been closed. In the woollen industry there is as dismal an outlook as faces any manufacturing enterprise. Hardly a factory is left of the great array that we had a few years ago; that is doing a profitable business.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. How would the hon. gentleman (Mr Cockshutt) prevent the people of Canada from buying the manufacturing implements and woollen goods that he speaks of as being brought in from foreign countries?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. My policy is to have these goods made in Canada and sold in Canada, and to readjust the tariff to bring about that result. The woollen business has been pulled down very largely by the preferential tariff—and I shall come to that subject presently—the Minister of Finance did not seem to find time to deal with it in his speech, but I intended to take it up. I was pointing out that there were many industries in this country that are not in a thrifty condition and that the tariff changes the minister proposes this session are not going to help any of them as I understand the situation. Many of our industries today should have additional protection of some kind or other in order that we may keep Canadian business in Canadian factories. Besides the items that I have already mentioned, take, for instance, cement. This is an article which, our Liberal friends admit, can be made as good in Canada as in any country in the world. Still we are importing large quantities of American cement into Canada. We desire to see the Canadian industry extend and to see our own plants employ our own people. This government was given a golden opportunity last year, and I pointed out at the time, when there was a balance of trade against us of $63,000,000, which should have been a warning to the Finance Minister. But

the hon. gentleman did not see it. To-day we are importing $120,000,000 from foreign countries, a large part of which should be made in this country by Canadian workmen. If this were done, we would not have these men walking our streets and coming to our city halls and parliament buildings asking for work.

These men could all be provided with work if these vast imports the Minister of Customs has encouraged were not taking place. This $120,000,000 worth of goods in excess should nearly all be made in Canada. We used to have the balance of trade in our favour, why have not we got it now? In 1903 we had a balance of trade in our favour of some millions, since then it has been going the other way, by leaps and bounds until now it is $120,000,000 against us in twelve months. Now I say that if the tariff was as it should be a large portion of these goods would be made in Canada, we would be employing our workingmen, and they would not be on charity to-day. It is a shame and a disgrace to this country that a state of things should be allowed to exist that has existed in the province of Ontario during this winter.

Under the beautiful system we have in this country we have become importers of almost everything in the list. These gentlemen rejoice in it; as the Minister of Customs says, I rejoice in these vast imports. Why, we are supposed to be a great agricultural country, under the aegis of our friend the Minister of Agriculture and what have we been doing this year? What do you think we have imported this year, among other things? Butter. Under the cold storage business of the Minister of Agriculture, and under the encouragement he has given to agriculture, we have been importing butter. You will say, surely that was a very exceptional case; where did it come from? I took the precaution of asking the minister some weeks ago and I got an answer. We imported $35,000 worth of butter this last fall. And where do you think the most of it came from? Great Britain, 160,000 pounds in one shipment, valued in all at about $35,000. So under the beautiful policy of the Minister of Agriculture that has done so much for the farmer, he has had to send to Great Britain and bring out butter to put on our tables to save us from butter famine.

I might give another item which was mentioned the other night. An hon. gentleman says: What about clover seed? Now, I want to give the Minister of Agriculture another pointer about his beautiful seed Bill. I want him to refer back to the last two or three years and see what has happened in the seed trade. Four or five years ago we were large exporters of clover seed. This gentleman came in with his beautiful Seeds Inspection Act, which made it a crime to have seed with a few weed seeds in it, and what has happened? He has made Canada to-day the dearest country on earth for clover seed, and instead of being exporters we are importers. And are we getting a better article? No, we are getting a worse article. We have not seed here to-day for our home trade. Right in the province of Ontario which used to export tens of thousands of bushels, we have not seed for the home trade. The minister's policy is largely responsible for that, as I pointed out to him that it would be. I pointed out to the minister at the time that he had a Bill there that was going to do the farmer the greatest possible injury, that it was going to make clover seed dear. Clover seed is silage to the land, it gives fertility to the land. It is selling in Ontario to-day at from $12, $14 and $15 a bushel, and very scarce at that, and much of it imported seed; whereas three or four years ago we had about a million dollars worth to spare, according to trade returns, in one year. But now we have to send abroad to bring in the very seed that the minister has legislated against by his seed Bill. And what was the cause of it? There is a certain weed called rib grass, which is in itself a harmless thing, and is considered one of the best seed manures that grows; in fact in the old country it is sown clear as feed for sheep. Seed with this rib grass, or plantein, as it is called, five seeds to the thousand, is condemned and not accounted a first class article under the seed Bill. He does not make any more difference between this plantein or rib grass than he does between mustard or rag weed, which are in themselves far more dangerous weeds; and it would be worse to use one rag weed to the thousand than it would be to sow 100 plantein or rib grass to the thousand. And because the hon. gentleman insisted on putting that through, in spite of my protest, he has made Canada the dearest country under the sun for clover seed. Instead of exporting it to other countries we are importing it from France, from Great Britain and from the United States, and in many instances it is not nearly up to the old standard that we had before the Inspection Act. It is just as I pointed out to him at the time that the Bill was being discussed, and it is because he could not discriminate between what is really a harmless weed and one that is very noxious. He made one the same as the other, and put it five to the thousand in spite of my protest. That should be immediately rectified, because it is doing this country immense damage, and the farmers to-day are not able to buy enough clover seed to keep their lands in a proper state of fertility. I have pointed out these two items where we are importers instead of exporters, as we should be. I might go down the list and show that out of this $120,000,000 balance of trade, many of these items could be saved to Canada if the tariff

was as it should be, and we should be manufacturing and producing these at home instead of sending abroad for them. That cannot be denied, Mr. Speaker, and it is to be regretted that when all has been said and done, the hon. gentleman has not found time to tell us what he proposes to do with regard to righting the things that are wrong. There certainly should be an adjustment at the present time in accordance with changed conditions, in order that we might have employment for our unemployed and adequate protection for all lines of industry for which Canada is fitted. If that had been done, we would have no men today walking our streets.

Now then a word with regard to the preference with Great Britain. As I pointed out, the Finance Minister did not find time to deal with that. That used to be considered a very important subject by the Finance Minister. To-day he has not found time to speak a single word with regard to it. He has not shown in his diagram here that trade with Great Britain is developing anything like as it should. It is true, we are selling to Great Britain more goods than to any other country, and it is the only country in the whole list to which we are selling more than we are buying from. But not at all satisfactory is the present state of the preference with Great Britain. He has been taking away from it a little at a time, very much like the boy that cut off the dog's tail, he took off an inch at a time in order that the dog might not be hurt so much. And so the minister has been taking away a little each season from the British preference in order that the people over there might not realize the fact that they were being robbed of what had been given to them a few years ago.

Then we had the imperial conference. These gentlemen went over there and were lavishly entertained in London. They had a long conference with the British authorities on matters concerning trade with Canada, and they came back and they have not shown us that we have got a single advantage with regard to trade with Great Britain. Did they make any earnest effort to remove the cattle embargo? We used to do an immense trade with Great Britain before our cattle were unjustly treated. This is a question that the Minister of Agriculture took under his care, and what has he done to remove the difficulty? I did not hear that a single word was said at that conference with regard to the removal of the embargo upon our cattle, which is a most unjust enactment. Several million dollars worth of trade of this country have been taken away from us by the wrongful enforcement of the Diseases Act upon these cattle and sheep that have been kept out of Great Britain. Not one single honest effort was made by these gentlemen at that conference to open the door for trade in this respect with Great Britain. The matter of mutual preference, that calls for every attention at the hands of this government, has been entirely slighted. These gentlemen have gone to England, they have returned again and they have not brought us anything to show for their negotiations with the mother country or that our trade relations are to be improved in any respect whatever. There have been a great many discussions upon this question for a great many years, but I want to place on 'Hansard' the view which I hold upon this question and it is contained in a resolution which I am about to present to the House and which I think expressed it better than anything that has ever been written on this important question of a mutual preference. This is a resolution that was moved in the city of Montreal during the great congress of the chambers of commerce of the empire in 1903. I am reading from the official report of the congress, dated at Montreal, August 17, 1903. I find that this resolution was one which embraced the views of all Canadians at that great discussion upon the imperial preference question.

It is resolved, 'that in the opinion of this Congress the bonds of the British empire would be materially strengthened, and the union of the various parts of His Majesty's Dominion greatly consolidated by the adoption of a commercial policy based upon the principles of mutual benefit, whereby each component part of the empire would receive a substantial advantage in trade as a result of its national relationship, due consideration being given to the fiscal needs of the component parts of the empire.'

There is a brief and concise statement of what a mutual preference should be. We find that these gentlemen went to London and that they made no effort to induce the mother country to reciprocate with us in the matter of trade. Yet, they present this statement which has been issued by the Minister of Finance in showing that our trade with Great Britain has been improving to a certain extent during the past few years but they do not say that it is anything like the volume that it should have attained, and instead of there being an increase in this trade during the past year the trade has actually diminished and our exports to Great Britain are falling off at the present time rather than increasing. A few items that I have mentioned, such as butter and clover seed, that we have been exporting, we are now importing from them. Imagine an agricultural country such as this is importing these things from Great Britain. Surely there must be something wrong when we are sending to outside countries for the products of the farm. Hon. gentlemen opposite have given us a pamphlet showing that our trade has increased with Great Britain. It is true that during the past ten for fifteen years we are doing

more trade with Great Britain than we once did, but it is nothing in comparison with what it should be and what it would be if a mutual preference were afforded us. This is the logical conclusion of the existing condition of affairs. If we got something from them for giving them something we might have an interchange of products between the various members of the family of the empire. That is the best policy for Canada to pursue and if these hon. gentlemen, when they visited London, had given the same attention that they apparently did to negotiate the French treaty to effecting an arrangement with the mother country they would have had a great deal more to show as a result of their efforts abroad. That French treaty will give us $10,000,000 of imports from European countries and about $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 of exports whereas Great Britain is the one country in the world that is taking more from us than we are taking from it. Still, they did not think it worth while to enter into negotiations with the British government to induce them to reciprocate in this matter and to give better terms to the colonies than to foreign countries. I believe they are ready for a change, the tariff reform movement is going on there and I believe that we will live to see the day when the idea of a mutual trade preference within the empire will be carried out. It will never be carried out by this government. They have been hostile to it from the start and they will be hostile to it to the finish. There is no imperialism about them in that respect. They stumbled into this preference as was pointed out this afternoon by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). They had no intention of going on with it, but when they found that they could not give the preference to anybody else they gave it to the mother country. If you read the argument put up by the hon. Minister of Finance when he first presented his policy to the House you will see that he had no intention of giving the preference to Great Britain alone but that he proposed to give it to all other countries that were ready to go into the bargain. When they found out that no other country would go into it he gave it to Great Britain alone. We were led to insist upon the abrogation of the treaties between Germany and Belgium. That is a large question that I am not going to enter into. My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) is an authority on that question and he may find time to take hold of it during this present debate. But, we know that instead of getting any advantages out of these various negotiations we have tumbled into first one difficulty and then another until we are to-day in such a state of financial depression that we are importing $120,000,000 worth more than we are selling, whereas the United States, with no greater possibilities than we have, had exports beyond their imports last year of $550,000,000. If we had exports and imports in the same ratio, if we were twelve times as large as we are, we would have $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 of a balance of trade in our favour instead of $120,000,000 of a balance against us. That is nothing but what we should have in a country like Canada. Still these gentlemen go on and say: What are you going to do about it? How are you going to right this? Well, we will have to right it because these gentlemen are incapable of righting it. Everything they touch goes wrong. Their whole business policy brings us to the verge of ruin. I pointed out in the remarks which I made in debate on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne that we were going to have suffering and hardship, soup kitchens and distributions of food. That has all come to pass within the last three or four months and these gentlemen are to-day at the old business they were at from 1874 to 1878—soup kitchens and the distribution of food by charitable institutions. The trouble is that the government is not paying for it. People connected with private charitable institutions have to put their hands in their pockets this winter and have to pay out money to the amount of thousands and tens of thousands of dollars in the province of Ontario alone to feed people who otherwise would have starved as you can read not in Conservative papers but in such papers as the Toronto 'Globe' and the Ottawa 'Free Press.' Men are marching upon public buildings demanding work or bread. This government have not done anything to meet the situation at all, but they put up the Minister of Customs to tell us that the country is as prosperous as it ever was and that taxation is not as great as it used to be. They glory in this sort of thing. They have asked for $119,000,000 in their main estimates, $3,000,000 for seed wheat and $5,000,000 odd in the supplementary estimates and before we get through we will have further supplementary estimates of $5,00,000 or $10,000,000 put before the House, the result of which will be that we will have further supplementary estimates when this country ought to be run for one-third or one half of that amount. Then, they say: We are doing great things; we are building great public works. They tell us that they are building the Transcontinental Railway. We have heard of the Quebec bridge but that is the only part we have heard of yet. There is not a mile of their railway running yet.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is not right.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. How much is running?

Mr JOHNSTON. About 250 miles.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It may be open for traffic but it is not running. No time tables

have been issued. There is no doubt that the hon. gentleman is correct in saying that the road is practically finished but it is not running, or carrying the products of the country or passengers in the regular way. That has been built by the Grand Trunk and not by this government. The hon. gentleman is probably referring to the west. I am speaking of the part from Winnipeg to Moncton that the government is building, and I am speaking by the book when I say that there is not a mile of that road in a position to be operated yet. I believe the statement made here the other day by the minister that there was not a mile of that road running from Winnipeg to Moncton. It is going to cost a vast amount of money and for years we will not be realizing upon that work. This is a case which illustrates the extravagant expenditures of this government leading to financial loss and presenting an example of extravagance and graft that has been unequalled by any government since we were a country. There is no doubt about that.

These gentlemen may talk as they like in this House but they cannot deny the fact that under this government there have existed corrupting influences the like of which we have never seen before, and that there have been unearthed in this House scandals the like of which we have never before heard of either in quantity or in quality. The conscience of the hon. minister, in the words of Scripture, seems to have become seared like as with a hot iron. He knows in his heart that this graft has been going on in every department of the government and that in one session there were fifty disclosures of graft on the floor of this House, every one of which was as big as the great Pacific scandal on which Sir John Macdonald was turned out of power. And still the Minister of Customs says he has not heard of any steals. The hon. gentleman comes from the same county as I do and in the coming campaign I would like to meet him on the platform in Brantford and hear him tell the people that he has discovered no steals since he has been in office. We will have a good tempered debate among the people who know us both ; we will debate the question fore and aft and up and down and then the people can judge whether there has not been any stealing and graft about this government. I will have a few figures to show him that he will not be able to explain away. I was found fault with for one vote I gave on the French treaty and there are several votes that the Minister of Customs will have to give an account for. He will have to explain his vote in regard to all these land deals and these timber deals and this Merwin business and it will be pretty hard for him to answer for his conduct. I gave him one instance in his own department yesterday, and if we discovered that much by asking a single question, is it not likely that there are others to be discovered. The minister told us that he had investigated this matter, but if my information is correct he did not get at the bottom of it. My information is that this particular party who had to make $4,200 of a refund and who has not been prosecuted, has made a public boast that he is ahead of the game.

Mr. PATERSON. Are you accusing me of taking the money ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I am not accusing you of taking the money but I am accusing one of your servants, and I am pointing out that you have not administered any punishment to him, and although you have asked him to disgorge $4,200, I do not think you got all the money back. Do you hear that ?

Mr. PATERSON. I did not hear that.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Well, listen to it again. I am told that this man who refunded the $4,200 has made public boast that he is $10,000 ahead.

Mr. BENNETT. Send Falconer to look after him.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. We will have to get Bowser after him. The government is very liberal in getting American experts up here at a cost of $50,000 to the people to straighten out the books of one department to cover up the graft as some one has said. They want some one to cook their accounts. The accounts are pretty rank and won't keep without cooking. I am not surprised that they need cooking and frying and boiling to take the unsavory smell away. They smell very strongly of graft in many departments of the government and so the government had to send to the United States for expert bookkeepers and pay them $50,000. And yet the Minister of Customs says he knows nothing about graft. Had we not Canadians in this country who could do that bookkeeping work without sending to the United States and paying these men $75 a day and travelling expenses? The Minister of Marine deplored the crookedness on the other side of the line and he gloried that Canadians were not like the people there, but still when the government want their affairs straightened out they send to New York to get the men to do it.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Is the hon. gentleman aware that Mr. Falconer has audited the books of the Cockshutt Plough Company of Brantford, Ont.?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman may think he has asked a smart question. I am not a member of the board of directors of that company and I do not know whom they have employed. It is only the other day the Minister of Customs stated I had nothing to do with the management of that company. It is nearly twenty years

ago since I was president of the company, and I do not know whether Falconer or anybody else was employed by the company, but surely the government is not going to flatter the Cockshutt Company by saying that because it has employed Falconer the government must employ him also. At all events I think I will leave my hon. friend (Mr. Duncan Ross) to Bowser who has invited him out to Vancouver, and who will deal with him when he gets him there. I cannot tell whether the Cockshutt Plough Company employed Falconer or whether they did not.

Mr. BENNETT. Did they pay him $75 a day ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I do not think they would pay him $75 a day and I do not think they would pay him his expenses from New York, and I do not think they would pay $5 a day hotel bill when he only paid $2. Anyway, I think we have men in Canada competent to do any work of that kind for the government if it is necessary to have it done. I do not like these importations from the United States. If my hon. friend from Belleville (Mr. Porter) were here I think he could tell of one importation made by this government from the United States in the shape of a trick ballot box.

I remember very well the time when it was on exhibition in this House. The First Minister was here that day and he was not wearing his usual sunny smile. My hon. friend brought here two of those imported trick ballot boxes. We do not manufacture such things in this country, but they were brought in to carry one or more elections in the particular district from which my hon. friend comes. Therefore, when hon. gentlemen opposite import anything from across the line we are apt to be suspicious of them.

The axiom this government act upon is not how little they can spend, but how much they can spend. Since they have come into power the expenditure of this country has gone up by leaps and bounds, until it has reached a point beyond which it cannot go. The Finance Minister has admitted that the limit of taxation has been reached, and that he expects that next year about $6,000,000 less of revenue will be raised than was raised this year. During the past year this government have been borrowing money at 6 and 7 per cent and have been spreading more sail when every other institution in the country has been warned by the banks to draw in sail. Setting a pace, which, if followed by any business organization, would bring upon it ruin and disaster, they have decided that this is no time to cut down expenses, and we have to-night the spectacle of the Minister of Customs saying : We have spent immense sums; we are going to spend immense sums, and we glory in that expenditure. It would not be so bad if all this expenditure had been for works that were profitable and that were going to bring a revenue back to the country, but when we find a large portion of it going for purposes which are illegitimate and which are going to bring back nothing to the country, it is time we called a halt and asked these gentlemen to confine their expenditure within reasonable bounds. I find that the words that I speak on that subject are almost identical with the words spoken by Sir iRchard Cartwright with regard to an expenditure of only about one-third the size ten or twelve years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to trespass upon the time of the House any further. I have endeavoured to make a plain, straightforward statement with regard to the points brought up by hon. gentlemen opposite. I give them not as the views of any party or individual other than myself. I have endeavoured to set forth what I believe to be the true policy for this government to pursue, and that is, that they should immediately set about facing the present conditions by large retrenchments in public expenditure and by readjustment of the tariff to suit the needs of those industries that are languishing or dying out in this country, and that from now on the motto should be that every one who undertakes to furnish a dollar's worth of goods to this government is to give a hundred cents of value. If that is done, I am not a pessimist in regard to this country, but an optimist. But I do say that this country cannot and I think will not afford very much longer to pay $3 for one dollar's worth of goods as we have been doing in the last few years. Hon. gentlemen know that that has been the case, as instance after instance of it has been given. I believe that this government has now gone so far in that direction that the people have their eye upon it and have decided that the next time an appeal is made to them, the hon. leader of the opposition, R. L. Borden, is the man they will select to form the next government of this country, and then we shall have a clean, pure and honest administration.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and the debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Fisher, House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 20, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No 124) for the relief of Andrew Walker—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 131) respecting the Occidental Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 132) to incorporate the Standard Accident and Guarantee Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 123) to amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act.—Mr. Fisher.

Bill (No. 133) to amend the Boards of Trade Act.—Mr. Fielding.

## DEPORTATION OF HINDUS FROM VANCOUVER.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver). Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask a question of the Minister of the Interior, in consequence of an article which appears in this morning's 'Citizen,' which I will read :

122 Hindus detained—Chief justice induced to sign habeas corpus order.

Vancouver, March 19.—Developments in connection with the ordered deportation of Hindus who arrived by the steamer 'Monteagle' are expected to-day. Late yesterday afternoon the 'Empress of Japan' cleared for Yokohama with only 35 of the 183 men ordered to be deported, on board. The 35 were deported because they are either ill or penniless, and no one attempted to keep them in the country.

The chief justice yesterday gave to counsel for the Canadian Pacific Railway an order for bringing into court to-day of the bodies of 142 Hindus on habeas corpus proceedings. This order was obtained without consultation with the officers or the counsel for the Dominion government. These officers now claim that the affidavits which induced the chief justice to give the order purported to be signed by the Hindus in custody of the government, who have never signed anything since arriving in Vancouver.

Dr. Munro, immigration inspector, on Tuesday ordered the deportation of all the Hindus by the 'Empress,' and yesterday gave no permission for her leaving port without taking them. Government officials therefore declare that the Canadian Pacific Railway is liable for $14,000.

I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of the Interior if he has any information in relation to this matter, if this despatch is true, and if there has been such a high handed proceeding on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I would like to ask him also if the government have taken any action, or purpose taking any action, in face of their own well defined orders, which were evidently not carried out by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The matter has been brought to the attention of the Department of the Interior, and has been the subject of considerable communication, by reason of a telegram from Dr. Munro, which I will read :

Vancouver, British Columbia, March 18.
W. D. Scott,
Superintendent of Immigration, Ottawa.

Canadian Pacific Railway refused to obey deportation order for 142 Hindus ex 'Monteagle' claiming they obtained order from Chief Justice Hunter to detain until to-morrow. Order obtained illegally, as I or no one else connected with government was served with writ or anything else, thereby giving no opportunity to oppose: would recommend action at once to hold 'Empress' at Victoria. Have notified company that penalty will be exacted.

(Sgd.) A. S. MUNRO.

Dr. Munro has been instructed to hold these people until the legal proceedings have been decided. The Department of Justice have been communicated with in order to ensure proceedings being taken to exact the penalty, if this can be done by process of law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What policy has been adopted in connection with the entrance into Canada of Japanese and Hindoos respectively ?

Mr. OLIVER. The same policy is being followed in each case, both Japanese and Hindus are subject to the same provision of exclusion or deportation. The provisions of the Act or the regulations which apply to Japanese and Hindus, I may say, apply equally to all other people.

## PASSAGE OF UNITED STATES WARSHIPS THROUGH CANALS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the Prime Minister whether any permission has recently been asked in connection with the passage of United States war vessels through the canals to the Great Lakes or whether any negotiations are now pending in connection with obtaining such permission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No negotiations are pending upon any such subject. Occasionally permission has been asked by the American authorities to pass not a war vessel but a training ship through the canals and permission has been granted.

## WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding, that the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Brandon). Mr. Speaker, I desire at the outset to congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) upon the most excellent address which he has given us in his presentation of the financial affairs of the country during the last financial year. I have read his speech with great care and I think the members

on both sides will agree that the hon. gentleman's presentation was as nearly a model of what a budget speech ought to be as it would be possible to have. We have the advantage of having in that address a most lucid and satisfactory explanation of the financial affairs of the country in a very small compass and therefore in such shape that it is not difficult for any person to secure a clear and definite idea of the many and complicated financial transactions of the country during the period to which it refers.

My hon. friend who followed him (Mr. Foster) has given us, as usual, a lengthy and able disquisition upon the affairs of the country for the last 20 or 25 years, and while I do not desire in the slightest degree to detract from the value of the hon. gentleman's utterances, I may say that I do not think the requirements of debate necessitate a continued discussion of subjects which have long since passed or should have passed into the limbo of forgotten things. I do not believe that either the House or the country takes more than a languid interest in the question whether the rate of taxation from 1878 to 1896 was 31·45 per cent or 31·42 per cent. I believe that while those comparisons might have been of some use during the period which immediately followed the accession of the right hon. gentleman who now leads the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to office, their usefulness has long since passed away. and with all deference might I suggest that while hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are no doubt quite justified in exercising their own judgment as to what they should put before the country when they appeal to the electors for support in political addresses outside of this House, in this House at least it would be to our own advantage and to the advantage of the country if we should debate rather what we are doing and propose to do than what we have done during a long period of years.

There is one point of real importance in connection with the presentation of the budget by the Minister of Finance, that is as to the question of the raising of revenue. It is the most important question perhaps with which the Finance Minister deals in his budget speech. While most of the information given is before the House and the country in one form or another in the books that are furnished to us, the principles adopted in the raising of the revenue are properly a subject of debate when the Finance Minister makes his financial statement in the House, and it is of interest then for us to know what are the differences between the gentlemen on this side of the House and their political opponents in connection with this question. We have adopted a tariff which has now been in force for a good many years in Canada; it is a tariff based upon certain principles, inaugurated some years ago under the financial administration of the present Minister of Finance. That tariff has been avowedly based upon the idea of a moderately protective tariff with certain features such as the preference and the commercial treaties, &c., introduced for the purpose of giving elasticity to our commercial system. That has been the general line of our tariff legislation and it is interesting for us now, after it has been in operation for a good many years, when it is subjected to criticism by gentlemen on the other side of the House, to note just in what respects they attack the method of raising the revenue, the general financial system and how they would alter it if they had the opportunity of doing so. We have listened to the hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who gave a disquisition upon the finances of the country, but we have not found anything in that lengthy address which indicates that gentlemen on the other side of the House are able to find fault successfully with the financial system which has been inaugurated and is now being carried out by the Minister of Finance. That is to say, we do not find in any definite expression of opinion or any resolution proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite that they are able to find a distinct and definite fault with the system of raising the revenue or would change that system if they had the opportunity of doing so to-morrow. If, therefore, that system is capable of sustaining the criticism of gentlemen on the other side of the House, and they are not able to suggest an improvement, we may fairly conclude that the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that he thought the tariff to be fairly well adjusted to the needs of Canada at the present time, is a statement well justified by the facts.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) spoke as to the financial necessities of the country during the next few years and of the possible difficulty that the Minister of Finance would find in conducting the financial affairs of the country owing to the fact that he would require to renew a certain number of loans; and upon this point it may not be out of place to give an expression of opinion. The financial condition of the world is a subject that it is important for us to understand and to take advantage of in dealing with our own finances. There are a few features in connection with the financial situation which I think might give to the Minister of Finance and the government and the House a certain amount of confidence in coming to the conclusion that no immediate difficulty awaits us.

The fact of the matter is that the late panic in the United States, and that which approached a panic in other countries, was due very largely to an excess of speculation in certain quarters. We all know that for some time previous to that

panic it was difficult to secure proper attention to investments in what might be called gilt-edged securities, such as the bonds and debentures of Canada are. It was found that those who had money to invest were rather inclined to invest it in securities of a somewhat speculative character, and it will, I fancy, be found in the light of the result that has followed in the European money market that it will be less difficult to float government loans during the next two or three or four years than it has been in the last two, three or four years, and that, owing to the fact that investors have ceased to have confidence in speculative investments, there will be an accumulation of money which will be available for investment in government bonds, so that the Minister of Finance, in all probability, will find it much easier during the next few years than he has found it in the past to place his loans upon the market. I do not doubt, from what little knowledge I have of the circumstances, that that will be the result. Therefore, while I do not minimize the necessity for caution and care in connection with the management of our finances, I do not think the Finance Minister need have any fear that the credit of Canada will not stand the very slight strain which will be put upon it.

It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to detain the House at great length, and I propose to devote the little time I intend to take up to suggesting what I think ought to be done in the future rather than to discussing these things which have been done in the past.

The first thing to which I wish to direct attention is the desirability of taking action in a direction which has been suggested in the public press at various times and which has received consideration in some quarters, but which, I think, has never been discussed in the House. I refer to the establishment of a thoroughly organized department, or rather the changing or reorganization of a department for the purpose of dealing thoroughly and completely with the question of foreign trade in this country. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had a few grains of wheat in the volume of —I will not call it chaff—but the volume of oratory which he presented to us, and one of the grains of wheat I detected was his suggestion that some department of government ought to be organized in such a way as to collect carefully and systematically information in regard to the internal business of the country. But my hon. friend might have gone further, because, while that information is of value, it is of value largely for statistical purposes unless it be utilized in another way, and it ought to be utilized by a complementary system of Canadian consular trade agents in other countries, who should be thoroughly qualified to deal with the questions which would come before them. I shall simply bring this matter before the House so that it may be discussed, and so that in the future—I hope the near future—some action may be taken. Nor do I intend to reflect in the slightest degree upon the Department of Trade and Commerce as it exists at present. It was organized for a certain purpose, and when it was organized, as I understand, it was largely supposed to be a statistical department for the purpose of putting in form the statistics which were practically prepared by other departments of the government. From time to time it has enlarged its scope under the pressure of circumstances, but it has never been decided by the government or by parliament, as a matter of policy, that that department should be organized for the purpose of collecting and furnishing the necessary information respecting trade matters and organizing a thorough and complete system of trade agencies in other countries. I believe the time has come when such a system of trade agencies ought to be established. If hon. gentlemen will look at the reports and papers which are available with regard to trade at the present time, in the case of our trade with Japan, to take it as an illustration, they will find that at present we are not getting our share of the trade with that country. They will find also that we are actually furnishing the goods to the United States merchants who are selling them to Japan and getting a considerable portion of the profit in that trade, all of which ought to come to Canada. That is because the proper means are not furnished for bringing Canadian merchants and manufacturers into communication with the would-be purchasers in Japan. I believe also that we could largely increase our trade with Great Britain; that we could, owing to the French treaty, largely increase our trade with France; and that we could greatly increase our trade with South Africa, South America, the land of political revolutions, is at present going through an industrial revolution; South America, populated as it is by a people who have not the capacity that northern peoples have for commerce and manufacturing industry, is going to furnish a great market for the manufacturing and industrial nations of the world. Canada ought to get a share of that trade, and we ought to have the question looked into thoroughly and properly by competent men. But unless we have a proper system and have men properly trained for the purpose, it is impossible we should get the advantages that otherwise would accrue. Now, it is perfectly true that we have not got any men in Canada at the present time qualified to act in this capacity, but in the process of organization we should take the best men we could get. If the Minister of Trade and Commerce went out to-day to look for a commercial agent to send to South America, I do not suppose that in the whole Dominion of Canada he could get a man thoroughly qualified for the post. In the

first place, that man would have to speak Spanish; and, in the next place, he would have to be thoroughly acquainted with the commercial relations of this country, and have at his finger's end the commercial statistics. We could not get such a man as that to-day. But if we can train scientists and geologists to go into the field; if we can train men for other pursuits in life, surely we can go to the trouble of training men to deal with that most important subject in connection with the commerce of Canada. Our universities are turning out graduates by the hundreds every year, men of the best qualification, the best blood and the best brains of the country. Many of these young men would be glad to take a special course to qualify themselves for positions such as I speak of if they only had the assurance that after they had gone through the necessary preparation they would get employment. I do not desire to enlarge upon this subject; I simply desire to put it before the House in the hope that its importance may be recognized, and in order that the government may give the matter full and careful consideration, and if possible take some action.

Connected with that is another subject on which I wish to touch briefly. In doing so it may bring me into slight conflict with the rules of the House, because this matter is mentioned in resolutions which are on the Order Paper, but as I do not expect to be here when these resolutions are discussed, I may be permitted to trespass on the courtesy of the House to express my opinion. Closely connected with the subject to which I have referred is another subject which has been discussed in this country during the last year, and which will probably be discussed at still greater length in this House before the session is over. I refer to the question of reform of the civil service. This, I think, is a question of great importance. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), while leader of the opposition in the Ontario legislature, declared himself in favour of the reform of the civil service of his province. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), greatly to his credit, I think, has, for the first time in Canada, put in the forefront of his platform a plank in favour of civil service reform.

For my part I would be delighted if the right hon. leader of the government could join with the hon. leader of the opposition and perform for the public of Canada the very great service of removing the public service entirely from political patronage and putting it on a higher plane. We are all members of parliament, we have all been through this business ourselves and we know all about it. I am not going to discuss it at length, but every member of parliament knows that the greatest nuisance in connection with public life concerns the dealing with questions of patronage. Every minister knows the same thing. It is an entire mistake if anybody supposes that dealing with these questions is a political advantage to the government in power. It is not a political advantage to the government in power, and it is no political advantage to any member of parliament. Take the case, for instance, of appointing a collector of customs or a postmaster; how many members of this House have ever got any advantage by the exercise of patronage in a case of that kind? Take the case of appointing a clerk to the customs office in Vancouver, or in Montreal or in Halifax; how is he appointed? The minister asks the member to make a recommendation, and the member writes to some one in one of these cities, he gets back the name of a person, whom he does not know and as to whose qualifications he knows nothing, and the man is appointed without the minister knowing anything about him or his qualifications. There is no other way to do it under the present system. It was done by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House when they were in power; it is done by us when we are in power. Possibly owing to the natural virtue of Canadian citizens the results have uot been as bad as they might have been, yet, obviously, this is not the best system under which the public service of the country can be carried on. There is a better system, and, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that while I know the feelings of many members of parliament upon the subject, I am sure that Canada will outgrow this system pretty soon, that the people of Canada will demand that it be changed, and it is the duty of a progressive parliament to anticipate the enlightened sentiment of the country and put these reforms into practical shape before they are forced to do so by the abuses which the people will no longer stand. I want to say another word on this subject. In England they tell me that the graduates of Oxford, of Cambridge and of the great public educational institutions are constantly appointed in large numbers to the public service and a distinguished graduate of Oxford told me a few months ago in London that the greatest blow that could be given to the great universities in Great Britain would be for the government to withdraw that patronage from them because the fact that large numbers of these graduates are going into the public service sustains the work of the universities and enables them to understand the work for which they are preparing their young men and to keep it steadily in view. What have we in Canada? From one end of Canada to the other we have universities. In my judgment they are most creditable to the people of Canada. In the face of great difficulties these institutions of learnings have been established, they are turning young men out by the

hundreds every year and every person who is familiar with college life in Canada knows that perhaps there are not more than half of the men who are trained by our universities, which are carried on at great expense by the country either directly or indirectly, who want to go into professional or business life on their own account. They prefer for one reason or another to have some clerical occupation and we all know perfectly well that thousands of these young men have left Canada and gone elsewhere for the purpose of getting the occupation that they could not get here. All those graduates of Canadian universities, instead of seeking occupations elsewhere, should go into the public service of Canada. It would be a good thing for the public service and it would establish a connection between the educational institutions and the public service of Canada, which would be of the greatest possible benefit, on the one hand to the universities, and on the other, to the public service because there would not be that divorce between our educational institutions and our public service which exists at the present time. Our educational institutions now have many men who are thoroughly up in connection with the study of sociological questions and questions of that kind. We are now passing from the condition of a simply pastoral community, and we have questions arising of the most complicated character in connection with our affairs, we have to call in from time to time the services of men who have made a special study of these questions and it is in the highest degree desirable that between the educational institutions and the government there should be a close and intimate relationship established. I believe that the development of this idea in connection with civil service reform would be of the greatest benefit to the public service as well as to our educational institutions.

There are a couple of questions in regard to the western part of our country which I desire to direct attention for a few moments. I need not, I think, apologize in this House for directing attention to western affairs because I think we have all arrived at the conclusion that the prosperity of the whole of Canada depends very largely upon the prosperity of that section of the community and we look for the continued growth and development of eastern Canada to the advantages which shall be derived directly and indirectly from western growth. There has been a great deal said in connection with the subject of immigration. I am not going to discuss that subject at length but only one phase of it. While there may be some questions in regard to the character of the immigrants, I think there is nobody who is familar with the facts of the case will say that there is any doubt that the immigrants we have received from the western states have been, in almost every case, of the most unexceptionable character and have contributed very greatly to the development of our western country. Further than that I desire to say that I do not think that any country could possibly get a better class of settlers than the western American settlers who have come into our Northwest provinces. They are vigorous, resourceful, law-abiding, they become citizens the day they arrive in the country and at the earliest possible moment they become producers. For the last year or two there has been some falling off in connection with the movement from the western states, but I am glad to say that the movement has set in again and that the prospects for the coming season with regard to immigration from the western states are remarkably bright. In connection with that matter I desire to make a suggestion which I trust the government will see its way clear to carry out, and that is in regard to the railway grant lands which are now in the hands of the government for disposal. I find that of the railway land grant lands, that is to say the odd numbered sections reserved by the government in former years for satisfying land grants to railway companies, there has been left over after the complete satisfaction of all railway land grants, something like 30,000,000 acres and that, permit me to say, is not land which lies in what we may call the northern part of the territory but is in a portion of the prairie provinces which has been surveyed and is therefore regarded as being available for immediate settlement. What I suggest in connection with this matter is that this land should be thrown open for homestead entry. I am satisfied that nothing would do more to promote the prosperity of Canada or to increase the stream of settlers from the western states, a most desirable class of settlers, than to throw these lands open for homestead entry and let them be homesteaded by these western settlers at the earliest possible moment, with certain exceptions to which I desire to refer in a moment or two.

Speaking generally I am satisfied that the experience of Canada in the last twelve or fifteen years has shown that the foundation of the success of her colonization policy has been the offering of free lands and that the putting of a small price on these lands would not be a benefit to the country because that would to some extent cripple the settlers and to the same extent retard production. I am satisfied that the result of throwing these lands open for homestead entry would be at once to double the stream of immigration from the United States, and I venture the suggestion that if that were done we should not hear, after six months from the opening of these lands to settlement, any more about dull times

or lack of confidence in that western country. But I would make certain reserves in connection with these lands. I would not open for homestead entry the whole of the 30,000,000 acres, but would reserve one-tenth or about 3,000,000 acres in order that they might be held unsold until a later day, some ten or twelve years from now, under the same plan as is followed with regard to the school lands. If you reserve 3,000,000, in ten or twelve years from now that will be worth from $10 to $12 an acre at the least, and you will have provided a fund of some $30,000,000 out of which the government will recoup itself for a certain outlay it will have to incur at a very early day. I refer to the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway. The people of western Canada are set in their view that the construction of that railway at a very early date is an essential to the prosperity and proper development of our country, and we will all agree that it ought not to be constructed in such a way as to impose a burden on the exchequer of Canada. I am not going to anticipate the debate that will probably take place on that subject in a few days, but it is clear, from the information which has been placed before us, that the navigation of the bay is practicable three and a half to four months in the year, and that the navigation of the straits can be rendered safe by our taking the proper means. It is perfectly clear also that there are great resources in the bay and the territory surrounding it. Instead of the land from the present terminus of the Canadian Northern, some 500 miles to the bay, being barren, it has great resources which, if properly developed, will prove of untold value. Added to those facts, there is this, that north of the surveyed land in Alberta and Saskatchewan, north of the 30,000,000 acres to which I have referred as being surveyed and now in the territory immediately eligible for settlement, there are 100,000,000 acres of land which will be available for disposal by the government and for settlement as soon as closer communication is afforded. The opening of that northern territory by the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway is what will bring that 100,000,000 acres into communication with the rest of the world and give it a value that will far exceed any possible expenditure on the construction of the railway itself. If the plan I suggest should be followed, there would be absolutely no burden imposed on the exchequer of the country. This question of the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway has been before parliament for some twenty years, but so far no government has submitted to parliament any proposition of a definite character. The question is surrounded with difficulties. One of these difficulties is that, under any arrangement which might be suggested or proposed by a government to a company to assist the company in building the railway, the government would have to provide sufficent money to build the railroad, and probably more, in order to induce any company to assume the burdens they would have to assume in connection with its construction. So that there has been extreme difficulty in any government facing the question and devising a proposition likely to receive the approval of the people. I am not an advocate of the construction and operation of railways by the government. I have no faith whatever in the idea that when a public utility is being properly carried on by a corporation there is any sense in the government taking it out of the hands of the individuals or corporations and driving them out of business on the plea that the government can do the work better. Everybody knows it cannot. For my part I have not the slightest faith in that idea, and I would like that other gentlemen who likewise do not believe in it in the slightest degree would say they do not. Too many of us are inclined to hedge on questions of this kind because we think public opinion may be strong upon them. But of course public opinion is apt to be strong on a question in an improper direction if the men who take a healthy view of it are afraid to say what they think. I am not in favour of the government acquiring public utilities when these utilities are well carried on by individuals or corporations, simply on the idea that the government will do better. But there are cases in which a company cannot be got to undertake an enterprise on a commercial basis. A case of that kind was the construction of the Temiskaming and Northern Railway. I think the Ontario government were perfectly justified in building that railway because the value of that northern country was at the time unknown and this enterprise was taken up simply as a colonization proposition. In like manner the Dominion government would be justified in building the 500 miles of railway to Hudson bay as a government work provided it first took the precaution to protect itself by making a reservation of land which would be ample to pay the exchequer every dollar of the money expended. Such a reservation would pay the cost of the railway, the wharfs, the elevators and everything connected with it, besides the lighting and buoying of the bay, the surveying of the channel and all kindred expenses—all of which would be recouped entirely to the government out of the proceeds of the land reserves, and thus the whole thing would not cost the people a copper.

I am taking up, I think, the time of the House longer than I ought, but I am going to ask the House to listen to me while I say a few words upon a subject which has been somewhat discussed in the press and which is known, whether rightly or wrongly, as the All Red Route. I may say at the outset that I have not the slightest

intention of offering to the House an exhaustive discussion of the subject because that would involve going into details and figures which would be wearisome and would not add anything in the long run to an intelligent appreciation of the subject. If the government should bring this matter before the House, they will no doubt furnish all the figures and details and hon. members will have then an opportunity of studying them better than they would if I were to give them at present. When the conference, which took place last spring between the various colonies of the empire, met in Great Britain, they passed a resolution which no doubt hon. members are quite familiar with, but which, for the purpose of forming a basis for discussion, I shall take the liberty of reading. The resolution of the conference is asfollows :

That, in the opinion of this conference, the interests of the empire demand that, in so far as practicable, its different portions should be connected by the best possible means of mail communcation, travel and transportation, and that, to this end, it is advisable that Great Britain should be connected with Canada, and, through Canada, with Australia and New Zealand by the best service available within reasonable cost;

That for the purpose of carrying the above project into effect, such financial support as may be necessary should be contributed to Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand in equitable proportions.

Now, some of the members of the press in Canada have asked : What is the scheme known as the 'All-red Route' ?—how did it originate ?—where did it come from ? Well, this is the scheme and this is where it originated—in the passing of this resolution by the conference. All the parties to the conference agreed to the resolution, so that this resolution is the unanimous expression of opinion of all the participants in that conference. Therefore, we may take it as fairly and definitely settled that Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand and Australia have committed themselves to the principle of an improvement in their means of communication, the greatest and the best improvement that can be made at reasonable expense.

My business took me to England last fall. Before going I had some conversation with my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) upon this subject; and, as I had taken a great interest in the matter, it was arranged that I should, informally and unofficially, do what I could to promote the movement in favour of carrying out this resolution. I think the House will readily understand that there are a great many things to be done before a formal resolution of this kind will result in anything practical. There are diverse interests to conciliate or overcome, there is a vast amount of ignorance upon the various departments of the subject to dissipate, and there are difficulties of an internal character in regard to negotiations to be surmounted. Then, there was the question—a very serious question in Great Britain—whether public opinion would justify the government of that country in undertaking a large financial support for this scheme. While all the different governments were united in their declaration of a desire to carry out this proposition, it would be a different thing, as we all can understand, before they could be asked to agree upon a definite proposition as to how much should be devoted to the work. I think the position of things in England improved somewhat during last year, and I did what I could to bring about an improvement during the short visit I made to London. I had the opportunity of discussing the subject, unofficially and informally, with the President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Lloyd-George, on several occasions, and with the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The conversation we had, of course, may not be repeated, and, in any event, as they were not official or formal, they could not be made the basis of an engagement. But I may say without indiscretion that I feel satisfied, as a result of what I saw and heard, that, when Canada, Australia and New Zealand go to the government of Great Britain with a definite proposition upon the subject, they can count upon not only serious but sympathetic consideration for that proposition. That is as far as one can go in connection with the subject, and as far as we would expect anybody to go even though we did bring it formally before them at an earlier stage of the negotiations.

Now, what, in reality was the scheme which the delegates of the Imperial Conference had in mind when they brought this subject forward ? They had something definite in mind, though it was not set out in the resolution. What they had in mind was a service from Great Britain to Canada of steamships equal in equipment and service to the best upon the Atlantic and giving an average speed of 24 knots. They had in mind also the idea of the fastest possible service across Canada, and a service from Vancouver to New Zealand, and thence to Australia, by ships of about 9,000 tons burden, making an average speed of 18 knots on the Pacific. The discussions that have been held have been based upon the idea that the service would be of this class.

As matters stand at present, New Zealand is very badly served in regard to her mail service. The service by way of San Francisco has broken down entirely, and, at present, New Zealand gets her mail by way of Australia, the service taking 38 days from London, England, to New Zealand. The service by the plan proposed would take mail from London to the Canadian port in less than 5 days, to Vancouver in 9 days and from London to New Zealand in not more than 25 days. Thus, New Zealand would gain 13 days in her mail service.

Australia would not gain anything in time, because her service goes the other way; but she would have an alternative route which would be of considerable value to her. I may say while on that point, that it is admitted by all parties that the route for this Pacific service must be by way of New Zealand to Australia. There are technical steamship reasons for that; but the fact is admitted that if you are to have a fast service from Vancouver, it must go to New Zealand first and then to Australia. There are no difficulties upon the Pacific in regard to this service—that is, no natural difficulties; the natural difficulties are all upon the Atlantic side.

There are a number of things that have to be considered in connection with the service. The first series of questions which we have to consider—which I do not desire to discuss at length, but only briefly to mention—relate to the physical side. Calculations have been made and discussions have been carried on on the basis of the service being from Liverpool to Halifax in winter and from Liverpool to Quebec in the summer. I have no desire to express any opinion as to the subject where the terminal points should be. If I were to express an opinion on that subject, that opinion would be the one I have already expressed—that the winter port should be Halifax and the summer port Quebec. But, obviously, no one can be committed to that at the present time. The governments of Great Britain and Canada have to agree upon the subject, and then they have to agree with the company that is to carry the scheme into effect, and then will be the time for the question of ports to be settled. Meantime, we can only discuss it hypothetically on the basis of these ports, and consider how we are to meet any difficulties that may be raised in regard to the physical questions of the case. The distances may be compared as follows:

Liverpool to Halifax, 2,485 knots.
Liverpool to Quebec, south of Cape Race, 2,801 knots.
Liverpool to Quebec, via Belle Isle, 2,633 knots.
Liverpool to New York by the shortest actual route is 3,026 knots.

Thus, Halifax has an advantage of 541 knots over New York; Quebec, by the southern route, has an advantage of 225 knots, and by the Belle Isle route of 393 knots over New York. Now, the computation of time for the best steamers is generally made from Daunt's Rock, just outside of Queenstown, to Sandy Hook. While this affords a mode of comparing the performance of different vessels, it does not give us much information as to what the actual length of the voyage is in time. As a matter of fact a 24-knot boat going from Liverpool to Halifax, and allowing four hours for loss of time and for delays in getting away, would go in four days and twelve hours; from Liverpool to Quebec via Belle Isle, allowing six hours for delay, it would go in four days and twenty hours, from Liverpool to Quebec via Cape Race it would go in five days and six hours. The actual time of the 'Lusitania' when she first broke the record on the Atlantic, was five days, eighteen hours and fourteen minutes, and I think she has clipped an hour or two off that since. So the time saved as between Liverpool and New York and Halifax would be one whole day and six hours, via Cape Race, twelve hours, via Belle Isle, 22 hours. That gives the actual saving in time, taking it for granted that you have a boat of the same class as regards speed as the 'Lusitania' or the 'Mauretania.'

Now as to the possibility of getting a boat of that kind, there can be no serious question, because I have in my possession, for the purpose of getting information on the subject, a definite offer from a company whose ability to construct a vessel like that is beyond question. The mere mention of the name would be quite sufficient to satisfy everybody. I have a definite offer for the construction of a vessel of 20,000 tons, equipped in every respect as the 'Lusitania' or 'Mauretania,' and capable of making 24 knots in ordinary weather, or a 25 knot boat. So it would not be necessary to have a boat constructed of the size of the 'Mauretania' or 'Lusitania' in order to get a speed of 24 knots. That is a most important point, because we could not put a boat of that size upon the Canadian route, there would not be sufficient traffic for it. I may say upon the question of the cost of ships, that an estimate was got from a responsible firm at the request of one of the officers of the Canadian government, so that there might be definite information on the subject.

There has been a good deal of discussion regarding the physical difficulties of the route. I had occasion to make some remarks in London on that phase of the question, and at once a very serious discussion arose as to the accuracy of the statements I had made, and the hostility of a certain portion of the press became distinctly manifest. And when it is remembered that the insurance underwriters have a distinct interest in maintaining a certain position in regard to Canadian traffic, it will be evident what the source of some at least of the hostility is. I took the trouble to go very carefully through the press criticisms of the remarks I made, and revise and examine again the source of the information, and I did not see that any successful attempt had been made to controvert the substantial accuracy of what I had said. What I said was substantially this, that so far as the question of fogs is concerned upon the route between Halifax and Liverpool, that had been fully and thoroughly investigated by the American Hydrographic Survey, and we were in a position to know—not to sur-

mise, but to know—by actual observation of the most careful and scientific character, what was the prevalence of fog upon the Canadian route, and what was the prevalence of fog upon the American route, and what the relative percentage of fog is. The Hydrographic Survey have fog charts prepared in which they show the percentage of days during which fog is met with. You can draw a line upon these charts from Halifax to New York and from Halifax to Quebec, and the line will run through a series of squares which are marked showing the percentage of fog upon those particular days, and you can average out the exact percentage of fogs which any vessel will meet in certain months in the year by going along that line. As a result of the comparison, I think those members of the House who have not given special attention to the subject will be gratified to know that the tabulated result of the comparison shows that the average fog on the Canadian route is three and a half per cent, and the average on the New York route is eight per cent. As a matter of fact the heaviest fog is just outside New York for a short distance eastward. On the New York route the maximum fog averaged on a quarter of a voyage—dividing the voyage into quarters so as to get as large a scope of comparison as possible—the New York maximum fog average is twenty-seven and a half per cent, and the Canadian maximum is twenty-three per cent; the New York maximum on the whole voyage is sixteen per cent and the Canadian maximum eleven per cent. So the idea that the course followed by vessels on the Canadian route is seriously impeded by fog from Halifax eastward is an entire mistake. As a matter of fact, there is twice as much fog on the American route as on the Canadian route.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask my hon. friend how long a period these averages are based upon?

Mr. SIFTON. I cannot answer my hon. friend exactly. I will get him the chart, so that he may acquire definite information. But it goes back for a considerable length of time, and the percentage is worked out very carefully by the hydrographic office at Washington.

Mr. SAM HUGHES Has the hon. gentleman any record of the distance from the shore of the fog banks on the United States route and those on the Canadian route?

Mr. SIFTON. The chart is a map of the ocean, and the percentage of fog is shown in little square units upon the surface of the water, so that you can see exactly what the fog is and what is the percentage.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are the dense fog banks nearer the Canadian or the American shore?

Mr. SIFTON. The American chart does not extend further than just inside the gulf of the St. Lawrence, or in that neighbourhood. I was going to refer to the fact to which my hon. friend has called attention. After you get out of the region which has been charted by the American Hydrographic Survey, the geographer of this government is making a further chart. He has not yet got the whole information, but from a conversation I had with him a little while ago I think the result will show that there is not a large percentage of fog even in the gulf, and that we shall be agreeably disappointed when the results of that inquiry are carefully tabulated. I have referred to that matter because I found in London a most determined stand taken by everybody with whom I discussed the question of fogs. They seem to have the idea, which it is almost impossible to eradicate, that on the Canadian route the further north you go the worse you find the fog, whereas as a matter of fact the further north you go the less fog you find upon the ocean.

Then there is the question of ice. I discussed that very fully and had others discuss that with Canadian Pacific captains. As a matter of fact there is no serious difficulty on the subject of ice at all. The captain of the 'Empress of Ireland,' who is a most experienced and competent man, told me that the ice did not give him any embarrassment at all, that it merely had the effect, from December to May, of requiring a slight deviation to the south. The ice comes down by the coast of Newfoundland, and from December to May there is necessarily a slight deviation to the south, growing a little more each month until the month of May, and then they are able to take a more northerly route again. So all the navigators agree that there is no serious danger to be apprehended from the subject of ice.

On the subject of losses on the St. Lawrence, we had considerable discussion on that question in London. An attempt was made to show that the statistics that were furnished by those who advocate this route were not reliable. I sent to the office of the Board of Trade Mr. White, the Canadian geographer, and he went carefully through all the statistics furnished by the Board of Trade, with the result that it was shown that the figures we had given were substantially accurate.

The difficulty is that when they are talking about losses upon the St. Lawrence route they count in against you every little coasting vessel that happens to run against a rock, everything in the shape of a vessel of more than a few hundred tons is counted a vessel lost on the St. Lawrence. You do not find this on any other route in the world. A vessel going out of New York harbour and perhaps running into the coast 100 miles north of New York is not counted against New York, but they follow some such

system on the St. Lawrence route and it takes a careful examination to show the real facts in connection with the St. Lawrence route.

The truth of the matter is that from 1880 to 1907 between Quebec and Liverpool and between Halifax and Liverpool, which are the routes of which we are talking, only five passenger vessels, properly so called, were lost, and passenger vessels are of course all we have to consider. That is not a bad record. Upon investigation three of these were shown to have been lost on account of lack of experience or lack of care on the part of the navigators. One was lost in such a way that we may fairly consider the loss was due to the dangers of the route. One other was lost in such a way that investigation showed that if proper soundings had been taken the vessel could not have been lost. Thus from 1880 to 1907 on this route only one passenger vessel, properly so called, has been lost owing to the dangers of the route. Obviously the question of the dangers of the route has been exaggerated by the opponents of the scheme.

Careful investigation has been made for the purpose of ascertaining the cost of such a service as I have been speaking of, and while it is very difficult to arrive at anything very clear and definite upon the subject, an effort has been made to make the calculation as definite as possible and I think the conclusion which has been arrived at and which I am about to state is a safe and reasonable conclusion and will be found to be justified by the facts, if an attempt is made to verify them.

It is estimated that a 24 knot weekly service between Great Britain and Canada of the character I have spoken of and a fortnightly service between Vancouver and New Zealand and Sydney, Australia, would, in the whole, cost for subsidy £1,000,000 per annum. It has been suggested that a reasonable allocation of the proportions of that million pounds sterling to the various contracting parties would be:

| | |
|---|---|
| Australia.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | £ 75,000 |
| New Zealand.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 100,000 |
| Canada .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 325,000 |
| Great Britain.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 500,000 |

Thus the three colonies concerned would contribute about one-half the total amount of subsidy and Great Britain the other half. I think it might safely be said that New Zealand is willing to give the £100,000. As to Australia it is not so clear what her present position is. Great Britain awaits a definite proposal on the part of the colonies concerned, Australia, New Zealand and Canada, and we may therefore say that the present position of the project is that it awaits definite action on the part of the government and parliament of Canada looking to the co-operation of New Zealand and Australia and then to a definite proposition being presented to the government of Great Britain.

At the present time, judging from the payments of last year, we pay about $680,000 a year for the Canadian-Australian service and for the Atlantic mail service, so that by the proposed distribution we would have to pay in addition to what we are paying now for these services from $900,000 to $950,000. That, therefore, would represent the amount of money which Canada would have to pay in order to bring about this very greatly improved service.

When you come to consider the various arguments that may be advanced in favour of this proposal, you enter at once upon a very large field, a field that I do not propose to enter this afternoon. Briefly I think it may be conceded that the growth of Great Britain, of Canada, of Australia and of New Zealand has now arrived at that stage which justifies the people of those countries in coming to the conclusion that they are entitled to have the best service, the best method of communication that modern skill and modern science will enable them to have. They are all great, all wealthy, all increasing in prosperity, and, having united themselves together in an imperial organization—because at the imperial conference they did unite themselves into an imperial organization, the significance of which it is hardly possible to overestimate—and it is not less significant because the organization is more or less loose in its character; they at the same time declared that it was in the best interests of the organization that the best possible means of communication should prevail between these countries. It is now the question for the different component parts of the empire concerned to consider whether they are willing to pay the price. So far as Canada is concerned, what may be said to be the argument in favour of it from a commercial standpoint? You can put it in two or three words. At the present time, mail, passenger and freight service of the best and quickest character from here to Great Britain goes through the United States, and from Australia and New Zealand goes across the continent of Europe, it does not go by our own ports or our own territory. In other words, so far as travel and transportation are concerned, Canada is on the side street instead of on the main thoroughfare. What this proposition means is that Canada shall be put upon the thoroughfare instead of upon the side street. If I argued for a month I could not make it any plainer than that. All the great social, political and commercial advantages which come from being on the main avenue for this traffic would come to Canada if this scheme were carried into effect. There have been and there will be objections of a serious and difficult character to overcome. It has been said that certain corporations of an influential character are opposed to the pro-

ject. That is so to some extent in Great Britain as in Canada. I have seen statements made, for instance, by men connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway that indicated in some degree hostility to the project. To what extent their hostility goes I am not in a position to say. But railway companies have been opposed to things in Canada before, and these things have nevertheless, come to pass. The Grand Trunk Railway was not in the early days very much enamoured of the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, and in later days perhaps the Canadian Pacific Railway was not very much enamoured of the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific, but yet the Grand Trunk Pacific will be built. Thus, you cannot always look for guidance to the gentlemen who control the destinies of these great companies, and I for my part should feel very hopeful, nay sanguine, that if the matter is approached in a proper way we shall not have hostility on the part of these gentlemen or of the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway company in Canada. On the contrary, I would hope that if the governments of the colonies concerned met with the government of Great Britain, agreed upon a proper basis and decided upon this service being inaugurated, some means could be devised whereby the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Northern Railway and the Intercolonial Railway would all join together for the purpose of making this scheme the great success it ought to be, and if they do this with the influences that will be placed behind it, I have no doubt there will be very little difficulty in making it that success. I shall not attempt to discuss the project in detail, or to give other reasons, many of which will occur to every one in support of the project, but I have thought that the time had come to make a few remarks upon the subject and generally to state the position as it is to-day in the hope that interest may thereby be further excited in the subject and that the government may feel itself justified at an early date in taking a decided position in connection with this project.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House long and I hope I shall be more successful in the fulfilment of that hope than the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Sifton) who has spoken for an hour and ten minutes, when I am sure he desired to speak only about 40 or 50 minutes. I have listened to many budget speeches and to many other speeches on the same subject during many years past but it seems to me that the budget this year is a little different from those of other years. This year the budget speech of the Finance Minister is different from what it has been in the past. It sounded like a valedictory; it was not so buoyant nor so hopeful as usual. True we were promised a little less expenditure, and also a great deal less revenue, and we were told to be prudent and to look out for the rocks ahead. Well, in troubled waters like these the man at the helm needs to be careful, and cautious, and far-seeing and I think it is just as well that the ship of state should change its pilot. To-day we were treated to a very able speech from the member from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and that also partook of the characteristic of a valedictory. It was a moderate speech in a sense, and it would seem as if during the time he has been out of office he has somewhat mellowed his former ideas. Always interesting to listen to, the hon. gentleman was particularly interesting to-day, and he was not at all chary about giving his former colleagues in the government a great deal of advice on varied subjects. He seems to think that the government is not quite up to the mark; he feels they have not done as much for the Hudson bay route which has been before the country for twenty years as they might have done, and he certainly believes they have not taken sufficient interest in that famous all-red route about which we heard so much up to the opening of the present session but which since then seems to have vanished into thin air. It is quite possible that the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) having found it impossible to convince his colleagues privately, thinks he may now get the support of the House to force them to action in the direction which he desires. It is quite evident also that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) is not satisfied with the fiscal policy of the government. When he came here from the narrower sphere of political activity in the west in the year 1897, I do not think he expected to be a minister in a government which had a protective policy. It is certainly not what he had been preaching in the west and it was not in accordance with the advice which he had given to the premier when he visited Manitoba. But anyway, the hon. gentleman admitted to-day that the fiscal policy of Canada is a protective policy and he suggests that the opposition cannot criticise it because their policy is also a policy of protection. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that we do criticise the kind of protective policy which this government has put in force; let me tell him that we do think that a protective policy can not be properly nurtured by avowed enemies of protection. The hon. gentleman was frank enough to admit that the policy of the present government was a protective policy, but his fellow Liberals in this House and on the platform prefer to describe it as the 'Fielding Tariff.' Be that as it may, it is a tariff under which $15,000,000 worth of woollen goods have been imported into Canada to the destruction of the woollen industry of this country and to the great loss of the working men who are employed in that industry.

Let me say further that the Fielding tariff is a tariff by which millions of dollars worth of cotton, which should be made in Canada, have been imported here from foreign countries to the great detriment of the Canadian cotton industry. We shall therefore continue to criticise this policy inside the House and outside the House, and I hope we will be able to criticise it to such good effect that the people of Canada will realize that it is not a policy which conduces to the welfare of this country. My good friend the Minister of Customs, with that stentorian voice of his which shakes the walls of parliament, declared last night that he was perfectly satisfied that the policy in force to-day was the policy which the Liberal party promised before the elections of 1896 they would give effect to if returned to power.

Mr. PATERSON. I don't believe you were here at all last night.

Mr. BERGERON. Oh, yes, I was, and I never miss hearing my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, when it is possible for me to do so. But let me remind him that I was here also when he used to thunder from these opposition benches in the good old days before 1896 and I remember him declaring—with an even louder voice in those days because he was younger—that an expenditure of $38,000,000 on the public service was driving this country to bankruptcy and ruin. But to-day the Minister of Customs is smiling and happy when his government is spending $120,000,000 a year in the same country and with practically the same population. However, hon. gentlemen opposite are more subdued than they were in former years; perhaps they see the handwriting on the wall, and perhaps it is that some of them like the member for Brandon, are putting their house in order and telling the people of Canada what they would have done had they been allowed to remain in power longer. Referring again to the member for Brandon, rumour had it last fall that there was a desire on the part of the Prime Minister to get him back into the cabinet. We were told that a minister of the Crown was despatched to the shores of the St. Lawrence where the hon. gentleman was peacefully residing, with a request that he should again become a minister of the Crown, and the same rumour had it that the member for Brandon imposed certain conditions, amongst others the side-tracking of two old ministers of the Crown who do not sit in this House and of another cabinet minister who is sitting very near the right hon. gentleman at the present moment. Of course the right hon. gentleman, out of that goodness of heart which every one knows he possesses, refused to let his two old colleagues in the Senate and the gentleman who is sitting beside him to-day, disappear from public life. And so, the negotiations between the member for Brandon and the ambassador of the Prime Minister were broken off, and the present Minister of Railways got his portfolio. But the hon. gentleman from Brandon wants to show that his usefulness is not gone and that if a new Department of Trade and Commerce is organized (not a little department such as we have now but a large and important one) he is the very man to preside over that department and to extend the trade and commerce of Canada all through the nations of the world. The hon. gentleman has been travelling all summer, he has acquired a knowledge of the conditions in Europe, and he now hints, and his colleagues may probably consider it before the elections, that he is the man to fill the bill. How is it that the present government, possessing all the talents, according to the Liberal press, have never thought about that yet, as they have never thought about the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway? I was going to say that they had never thought about the all-red route but that would probably not be quite correct. They have thought about it but they have not been able to carry out the scheme. These are the things which the hon. member for Brandon advises them to do before he goes away. The principal reason for the speech which he has delivered was that he desired to bring to the attention of the government the all-red route, but he seems to have failed to impress hon. gentlemen opposite very much if we may judge by the applause which came from the other side of the House and therefore, I suppose, that the subject will be dropped.

To come back to the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), it will be remembered that last night he put the question to the House: How is it that to-day we are having such a revenue; how is it that we are spending so much money? The minister said that when the Conservatives were in power their revenue was not as high as our revenue, and consequently their expenditure was not as high as ours is. But my hon. friend will remember that the country has grown older. He will remember also that Canada was larger when the Conservatives were in power than it is to-day. Not only did we own more land in the Northwest, but we owned Alaska, of which we have been deprived since this government has been in power. It is not a bad thing to remember that everything which has been obtained by Canada, every addition that we have made to this country, has been obtained by the Conservative party, while every bit of territory that we have lost has been lost during the incumbency in office of the Liberal party. I just wish to remind the hon. Minister of Customs of this fact, because when he makes one of those wonderful speeches, he requires the application of a little cold water to his overheated imagination. These hon. gentlemen are at last becoming a little more grateful than they have been in times past. We never heard before of Providence.

In the olden times the present government were responsible for every blessing that came to this country and for everything for which they thought they were entitled to claim credit. It was well known that any one who dared to say that any benefit came from anywhere else would be called to account by these hon. gentlemen, but last night the hon. Minister of Customs did speak of a bountiful Providence. This may contribute to the remission of the many sins of my hon. friend. He admits at last that Providence has really had something to do with whatever blessings this country has enjoyed during the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite. Probably he found out that Providence is getting a little tired of it. Providence was not as good as He had hitherto been last summer. He may not be as good next summer, and perhaps the hon. gentleman was making amends. He said that the government raises enough revenue. He said they had a different way of administering the affairs of the country from that which was adopted by the Tories, and, of course, it will be left to the people to find out which is the better way. The former Minister of Finance, my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), when we were passing through a crisis, about eleven or twelve years ago, took from the people a certain amount of taxation that was weighing upon their shoulders. It may be that the debt was increased, but that has to be paid by future generations. The people who lived in Canada at that time had a remission of over $20,000,000 of taxation. The minister says : We administered the public affairs differently ; we did not increase the public debt. I have heard that contention very often. I heard the same thing on the hustings in Stanstead and Nicolet. I find that the public debt in 1896, the last year in which we were in power, was $258,000,000, in round figures. In 1906, under this administration, the public debt was $267,000,000. That is a big difference, and when hon. gentlemen opposite say that they have not increased the debt they are not talking according to the book, because the book which I am quoting is published by the government. They have increased the public debt and they have taken from the people over $129,000,000 in taxes. Still they persist in saying they have not increased the taxation of the people. I find also in this book, page 20, that in 1896 we took altogether from the people of this country in taxation $36,000,000 ; that is to say, $27,000,000 in customs and $8,000,000 in excise. If I take the return for 1906-7 and add what was taken during the three months for which we have no figures, I find that they have taken over $90,000,000 in taxes from the people of Canada. If you subtract what we took in 1896 from what they have taken in straight taxes which cannot be remitted, you will find that they took $52,000,000 more than we took. I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Customs to these figures showing the taxation imposed upon the people of Canada by this government and by the government which preceded them. In 1896 the taxes amounted to $5.46 for every man, woman and child in the Dominion. What is the per capita tax to-day? It is over $11 for every man, woman and child. Still my hon. friend will say again, as I have heard him say two or three times, that the taxation has not been increased. They have increased the debt, they have increased the taxation, they have lost the territory of Canada, and a large area of our lands in the Northwest has gone into the hands of private persons, and the money which has been received from the sale of lands has been squandered in the scandals which we have brought to light in the Public Accounts Committee since the commencement of this session.

The hon. Minister of Customs has an extraordinary way of explaining certain transactions of this government. With reference to the Crows Nest Railway, he says that the bargain they made with the Canadian Pacific Railway was better than the one that we made. I admit that it was better for the Canadian Pacific Railway, but it was worse for the country. We were ready to subsidize that railway to the tune of $1,600,000 and lend $20,000 a mile to a company which was responsible and which would have paid us back, as they paid us the $30,000,000 loaned in 1884. The present government did not give the subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway directly, but to a company formed of their friends they gave $3,600,000 for the construction of the Crows Nest Pass Railway. My hon. friend says that the bargain was a better one than that which we submitted to parliament before we lost power in 1896. When my hon. friend was speaking last night, for a while I thought that he wanted to show that he was ripe for the other House, except that at the end of his speech he was dancing from the platform of 1893 to the Halifax platform, and he showed such an amount of agility as to intimate that he was not going to the other House yet. But, I repeat, my hon. friend has an extraordinary way of explaining matters. He talked about the Yukon Railway. I do not believe that since I have been in parliament I have ever remembered a transaction which deserved the condemnation of the people of Canada so much as that one.

How is that ? About a week or ten days before parliament met, a minister of the crown, a sworn trustee of the people, made a bargain with a railway company to build 150 miles of railway. In return for building that railway, he agreed to give them four million acres of mineral land, to be chosen within six years out of the whole province of the Yukon. That mineral land might prove to be worth $200,000,000, but that evidently was not taken into consideration by this minister of the Crown or

his government at all. Well, Mr. Speaker, the deal was so thoroughly bad that it was rejected by the Senate. Even their own friends in that body could not swallow it. And after its rejection by the Senate, we heard no more of it. There was nothing to prevent this government resuscitating that measure the following year and forcing it through this House and probably the other, but they were afraid of public opinion and they let the scheme rest in oblivion.

What did they do afterwards? After they had made this contract, which might have involved an expenditure of $200,000,000, without the assent or the authority of parliament, and after the Senate had rejected it, they paid an indemnity of $300,000 to these gentlemen with whom they had thus illegally made that bargain, and yet the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is perfectly satisfied with that transaction.

My hon. friend spoke about the Halifax platform. That is a platform which hon. gentlemen opposite particularly dislike. My right hon. friend, at the opening of the House, spent most of his time discussing it instead of discussing the speech from the Throne. Well, I hope that that Halifax platform will be carried out much more effectively than has been the platform which was adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1893, but which they conveniently lost as soon as they got into office and have never since been able to find.

The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) defended last night the Arctic expedition. Well, my hon. friend was not so easily satisfied when he was on this side. I would not like to say that he was more honest then than he is now but he was certainly more sincere and more frank. He certainly would not have defended such an expedition as the Arctic when he sat on this side. I have never yet heard any one who could seriously explain what really was its object and its raison d'etre. All we know is that it has cost us half a million dollars. But the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) says he is proud of that expedition. He rejoices because we were able to plant the British flag on Hudson bay. Where could the hon. gentleman have derived his notions of the extent of the British possessions on this continent? Surely he must have known that the British flag was planted on Hudson bay long before he was born.

I should like to refer my hon. friend to the speeches made by himself and his friends when in opposition against the expenditure of the late Conservative administration. Take, for instance, the speeches by Sir Richard Cartwright on the budget. Sir Richard Cartwright used to complain that this was a dear country to live in and he called on Heaven to witness that if the Grits ever got into office, they would have a fiscal policy which would make this a cheap country to live in—so cheap that we would not have to spend any money bringing in immigrants because people would flock into this country from all over the world. But what is the case to-day? It is quite the reverse. I do not think there is any other country under the sun where living is so dear to-day as it is in Canada. It is even dearer than in the United States which has always been held up as the most expensive country to live in. And instead of immigration pouring in of its own accord, we have to spend an immense amount of our money to induce it to come here, and a good deal is spent on bringing in a class of immigrants who are a disgrace to any country.

My hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, is apparently delighted with everything, but the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) sings a somewhat different song. I never heard him make so modest a speech as he did the other day. It appeared to be rather a valedictory as if the hon. gentleman saw the hand-writing on the wall. For eleven years we have had the present government in office and we all know how they have managed to stay there. We all know the combination which has kept them there. There is the party press to which they have paid over $1,000,000 since 1896 for sounding their praises. They have had their friends all over the country forming themselves into great corporations to which government contracts are given without any call for tenders, except to the favoured few, and which in return help the government at election time. Then there is the whiskey lavished in different counties even by ministers who pretend to be teetotallers. These are the influences which have kept these hon. gentlemen in office even though they have been false to every one of their ante-election pledges.

But there must be an end to everything and there are many signs that the end of these hon. gentlemen's administration is fast approaching. The people are beginning to realize keenly that they have been deceived. They showed it in Ontario three or four years ago, they have shown it in British Columbia and Manitoba, and only the other day in New Brunswick they declared, by an overwhelming majority, that they had enough of Gritism in this country, and I have no doubt the people as a whole will give forcible expression to that opinion when they have the opportunity.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton). My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) started out by telling us that the budget speech of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) sounded like a valedictory. Well, let me pay the hon. gentleman the compliment of saying he is one of the most unconscious humorists in this or any other House. As far as I could judge, the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) appeared just as confident this year as in former years—

in fact even more confident—that his annual statement would be perfectly welcome to the people. Why any one should think the contrary, I cannot imagine. Had the prosperity of the country decreased, had our financial condition been impaired, there would have been some ground for depression, but instead our Finance Minister presents us with the largest surplus we have ever had in any one year. He has shown great increase in trade and every indication of continuous prosperity; and if for the needs of the years to come, we shall have to add about $12,000,000 to our national debt, what is that in comparison with what has been accomplished? What does that mean? It means simply this:

In 1907, as I understand it, our national debt amounted to $263,000,000. If $12,000,000 is to be added to that debt, as we are told is to be the case, largely on account of the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, that will make the debt $275,000,000. Now, the debt in 1896 was $258,000,000. In other words, from 1896 down to 1908, the total increase in our national debt will have been $17,000,000. Compare that with the previous regime. In 1878, the debt was $140,000,000; and in 1896 it had increased to $258,000,000. That is, in 18 years of Conservative administration, the debt increased by $118,000,000, whereas, in 11 years of Reform administration, the debt had increased only $17,000,000. In other words, in each year of the Conservative regime, the debt increased $6,055,000 on the average, whereas under the Liberal regime, it has increased only $1,550,000 a year on the average. Speaking for myself, I do not regard this increase in the debt as anything to be particularly perturbed about. As a young Canadian, it does not seem to me that we should merely hoard our resources, so that, at the end of the year, we may show some decrease in our national debt. True, it would be a good thing, if even with our need of public works, with our need of improved systems of communication, with all the demands of a new and growing country, we could still reduce our national debt. If this could be done without unduly increasing taxation, no one would rejoice more than I. But we must recognize the fact that this is a growing country, a country whose resources must be developed, and whose facilities for the living of a true national life must be increased; and any government that wishes to hold the confidence of the Dominion of Canada must show it is a progressive government, willing to meet the needs of the country in order that the country may prosper and progress. The truth here is that expressed by the old adage: You cannot have your cake and eat it too—that is you cannot meet the progressive claims of a growing country, you cannot build up that country as it should be built up, without large expenditures and additions to the public debt. The Finance Minister has told us that we must approach the ensuing term with care, caution and courage. But we must remember that even though our expenditure, as our friends across the way so often remind us, be larger than when they left power, yet, we must go ahead with caution and courage, not leaving undone the things that ought to be done, even though we have to spend more money than we have heretofore spent. I repeat that Canada is in a transition stage and is moving on to greater and better things; and any government that fails to provide the means by which the resources of the country shall be developed is not doing its duty to the people and is not carrying out its trust. Therefore, even though our friends opposite find fault with us for spending more money than was spent when they left office, I contend, as has been so often said before, that we had a right to find fault with the Conservative government for the way they spent money, because they did not keep the business of the country going as business men should do, and spent money which they did not possess; but there is a difference between that position and the position of the Liberal party. Our expenditure is absolutely justifiable. So far as that expenditure has been increased by the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, I believe that any person who would go to the people of Canada to-day and say that these expenditures should stop, he would find the country directly and strongly opposed to that opinion. We have heard it said to-day, as we have heard it said before, and said truly, that we are dependent upon the west in great degree for the prosperity of Canada. The east and the west are absolutely bound together; in the first place, because the west is the place of our future breadstuffs production, while the east is the seat of our manufactures. Without either, the other is of no use. Therefore, any government that would, for a moment, stop such expenditures as are made wisely to increase our transportation facilities, and so improve the position of manufacturers and farmers alike, would be absolutely betraying its trust and would not be governing the country in a statesmanlike way. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) grew extremely eloquent on the subject of expenditure, and wound up one of his sentences by saying:—

> They placed this government in the Seats of the Mighty to carry out tasks, and all Canada waited to see them prove their power and their policy if they dared to put it into effect.

The country did place this government in the seats of the mighty in 1896. And they waited and watched for four years; and when the government appealed to the country in 1900 the country confirmed them in their places. And again they went back

to the country in 1904, and the country, having waited and watched, again approved their policy and confirmed them in their occupancy of the seats of the mighty. What was that policy? The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) said he did not know what the government's policy in regard to the tariff was. Well, we might ask hon. gentlemen opposite what their policy is. When have they brought in a resolution relating to the question of the tariff? Where do they stand on that question? No later than last session we saw these hon. gentlemen very much mixed up in their tariff policy, one wishing to go one way and another a different way. In fact, that has been the case ever since the present tariff policy was declared by the Minister of Finance in 1897. Sir Charles Tupper denounced that policy as iniquitous. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said that it was of few lines but absolutely no principle. The hon. gentleman repeated that in his speech yesterday, and many others on that side have taken the same view. These hon. gentlemen say we have absolutely no principle, and the hon. member for Beauharnois says we have no policy. The hon. member for North Toronto tells us that the Liberals came into power in 1896, found everything in good order and took advantage of the tariff policy that was then in force, and that to that is due the great prosperity this country has enjoyed for eleven years.

On that subject let me read a few remarks that were made from time to time by hon. members opposite. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) said:

I hold that the tariff should be so arranged that every institution in this conutry which is manufacturing goods to be consumed by the Canadian people, should have sufficient protection to keep out the same class of goods made in any other foreign country and I have no hesitation in saying that if that country should be England, the policy of Canada should be framed in the interests of the Canadian taxpayer as against the people who are producing the same class of goods even in the old country under the same flag.

That was an extremely loyal proposition from the hon. member for Peel. He seemed to think then that this tariff, which they now claim as their own, did not amount to much. Then, what did the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) say, as found in 'Hansard,' page 2384, of 1902?

It was said in the early days of the present tariff, that the Liberals had stolen our clothes. I have never said so, but of course, when the preferential duty was only 12½ per cent and when on coloured cotton goods and many other goods the duties were practically the same as under the Conservative regime, here was some reason for, perhaps, coming to the conclusion without due consideration that the Liberals had stolen our clothes. But I do not consider they have done anything of the kind. I am only sorry that they did not, for it would have been better for the country if they had. Their tariff is instead just the antipodes of ours.

So, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, the claim of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) must be absolutely dismissed. It is not their tariff, it never was their tariff; it is a tariff that was framed on the resolutions that were adopted by the great Reform convention held in 1893. I claim that that tariff has done all it was expected to do, that it is a tariff which is beneficial to every one. In this connection let me read a short extract from the Toronto 'News' of November 30, 1907. It is headed 'The Tariff':

Before closing some reference must be made to Mr. Borden's attitude towards the tariff. It is a fair way of putting it to say that he himself abstained from mentioning it with equal sedulousness everywhere. He was challenged once in the west, and confined himself to the one case of agricultural implements, and to a demand for an investigation into their cost which would show authoritatively whether they need protection or can dispense with it. It has been pointed out in this correspondence that a conflict is going on between low-tariff and high-tariff wings of the Conservative party, and while it is in progress Mr. Borden is keeping quiet on the issue. The frankness with which both sides of the shield were presented to the west was accidental and not particularly welcome. Mr. Cockshutt, who argued for protection, was a volunteer, a somewhat aggressive volunteer, for the platform.

So it would appear that when the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) gets up and argues in this fashion, it would be well for him and his associates to bring down some alternative policy in the shape of a resolution, and let us know exactly what their views are on this question.

I was struck by one thing in the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto when he was declaiming against the extravagance of this government and mentioning a number of things in which they had been extravagant. What struck me as remarkable was that he should have charged the government with extravagance in the expenditures upon agriculture and art. It is very true that this government has spent much more in that direction than the Conservative government did. In 1895-6 the Conservative government spent, under these heads, $383,432, whereas this government in 1905-6 spent $1,365,860. Now, there can be no greater truism than that there is no industry, however great—and you may apply the remark to every province in the Dominion of Canada—that forms more absolutely the basis of all other businesses, the basis upon which the country depends for good or ill, than the agricultural interests. In 1901 the capital invested in agriculture was $1,787,102,000, and the value of the products was $363,126,000. In dairying the capital invested was $6,315,000, and the value of the products was $29.721,000. Since that time we

know that the investment, as well as the value of the products in these lines, have very largely increased. Now, in view of the amount of capital invested and the enormous income derived from that capital, I would like the hon. member for North Toronto to go into some rural constituency like my own, or that of many other members of this House, and tell the farmers that this government is giving too much aid to their industry and that it ought to be curtailed. It is true we are spending more, as these figures show. Without desiring to weary the House, let me read the figures with regard to a number of items in which this government has spent more than the Conservative government did :

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Experimental farms— | | |
| Conservatives.. .. .. .. | 1895-6 | $ 77,500 00 |
| Liberals.. .. .. .. .. | 1905-6 | 110,452 00 |
| Exhibition grants— | | |
| Conservatives.. .. .. .. | 1895-6 | $ 1,243 00 |
| Liberals .. .. .. .. .. | 1905-6 | 219,500 00 |
| Dairying interests, live stock and fruit industries— | | |
| Conservatives.. .. .. .. | 1895-6 | $ 75,000 00 |
| Liberals .. .. .. .. .. | 1905-6 | 167,000 00 |
| Printing and distributing bulletins— | | |
| Conservatives.. .. .. .. | 1895-6 | ..... |
| Liberals .. .. .. .. .. | 1905-6 | $ 7,000 00 |
| Quarantine— | | |
| Conservatives.. .. .. .. | 1895-6 | $ 95,247 00 |
| Liberals .. .. .. .. .. | 1905-6 | 624,758 00 |
| Cattle quarantine— | | |
| Conservatives.. .. .. .. | 1895-6 | $ 63,827 49 |
| Liberals .. .. .. .. .. | 1905-6 | 202,764 82 |
| Health of animals— | | |
| Conservatives.. .. .. .. | 1895-6 | $ 31,419 00 |
| Liberals .. .. .. .. .. | 1905-6 | 421,933 00 |

The expenditures have increased, but I claim they have been made for the welfare and for the betterment of the agricultural classes. Every dollar that has been expended there, has been expended, I believe, with absolute honesty ; if it has not been, if there had been any doubt of improper expenditures, our friends opposite would have been quick to appeal either to the Agricultural Committee or to the Public Accounts Committee. But so far as these expenditures go, I am sure I am right in saying that every dollar has been expended properly, every dollar has been expended for the benefit of the great agricultural classes, with whom the hon. member for North Toronto seems to find some fault. Now, what have been some of the results?

The results of these expenditures.

| | |
|---|---|
| Butter— | |
| From 1887-1896.. .. .. .. .. .. | $ 14,456,272 |
| From 1897-1906.. .. .. .. .. .. | 46,599,783 |
| Cheese— | |
| From 1887-1896.. .. .. .. .. .. | $112,591,562 |
| From 1896-1906.. .. .. .. .. .. | 202,896,511 |
| Ham and bacon— | |
| From 1887-1896.. .. .. .. .. .. | $ 17,456,821 |
| From 1896-1906.. .. .. .. .. .. | 114,772,561 |
| 16 years of Liberal rule, agriculture exports.. .. .. .. .. .. | 953,981,000 |
| The prior ten years.. .. .. .. .. | 451,938,000 |
| Increase.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 502,000,000 |

In other words, in ten years of Liberal rule, agricultural exports have been $953,000,000, while for the preceding ten years they were $451,000,000. We have thus increased our agricultural exports for ten years by $502,000,000. When this government can say to the people of Canada and to the class of whom I am speaking, there are some of our expenditures and some of the results, I cannot but think that the people will say that this particular expenditure has been well and properly made; it has been made in a sane manner, in a manner which does good and redounds to the benefit of the whole people, and that in so far as that branch of the government is concerned they have no fault, but rather commend the government for their course.

I am free to admit that I did not grasp the logic of the argument of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who in rebutting the statement that had been made by the Minister of Finance said : It is perfectly true that you are exporting very much more than you ever did before, but let me go back to 1896 and I can show you by a compilation of figures that although our exports were then millions of dollars less, as a matter of fact we were exporting much more in 1896 than is being exported in 1908, because the prices have gone up. There is an old saying that money talks, and it appears to me that the people of Canada cannot be led to believe that while they are exporting hundreds of millions to-day and were exporting but a very few millions in 1896 their trade was as great in 1896 as in 1908. If a merchant to-day has twice the turnover that he had a year ago, I do not believe that he puts it down to an increase in price, but to the fact that a dollar this year buys more than a dollar did last year; where he received $1 last year he receives $1.75 to-day, and hence the turnover has been larger than it was the year before. Surely these principles which can be applied to a private business can be applied as well to the business of a country.

I beg to call your attention to the increases in foreign trade for the years ending 1897 and 1907. They were in round numbers as follows :

| Year. | Total trade. | Imports. | Total exports. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1897 .. .. | $257,000,000 | $119,000,000 | $137,000,000 |
| 1907 .. .. | 617,000,000 | 359,000,000 | 258,000,000 |

But, Sir, leaving all that out of the question, I think that one set of figures that has been given by the Minister of Finance absolutely refutes the argument of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), that is, the increase in railway traffic. The tonnage carried by the railways of Canada in 1897 and 1907 was as follows :

| Year. | Tonnage. |
|---|---|
| 1897.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 25,300,000 |
| 1907.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 63,866,000 |

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Was that all exported?

Mr. PARDEE. Not necessarily, and I am not arguing that it was. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said that the imports and exports are greater because the prices are greater and consequently the actual quantities were no better than in 1896. I asked the hon. member if the tremendous increase in the railway traffic does not support the contention of the Minister of Finance, because surely the railways are carrying the actual goods, they have not been carrying air.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I ask the hon. member if these are all for exports? It would not show anything unless they were for export.

Mr. PARDEE. Why not? The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says that our total trade is no better than it was in 1896; he says it appears to be better because the prices are better. I say that the total trade must be better if the railways are carrying more. Surely it is a self-evident fact, and I therefore commend that simple argument to the attention of the House. I could not pretend to follow the hon. member through the ramifications of the figures he presented to the House, and the conclusions he arrived at from them.

I wish to dwell for a few moments on the important increase in what I might call our domestic or home trade, that is actual manufactures within the Dominion of Canada. The interim census respecting manufacturing development from 1901 to 1906 show the following facts with reference to manufacturing establishments at the end of that period :

| | |
|---|---|
| Total manufacturing establishments in Canada.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 15,796 |
| Persons employed.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 392,000 |
| Aggregate capital.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $846,000,000 |
| Salaries and wages paid.. .. .. .. .. | $165,000,000 |
| Output valued at.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 718,000,000 |
| Aggregate investment in Ontario alone.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $397,000,000 |

The other provinces followed in the order, Quebec, New Brunswick, &c. During that period there was a notable decrease in the number of establishments employing about five hands. The number of establishments employing five hands or more has decreased from 14,000 in 1900 to 12,000 in 1905. This is of course entirely due to amalgamation, the larger ones absorbing the smaller and taking them out of the road so that there are now fewer manufacturing establishments in Canada than there were in 1901. Although the number of manufacturing establishments has decreased during that period, yet the aggregate capital increased during the same period from $446,000,000 to $833,000,000, a gain of $386,000,000 or 86 per cent. This statement shows very excellent natural conditions. It shows energy and ability on the part of the people of Canada, and a tremendous development of manufacturing during that five year period. In other branches of industry the results have been just as good.

The wage record shows that diffusion of results has been general, and employees have a full share of the increased activity. The average salary and wage per employee in 1900, $334 per annum; in 1905, $422 per annum, or about 27 per cent increase. The increase has been general throughout the provinces, and has been Canada's defence against commercial depression, maintaining a high standard of living, keeping markets active, and saving the industrial establishments from accumulating unsaleable goods. In establishments having five or more employees, the total number of employees in 1905, 383,920 ; in 1900, 339,173 ; increase, 44,747. The salaries and wages paid employees in these :

| | |
|---|---|
| 1900.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $113,249,350 |
| 1905.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 162,155,578 |
| Increase.. .. .. .. .. .. | 48,906,228 |
| Increase of wages.. .. | 43 p.c. |
| Increase of employees... | 13 p.c. |

This proves conclusively that the workers obtained a full and fair share of the benefits of industrial expansion. All goes to show that the government are keeping a careful supervision of the manufacturing development, and are in that way able to decide wisely in regard to such legislation as may arise from time to time, and it further goes to show that the manufacturers and leaders of industrial development have full faith in the development of the country, and have full faith in the tariff legislation of the government.

Now, Sir, there are two things which have happened from this prosperous state of affairs which I have endeavoured to point out to the House. There is no question about it that you have constantly increasing employment for our people and when you have the rate of wages increasing year after year, it is the best defence against commercial depression ; it means a higher standard of living for the people, it means more active markets and it saves industrial establishments from the accumulation of unsaleable goods. It further shows that the people of Canada have energy, ability, and faith in the country. And, moreover, it shows to my mind absolutely conclusively that the people have faith in the sane and wise tariff legislation of the government, and are therefore not afraid to invest their money in manufacturing enterprises. With that growth and that prosperity going on among all classes and all industries even though there may be larger sums expended in the public service to-day than in 1896, and even though the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) may say that to-day our taxation is $27.05 while last year it was $27.06 and consequently the country is going to the dogs ; the great test is that the revenue of the country is suffi-

cient to permit of that money being spent and that the money is spent for the benefit of the country as a whole. And when you see your farmers, your manufacturers, your wage earners, in a happy and contented mood and with $1.50 to spend to-day when they only had one dollar ten years ago, you may take it as a sure sign that the country is prosperous. True, my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) is continually crying out: hard times and soup kitchens, but I can tell him sincerely and honestly that I do not think such language from him does the country any good. I do not think he is helping the cause for which he is working—if he is working for the welfare of the country. I do not think it helps anybody much to have a leading man in his community come to this parliament and continually decry the country which he represents; even if times were hard, and they are not, I think it would be better if the hon. gentleman took a roseate view, and say that although we were a little pinched yesterday we are on the high road towards success to-day. Surely, if he took that course, it would be better for him, for his constituents who would like him better, and it would be better for the country. And, my hon. friend from Toronto declared that after all the things the opposition have pointed out during this and previous sessions, he would like to see Providence and any of the ministers walking up and down together. Well, these allegations of the opposition were inquired into and they have long since been exploded, but still these gentlemen opposite roll them under their tongues as sweet morsels. Although the country long since has forgotten them our hon. friends opposite like to try and remember them as the only consolation they think they have. But, as to Providence walking up and down with any of the ministers, I would remind my hon. friends opposite that were they in Centre York they could have seen Providence taking a short walk with the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Railways and Canals, and they seemed to be pretty good friends. If these hon. gentlemen opposite had gone to South Huron they would have seen Providence walking around on most absolutely intimate terms with the same gentlemen, and if they had gone down to Stanstead they would have seen the Minister of Agriculture in his happiest mood, and Providence walking with him in its happiest mood too. It does not seem to me that we on this side of the House need fear to trust to the people. We have appealed to the country under similar circumstances several times. We have had by-elections and a good many of them since the last general election, and if I remember aright our net majority in this Chamber has increased since 1894 by two members. It does not look altogether as if these doleful stories were true, that come from hon. gentlemen opposite who seek the fruits of office but who do not put forward any platform on which to step into power. They have no alternative policy to offer to the people. They roll the word 'graft' under their tongues until the people are sick and tired of it. If hon. gentlemen opposite would take some advice free, I think the people of Canada would like to see them offer some alternative policy, although I do not believe they can find any policy under which the condition of the people of Canada would be better than it is under the policy which the present government has carried out so successfully. I do not agree with the hon. member for North Toronto when he says that the government seem to think there is some God-given instrumentality which will see them through. The government thinks nothing of the kind. The government know absolutely well that it is not any God-given instrumentality which has returned them to power on several occasions and which will return them to power again, but it is the faith of the people in the ministers and in the wise policy of the government which has made the country prosperous. It is the policy of the government which has put it in power and which keeps them in power and which will keep it in power. It is because the people of Canada believe that the present government is a good government and a wise government and promulgates the best possible policy for the country, that they will have nothing to do with the Conservative party which they have tried and found wanting.

I want to refer, in closing, to one of the remarks which the hon. gentleman made, and which was this: He wanted to know by what right the Minister of Finance could in any way whatever bring himself to give help to the banks in order that some of the wheat crop of the west might be moved. He said that the minister had gone out of his way to do it, that he had no right to do it, and that he had actually broken the law in so doing. A few weeks prior to the time when that same arrangement was come to, I do not believe there were many Conservative politicians, and I am quite sure, from the Conservative newspapers that I read, there were very, very few of them that did not unanimously say that in this stringency which had arisen regarding the removal of the wheat crop of the west, some 30,000,000 bushels, I believe, there was no reason why the government should not formulate some scheme in order that it might come to the help of the grain-growers in that district, in order that the banks might be provided with funds and in order that these funds which were necessary might be used for the removal of the wheat crop. There was hardly a Conservative politician or newspaper but held up both hands in favour of this policy and declared that it ought to be carried out, and that the government would not be doing its duty unless it did carry it

out. The government did, in the sanest way that any government could, come to the relief of the west to the extent of five million and some odd thousands of dollars by guaranteeing the banks, and the government in turn were absolutely secured against that guarantee; the moneys were advanced, the wheat crop was moved, and there can be no doubt about it that by the removal of the wheat crop benefit inured to every person in that portion of Canada. Then these hon. gentlemen come here and find fault with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance for doing that which he was in duty bound to do. I say that, in view of all these things, the government have amply carried out all that they ought to have carried out. I do not say that the government are perfect, but I do say that taking them as human beings, and taking them as having large and intricate departments to administer, taking them with the large and diversified interests in all the different provinces of the Dominion to legislate for, although they may not have been perfect, although there may have been sins of omission and commission, I say, and I say it in all honesty, that, as far as governments go and as far as human beings go, I do think that since the year 1896 the government are entitled to credit, and to very, very large credit, for the way they have carried on the affairs of this country. I say that if they are no more recreant to their duty in the future than they have been in the past the people of Canada will be absolutely content to entrust their affairs to their hands.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. members on this side of the House will be very grateful for the free advice that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Pardee) has given us, and I think that the government ought to be grateful to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) for the advice that he gave them in his speech to the House. I think the House ought to be congratulated upon the moderate tone of the hon. gentleman's remarks and upon the position which he took in criticising the government, for that is what his speech practically amounted to. The first portion of his address was devoted to the suggestion of a new department of the government—a department of foreign commerce. It seemed to me that that was about as strong a criticism as he could make in regard to the present Department of Trade and Commerce. What is that department for? If that department is not for the purpose of taking care of, strengthening and enlarging the foreign trade of Canada, what is its object? That department has to-day, in different parts of the world, almost as many representatives and agents as the hon. member for Brandon would suggest, I am sure, if we had a new department. I find in looking at the weekly report of that department that we have agents in Sydney, Melbourne, British Guiana, Japan, France, Birmingham, Leeds, Manchester, Bristol, Mexico, Newfoundland and South Africa. These are trade commissioners, and in addition to that we have agents in Jamaica, Antigua, St. Kitts, Trinidad and Norway, besides the Canadian High Commissioner in London. I imagine that the criticism of the hon. member for Brandon would not have been so severe, and he would not have urged the organization of a new department along the same lines as the Department of Trade and Commerce, if these gentlemen were doing what they are being paid to do—that is, to look after the commerce of Canada.

The next criticism that the hon. member made in regard to this government had reference to the civil service. The hon. gentleman practically took up the platform of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) in regard to reforming the civil service, and, of course, in doing so, we on this side of the House must agree that he stood upon solid ground. We have thought that for a long time. It has been the common thought of this country for a great many years, as it was a subject for public discussion for a great many years in the United States before they inaugurated civil service reform there. I well remember that in the United States the system that prevailed in regard to the civil service of that country was a reproach, but that has been reformed of late, and I believe the time has come when we should advocate the appointment of men to the civil service on account of their qualifications rather than on account of their politics. I believe that our civil service can be conducted, not only in a very much more economical manner, but very much more efficiently under such a system as that which we propose.

The next topic of discussion taken up by the hon. member for Brandon was immigration, and, judging by the remarks of the hon. gentleman in suggesting strong encouragement of immigration from the western states to Canada, I concluded that he has no very strong words of commendation to utter with regard to the immigration that we have been getting to a large extent from Europe of late. I do not know exactly what other conclusion could be arrived at from the hon. gentleman's remarks. We have been spending large sums of money in encouraging immigration from the western states, and I think that both sides of the House will agree that the settlers from the western states make very good settlers in Canada and that we cannot have too many of them. But there was this insinuation, as I understand—and I cannot look at it in any other way—that the immigration that has been brought into this country from across the water has not been what it should have been. I am sure we will all agree with that. We have in Canada to-day, in our cities and towns, a very considerable number of men

who are out of employment. These men who are out of employment are largely the very worst of the class of immigration that has been brought in during the past year. We had approximately about 250,000 people last year who came to Canada. If that immigration had been sifted in some way and 25,000 had been left at home—and that is about the number on which a bonus was paid to the agents for bringing them here—we should not have had in Canada the number of men out of employment which we have to-day. 25,000 will probably cover the number who are really suffering in Canada from want of employment. It is certainly the duty of the government to provide some means, whether by abolishing the bonus system or making more stringent regulations at our ports on this side or at the ports on the other side, of preventing this large proportion of undesirable immigrants coming to our shores who must always be a great detriment to the country.

The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) suggested that in the near future we should be able to borrow money on easier terms. Well, I would draw his attention to the fact, as stated in the newspapers, that the bond issue of the Grand Trunk Pacific has been a total failure, and that the syndicate have only been able to float a small quantity of them. That certainly does not indicate any increased easiness in the money market for Canadian loans in the immediate future.

The chief topic of hon. gentlemen opposite has been the condition of the country, which they describe as extremely prosperous, and they have all dwelt at length upon the increase in our imports and our exports. For this increase, they gave exclusive credit to the government. They have not explained in what manner the government has brought about this condition, and it would be rather difficult for them to do so. I would ask: Has this government, during the past ten years, opened up any new markets? The only new market I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite suggest as having been opened up by this government is the market of the United States for our store cattle and some calves, the entry of which into that country has been made easier by the relaxing of the American regulations. But this is due to the relaxing of the American quarantine regulations which followed the relaxing of our quarantine regulations against their cattle. But what about the British market? Has this government succeeded in getting the embargo removed there which was imposed on our live stock on the pretense of guarding against contagious diseases? Not at all, we are just in the same position to-day as we were years ago, and the fact that we have relaxed our quarantine regulations against the American cattle is not calculated to strengthen our claim to have that embargo removed. Are the conditions in other respects in the British market better to-day than they were eleven years ago? No one will say they are. We had free entry to the British market then and we have it still. Have we been able to get our products into France or the United States on better terms? Not at all. When they were in opposition these hon. gentlemen opposite promised that if they were returned into power they would get our calves and sheep and horses in free to the United States. They even figured out how much profit our farmers would make on each head shipped. The former member for Lincoln, now in the Senate (Mr. Gibson), scattered throughout his county a pamphlet showing that each farmer would make $30 on every horse and $25 on every cow he sent to the United States; yet to-day these animals go to the United States subject to exactly the same duties as they were then. The United States market has not been opened to us nor has the French market, but the German market is closed to us altogether. From Germany, the second best market in the world, our products have been completely shut out, and that is due solely to the action of this government. Here is a case where these gentlemen did great injury to this country. And they did it for what purpose? In order that they might allow goods to come into Canada from the British islands at reduced rates. Are we benefited by that preference? Is it any great advantage to our people that we can get our goods at one-third less duty? Are the manufacturers satisfied? Are the woollen mills satisfied? Are any of our manufacturers satisfied that the British preference is of any advantage? It would have been some advantage if we could have got our goods into Britain on better terms than are given other countries. If we could have got a mutual preference we would have been willing to pay a big price. Well, we did pay a big price, and all we got is exclusion from the German market.

The Finance Minister talks of great increase in imports and exports, and to hear him you would think that that increase is due to the policy of this government, that the conditions of this country are different from those of any other, and that these large increases are due to the genius of the present administration. I have here a little comparative table showing the increase of imports and exports in some countries which occupy a position analagous to that of Canada. Canada is a young country with enormous resources, with great areas of fertile land ready for the plough, occupying, in this respect, much the position that the United States did forty years ago, when it made enormous strides in development just as Canada is making to-day. Let us take countries that occupy somewhat similar positions to Canada, and see whether it is the doing

of this government or the conditions of the time that cause these increases in exports and imports. Argentine occupies a position almost exactly the same, and ten years ago its trade and commerce was about the same as ours. Japan is a country which, though not young in years like Canada, yet enjoys a very similar position in that the activities of the country have only lately been aroused, making it, for all practical purposes a young country among the nations of the world. Mexico is another country which is close at hand and, in many respects, affecting trade and commerce has a position similar to that of Canada. Let us make a comparison of Canada with these countries in order that we may know where Canada stands.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

### PRIVATE BILLS.

### INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS OF CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Institute of Architects of Canada.—Mr. J. C. Walsh.

Mr. LENNOX. So far as I can see this Bill seems to deal with an educational question, as those to be admitted into this institute have to come up to a certain educational standard and to pass certain examinations. It does not seem to be proper legislation for the federal parliament to pass.

Mr. GERVAIS. The Bill has been reprinted a number of times before it passed the committee and its most objectionable features have been eliminated from it.

Mr. LENNOX. I have not a copy of the reprinted Bill.

Mr. GERVAIS. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) would be right if the Bill now before the House were similar to the Bill introduced, but as the Bill stands at present it merely amounts to the incorporation of a club. I fought the Bill for four sittings in the Private Bills Committee, and I might tell my hon. friend that all the clauses with reference to education and public instruction have been stricken out.

Mr. SPROULE. Even admitting such is the case, the Bill still provides for the admission of certain architects to the exclusion of all others and this gives those who are excluded a lower status. Some years ago we tried to get a Bill through this House which provided that all medical men in the Dominion should come under the same standard, but that Bill, which was introduced by Dr. Roddick, was opposed by the province of Quebec which absolutely refused to come under its provisions. The Bill only passed when there was a provision inserted that until every province in the Dominion elected to come under the Bill by provincial legislation it should not become operative.

Mr. GERVAIS. I would ask my hon. friend to look at clause 11 of this Bill which says :

Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to encroach upon the rights and privileges conferred upon any association of architects having a charter from any province of Canada.

I think I may say that at my suggestion all the objectionable clauses were stricken out in the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. My own opinion is that a Dominion standard for the learned professions would be better, but this parliament should not provide it for one profession and refuse it to another. If we are competent to pass this Bill for the architects we certainly should be competent to pass a similar Bill for the medical and legal professions. But it was claimed that the Roddick Bill, which was somewhat similar to this, was ultra vires of the federal parliament. If you extend the principle to all professions I would be very glad, but we should not grant it to one profession and deny it to another.

Mr. MACPHERSON. This is a pretty broad Bill, and I do not see that the amendments made to it in committee have been reprinted.

Mr. GERVAIS. They are. While the Bill, as originally presented to the committee, provided for a close corporation, the clauses to which Dr. Sproule has referred were eliminated, and there is now absolutely nothing that will exclude any one from or force any one to join this body; it becomes purely and simply a scientific club for purposes of scientific research, and each province will govern its own body of architects. The Quebec association has power from the legislature to control examinations and the admission of students, and nobody should intend to encroach on them.

Mr. SPROULE. I see that in the Bill, as reprinted, a good many of the objectionable features have been omitted.

Mr. J. C. WALSH. The chartered accountants have a similar institution, and they are incorporated, I understand, in some of the provinces. They asked for the formation of a Dominion association in order that they might come in closer contact and be better able to assist one another in the studying of all that would aid in their advancement as a profession. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) would have been perfectly right in objecting to the Bill as it was first presented, and in comparing it to Dr. Roddick's Bill, but all of the

objectionable features have been eliminated, and it now provides simply for the incorporation of a scientific body. The architects are in a peculiar position. The province of Quebec alone has an association of architects, having absolute control of their profession in that province. Lately a similar association has been incorporated in Alberta, but there is no such institution in any other province. The purpose of this Bill is to form a wider association and to better their position as a profession.

Mr. LENNOX. From subsection (a) of section 4 it would appear that there are associations in other provinces than Quebec. I observe that many objectionable features have been eliminated. I note, however, that section 11 in the new Bill is no improvement on section 18 of the old Bill. I would say generally that the distribution of these reprinted Bills is not satisfactory. I do not know whether to place the blame on the person who attends to my file or on some one else, but it is impossible for any one who wants to conscientiously study these Bills to do it in this hurried way. I could see by the Order Paper that there were amendments, but I could not ascertain in advance what they were.

Mr. FIELDING. What is the effect of section 6 of the present Bill?

Mr. LENNOX. I noticed that, and I was wondering whether under the provisions as they can make rules necessary for the maintenance of the honour and dignity of the institute, they would be able to interfere with the rights of other people, but I thought that this would be construed more as applying to rules for their own guidance and governance. The clause as to the admission of candidates for membership in that institute is important, but I do not know whether it concerns the public very much whether they make the rules very stringent or very easy.

Mr. FIELDING. If they are confined to their own members ?

Mr. LENNOX. I think they are confined to their own members.

The institute may, by by-law, make regulations governing the admission of candidates for membership in the institute.

They may make that very difficult. If they like, probably they could make an educational test.

Mr. SPROULE. The 11th clause reads :

Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to encroach upon the rights and privileges conferred upon any association of architects having a charter from the legislature of any province of Canada.

That might be worked so as to discredit any other architects who are not members of this institute. They might claim for it that it was of a higher standing than those who received their powers from a provincial university or other educational body.

Mr. GERVAIS. Let me remind my hon. friend that the title of the corporation has been changed. It will not be called 'The Institute of Architects of Canada,' as was at first proposed, but it will be called 'The Architectural Institute of Canada.' We did not want to give to this new corporation the right to style its members architects, and that would have been unconstitutional and inexpedient and they will be purely and simply members of that architectural institute. It was pointed out before the Private Bills Committee that this was supposed to be an institute without any staff of professors, without any school organization or curriculum, without any teaching, and I objected to create such a corporation without any proper mechanism for teaching the art of architecture. It is now rather of the nature of a club. Is it within the province of the parliament of Canada to organize a social club, creating simply civil not commercial relations between its members and the main body ? I have very serious doubt on that point.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a professional club. Now here is another thing that strikes me. The membership of the institute may establish classes and determine the right, and terms, and privileges and conditions of the said classes. Would they not have the right also to determine the standard of the curriculum ? They might pass a by-law saying that no person can become a member unless he has attained a certain professional standard. That would enable you to determine a standard which would exclude the members of some provincial body.

Mr. J. C. WALSH. I am willing to accept any modification. I may inform the hon. gentleman that clause 11 was added because the association of the province of Quebec allege that they had certain rights, and they naturally ask that those rights be protected. Now in case there might be anything in this Bill which encroached on their rights, we put in this clause to protect them. We say to them, Whatever rights you have will remain to you, they are vested in you. Now the province of Ontario may incorporate their architects or they may not, but whatever they choose to do, this Act cannot affect any of their rights or privileges. That is why clause 11 has been inserted.

Mr. BLAIN. This Bill was before the committee for some time, and as it comes to us to-night it is almost a new Bill. I think it deserves a good deal of consideration. For example clause 5 says :

No member of the institute shall be a building contractor or manufacturer, or a dealer in building material or supplies, nor be in partnership with any building contractor or manufacturer or dealer in building materials or supplies.

Now there are a large number of contractors in the province of Ontario who are pretty fair architects, and if this Bill were passed these men would be barred out, they could not become members. I do not think that clause ought to be adopted. In the province of Ontario there are a large number of contractors who draw plans. For instance, in a country town the local architect is generally the leading builder in the place, and farmers come in and consult him.

Mr. GERVAIS. I would remind the hon. gentleman that this corporation is not a close corporation, it is an open corporation; it is, if I may so speak, an optional corporation. You may come into it or you may not. If you come in, you are subject to all the by-laws and conditions of admission, but you are not bound to come in. The new corporation cannot interfere in any way with the rights of any architect.

Mr. SPROULE. The one thing that appeals to me is this, when you have a Dominion standard the association will be apt to say that its membership occupies a higher position than those of any provincial association.

Mr. GERVAIS. The members of this association cannot style themselves architects. I objected to that, because in the province of Quebec we have a provincial association of architects. We have established two schools of architecture. One was started at McGill some years ago and another one at the polytechnic school. Great architects from the other side have been brought to Montreal and the proper teaching of architecture is now being carried on there. Such a brilliant artist as Mr. Max Doumic, of Paris, holding a diploma from the French government is the director of the school of architecture of the polytechnic school of the applied sciences faculty of Laval University at Montreal. As a matter of fact I objected to all the clauses of the original Bill, but as we have the reprint before us to-night there is not much in it. I think that the purpose of what remains of the Bill is to make of forty so-called architects a social club. I have still some doubt whether this Bill should be passed for the purpose of organizing a social club.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The objection that the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) takes is not well founded The reason that the architects themselves are desirous of seeing a clause like that in the Bill is this : If you are putting up a building, whether it is great or small, to have the architect you are employing interested in the supplying of any of the material must be of necessity a bad affair. You wish to have your architect entirely free from any association with the contractor or manufacturer of supplies for the building. The architects themselves are the people who are desirous of seeing that clause go in and it should be remembered that this organization is voluntary and that any man who is qualified may become a member of it. It will not interfere at all with the man that my hon. friend speaks of in the country town who is a contractor and builder. He is not an architect at all though he may call himself one. For an architect to be associated with the supplying of the material that goes into a building is something that we must look upon as being very unfair to the owner of the building. That is the reason why the architects take this stand.

Mr. BLAIN. I agree at once with a portion of the remarks of the hon. gentleman, but from another portion I wish to dissent. I could not support that Bill under any consideration because I think it creates a monopoly. Take an instance from a country town; there are two men, one is an architect pure and simple and he would have the right to become a member of this institution. The other man is an architect equally as good but he is a contractor as well. In the one case the architect may receive a membership while the other man would be barred out because he is a contractor, and the public are more interested in the architect and contractor than they are in the architect for the reason there is in almost every town in Ontario men who are contractors and architects. They have studied ; perhaps they are not full fledged architects, as my hon friend points out, but they are sufficiently full fledged to be able to construct the average house in any town in Ontario. I do not think it would be well to legislate against that class of people.

Mr. MACPHERSON. This does not legislate against that class at all, but what it says is this : If I am going to put up a building into the construction of which 10,000 bricks enter I have an architect who recommends that John Jones' brick be used, and I find afterwards that the architect is associated with John Jones in the manufacture of this brick and that I have possibly had to pay from $2 to $4 a thousand more for it than I would for other brick. That man then would be struck off the rolls if he were a member of this association and rightly so. That is the very point in relation to which the architects themselves wish to protect the public.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand at once that the architects are quite anxious to protect themselves, but I am not talking about the public.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I am talking about the protection of the public. I am the public in this instance and I am talking about an architect and a manufacturer using his position to recommed these particulars bricks to be put into this building. They will probably cost from $2 to $4 a thousand

more, but I find out afterwards that the architect is interested in the manufacture of the material. This Bill protects the public in this way that a man will be obliged to be a good clean member of the association or he cannot enjoy the rights and privileges of the association. I fancy that membership in the association is very much like the possession of an honorary degree in any other profession. He is not obliged to be a member of this association, but it is entirely voluntary and honorary. If the architects of this country can get together in such an association as this it will raise the standard of architecture and of architects.

Mr. BLAIN. I cannot see any advantage to the public in this Bill. It is for the purpose of giving a number of architects an opportunity to raise their fee against the public. It cannot have any other object. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) shakes his head. Perhaps he will give us some explanation of it.

Mr. FISHER. I see no objection to the Bill and I very much doubt if there is any. As I understand it this Bill is for the purpose of permitting the formation of a society of architects which will extend over the whole Dominion and which is designed to elevate the practice and profession of architecture and the study of the art. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain), a few minutes ago, spoke as if the builder and contractor, whom he calls an architect but who is at the same time a contractor, in a small country place, would not be allowed to take a job from him to build a house. There is nothing of the kind in this Bill.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend misunderstood me. The first line of section 5 says that 'no member of the institute shall be a building contractor.' That is my point; the meaning of that is that no man who is a contractor, no matter how good an architect he may be, may become a member of this association.

Mr. FISHER. Quite so; and I think quite rightly for this reason. Even although he might be an architect, if he were a member of the institute he would have an advantage as a contractor over other contractors in reference to his associates in the institute and even although he might not himself have, as an architect, a contract from my hon. friend or anybody else who was putting up a building he would have the advantage by being a member of this association over other contractors and the architects in it would be, perhaps, to a certain extent, by employing him as a contractor, giving a preference to him over other contractors. I think it is absolutely essential for the benefit of the employer that architects and contractors should be separate as far as possible and that the architect should be the watchdog to guard over the work of the contractor for the benefit of the man who is erecting the building. I think it would be a misfortune and a lowering of the profession of architecture if the architects themselves were interested in contracts for buildings, not only the buildings for which they themselves are the architects but for other buildings. I have no hesitation in saying that I would gladly support any organization which will improve the architecture of the country. Our architecture needs improvement very much indeed. There is no intention, I understand, to prevent other people from practising the profession of architecture in Canada; and that being the case, I do not see why we should not allow a certain number of architects to organize themselves into an association for the improvement of their profession and for their mutual benefit.

Mr. LENNOX. With the consent of the promoter of the Bill, I move that the committee rise and report progress. This Bill has been reprinted and subsequently very much altered, and we have not had the second reprint. Although I see no great objection to the Bill, yet, as its promoter is consenting, and as many of us want to consider it as reprinted in its final form, I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. GERVAIS. Is it possible to have a certain day fixed next week?

Mr. LENNOX. It will come up on Monday.

Mr. GERVAIS. Some of us may not be here on Monday afternoon.

Mr. LENNOX. It may come up any time on Monday as all day Monday is for private Bills.

Progress reported.

TRANS-CANADA RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 107) respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

Mr. FISHER. This is simply an extension of the time for beginning and completing this road.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this another company apart from the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In point of time, it precedes the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. FISHER. The route of this railway is far north of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. BERGERON. It may be that this company want the time extended so as to give them opportunity to make some arrangements with the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I do not know that that would be in the public interest.

Mr. LENNOX. This Bill comes to us in an entirely new form from the Bill as first printed.

Mr. SPROULE. All that is left of it by the Senate is the preamble.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think it is advisable we should go on with it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is simply giving the company a certain length of time within which to commence and complete the road. This is a proposal that was undertaken by some gentlemen in the province of Quebec. They proposed to build a railroad somewhat further north than the route eventually adopted by the Grand Trunk Pacific. It was understood that they were going to apply for some assistance, but the adherance of the government to another route prevented this enterprise being gone on with. They are simply asking a reasonable time within which to commence and go on with the work and are not interfering with the rights of any one else.

Mr. GRAHAM. The amendment is simply substituting for the clause in the original Bill the regular clause allowing two years to begin and five years to complete.

Mr. LENNOX. When more than half the Bill is changed, it had better be reprinted.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is nothing in the change only this that we thought it better to put in the usual clause. It makes the time a little shorter. They asked eight years and we make it the regular five.

Mr. BERGERON. This company got its charter in 1895 and there have been several extensions since. They do not seem to have any intention of building the road, and it is just possible that when the Grand Trunk Pacific come to locate their line this company may be in the way and require some compensation.

Mr. FISHER. This road is located about 100 miles north of the Grand Trunk Pacific and cannot possibly interfere with it.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

## CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 108) respecting the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the Northern Empire Railway Company.—Mr. Parent.

## WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

The hour for private Bills having expired, House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: 'That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.'

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). When the House rose at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was about to read a table showing the state of trade of Canada as compared with that of three other countries situated as nearly like Canada as any others in the world. My object is to reply to the main argument advanced by speakers on the other side and the greatly increased trade of Canada during the past ten or eleven years is the result of the wisdom and prudence of the administration, my contention being that, so far as the exports are concerned, the ministry are in no wise responsible for the increase, while, as regards the imports, they are, unfortunately, responsible to a very large extent. The figures I have are for 1895 and 1905, this latter being the last year for which I could get statistics in regard to these foreign countries:

COMPARATIVE TABLE.
INCREASE IN TRADE IN TEN YEARS,
1895 TO 1905.

| | 1895. | 1905. | Increase |
|---|---|---|---|
| | £ | £ | Per cent. |
| Imports, Japan ... | 27,233,000 | 101,891,000 | 274 |
| Exports, Japan.... | 28,527,000 | 67,486,000 | 136 |
| Total trade.. | 55,760,000 | 169,377,000 | 201 |
| | $ | $ | |
| Imports, Argentine | 95,095,000 | 205,154,000 | 115 |
| Exports, Argentine | 120,070,000 | 322,844,000 | 168 |
| Total trade.. | 215,165,000 | 527,998,000 | 145 |
| Imports, Mexico... | 6,801,000 | 17,224,000 | 153 |
| Exports, Mexico... | 9,729,000 | 19,459,000 | 100 |
| Total trade.. | 16,530,000 | 36,683,000 | 122 |
| Imports, Canada .. | 110,781,682 | 266,834,417 | 140 |
| Exports, Canada .. | 113,638,803 | 203,316,872 | 79 |
| Total trade.. | 224,420,485 | 470,151,289 | 109 |

It will be observed that, if the total trade of a country is an index of the progress of that country, Canada is the lowest in this list of four, having an increase of only 109 per cent as against 201 per cent for Japan, 145 per cent for Argentine and 122 per cent for Mexico. But a much more significant point is the relation of imports and exports in these several countries. For, I submit, the total trade indicates very little. Let us compare these countries in regard to their imports, and the ministers may take as much comfort as they like out of the fact that our imports have grown excessive in this period. Japan shows an increase of imports of 274 per cent as compared with 140 per cent for Canada. What

is the reason for this? Japan, at the present time, is borrowing heavily, mortgaging everything in sight in order to increase her powers of manufacture, transportation and general industry.

She hopes at some future day to be able to pay that back, I presume. Canada is doing something along that same line. She comes after Japan in imports, buying a great deal more than she sells, especially this last year, when I believe her imports were something like $120,000,000 more than her exports. Compare Canada's condition with that of the Argentine republic. Ten years ago Canada and the Argentine were almost in the same position, the total trades of the two countries was within $9,000,000 of each other. The trade of the Argentine republic was $215,000,000 and that of Canada $224,000,000. These countries have almost exactly the same population, the tide of immigration has been flowing in to them at the same rate, the tillable area and conditions are very similar. What are the conditions to-day in the Argentine republic and in Canada? In the Argentine republic, in the years 1905, her imports were $205,000,000 and her exports $322,000,000, or nearly $120,000,000 more than her imports; while Canada, in 1906, had nearly $120,000,000 more of imports than of exports. Now, I submit, whatever antiquarians may say who have their noses buried in musty old books printed fifty or sixty years ago, I leave it to hon. gentlemen opposite, even to my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes) whether he would not like to have conditions in Canada the same as they are in the Argentine republic, whether he would not like Canada to have $120,000,000 more of exports than of imports? I do not think there is an hon. gentleman in this House who would really prefer to have an excess of imports over exports.

Let us look at the position in the neighbouring republic. The United States have had an excess of exports over imports of something like $500,000,000 a year for a great many years. Will any hon. gentleman say that the United States is going backwards? If we are to judge from arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite who are so proud of the excess of imports over exports, we must conclude that the United States is in a bad way, that she must be going backwards, because her exports have exceeded her imports by $500,000,000 a year for many years. But what are the facts? Are not the United States growing richer, perhaps, faster than any other nation on earth? $500,000,000 of gold coming into that country every year in excess of what they pay out. Her industries are so active to-day that her manufacturers are pouring over the boundaries with their gold into Canada and Mexico to find an outlet for the investment of the money they have received from the excess of exports over imports. And yet hon. gentlemen talk about the advantages of an excess of imports over exports, showing that they derive their theories from old books printed a great many years ago. One of the cardinal principles of these theories is that a nation cannot sell unless it buys. What is the United States doing? Selling $500,000,000 more yearly for many years past than she buys. And is not the United States able to pay for everything she buys? The fact is that the old theory has been exploded by the actual facts of to-day staring us in the face. It is a fallacy of the worst kind, and I am sorry to know that it is indulged in by some hon. gentlemen opposite.

I presume that some hon. gentlemen who will follow me will refer to the case of England. They will say: There is a country that imports more than she exports. And England is not going to the dogs. The case of England, as was explained by the hon. member for North Toronto, is entirely different from that of most other nations. She does not get money enough from her exports to pay for her imports, but she gets vast sums of money from other sources. Her enormous fleets on every ocean are making vast sums of money which come silently into the coffers of the country. More than that, English capitalists have money invested in almost every country in the world—in Canada, the United States, Japan, China, the South American republics, Africa; all over the world English capitalists have enormous sums of money on interest, that interest is coming in every day, and it is with that interest that England pays the excess of imports over exports. It may be asked: But where did she make the money? If she is importing more than she exports, she must be going behind. I would recommend hon. gentlemen to look at the trade and navigation returns of England for the past one hundred and fifty years. Between 1750 and 1850 they will find that England, almost every year, had an enormous excess of exports over imports, to such an extent that in that period of one hundred years the total excess of exports amounted to no less than $4,500,000,000. That money alone, if put out at interest at 4 per cent, would, I suppose, pay several times over all her present excess of imports over exports. Money put out at 4 per cent doubles in twenty years. So in 1860 this money would amount to $9,000,000,000, in 1880 it would amount to $18,000,000, in 1900 it would be $36,000,000,000, and at the present time approximately $50,000,000,000. In my judgment, that is one of the sources from which England gets her money to pay her excess of imports. It does not seem to me that any argument has been advanced, either in this debate or in any other, to show that a condition of trade where imports exceed exports is a healthy condition, and that, if permanent, it can be any other than an unhealthy condition for

Canada. I say the ministry are responsible for this excess of imports. Their fiscal policy admits large quantities of goods from abroad that ought to be made at home.

This treaty with France, it is expected, will increase our imports from that country. If the duties were reduced to a minimum the imports would be very much larger, and these gentlemen would be able to show in the trade and navigation returns an enormous total of trade with France, and they would go before the people and claim applause for an enormous increase in the total trade. By this French treaty we have reduced the duty on wine to such an extent that those who are engaged in the manufacture of native wines believe that the French wines will cheapen the price of Canadian wines and render their business unprofitable. Instead of the two or three hundred thousand dollars' worth of French wines at present coming in, we will probably have five or six hundred thousand dollars' worth soon coming in, and probably if the duty was still further reduced sufficient French wines would come in to supplant totally the sale of our still wines in Canada, the manufacture of which to-day amounts to something over a million dollars. Our wine manufacturers will be put out of business, our fruit-growers will be put out of business. Instead of making a reasonable profit upon their investment, the wine industry will be a dead industry. That is a natural result of an excess of imports, particularly if brought about by lowering the duties.

I might point out scores of other articles. A few years ago we were importing into this country less than $10,000,000 worth of woollen goods; we were manufacturing most of the woollen goods used in Canada, What is the condition to-day? Year by year our imports of woollens have increased and the home production has decreased, until to-day the woollen mills are nearly out of existence and we are buying nearly $15,000,000 worth of woollens in Great Britain annually. This shows largely in our imports, but is it for the benefit of this country, of the woollen mills, of the people who wish to have woollen mills operate in order that there may be a better market for what they themselves produce? Is it to the advantage of the farmers that several thousand workmen should be thrown out of employment? I submit not, and the ministry should receive no credit, no applause, for having increased the imports into Canada while they are not able to point to a single market which they have opened up or a single thing they have done to increase our exports.

Our exports increased in ten years 79 per cent, while those of the other countries increased as follows: Argentine, 168 per cent; Japan, 136 per cent; Mexico, 100 per cent. If the ministry claim credit for this increase I would suggest that next year instead of going to France to negotiate such a treaty as they did last year, they should take a trip to the Argentine Republic and ascertain how the ministry of that country managed to swell the exports more than twice as rapidly as ours have increased in ten years. Or let them go to Mexico, that old state, and ascertain how the Mexicans have been able to increase their exports in ten years at a more rapid rate than we have done. Let them take Japan, that country which was sneered at a few years ago as being half civilized. These gentlemen come here proud of having increased their exports, but Japan has increased her exports in a much greater degree.

The Minister of Agriculture is held up as having done much to increase our export trade. I was surprised on turning to the exports of some of our agricultural products in the official returns. The minister has been for a number of years making a great boast of the expenditure of $100,000 to equip almost a fleet of steamers crossing the Atlantic with cold storage, and it is claimed that we have been able to send large quantities of butter and fruit in this way. I have said frequently in the House and it is still true, that the export of fruit in cold storage is a dead industry. We are not exporting any. A few years ago, when the cold storage system was first installed, it was tried, a number of experiments were made. There is no earthly reason why we should not export fruit in this way. We could even export peaches if we had cold storage that was any good; that could be relied on. We tried it with pears, which will stand shipment almost without cold storage, but we were unsuccessful, and to-day the industry is absolutely dead. Last summer, with a mechanical cold storage, we kept 20,000 baskets of peaches, the tenderest fruit we have, not selected fruit, for over three weeks, and then used them in the canning industry, and we did not lose five baskets out of the 20,000 baskets, but we cannot send hard, sound, selected peaches to Great Britain in cold storage ships because the temperature varies What is the argument of the minister? That these ships were not constructed to be operated as a cold storage plant is on land and to maintain a stable, equitable temperature; that they are only a sort of make-shift to keep the temperature somewhere near the proper point, a sort of aids to navigation, if I might so express it. There is no reason why the cold storage plants on the ships should not be made as perfect as on land, and why we should not carry the products of our orchards to Great Britain. There is a boundless market for our fruits there if we can convey them safely across the Atlantic, but peaches, the best fruit we have, have been selling for two seasons out of the last ten years as low as 10 cents a basket. There is no reason for not laying them down in Great Britain if we

had good cold storage facilities. Money was voted willingly for this purpose. No member in the House opposed the grants, no man on this side has raised his voice against the granting of money for the assistance of the agricultural industry in this or any other way, but here we have $100,000 paid out and no control over the temperatures has been retained, the consequence being that we cannot export fruit to the old country with any degree of safety and the growers have given up trying.

Then take butter. Butter does not require a very efficient cold storage system; it may be kept at any temperature below freezing point, and one would have expected a large trade in this commodity. We have heard it trumpeted abroad throughout the land what wonderful things have been done in exporting butter in cold storage. The figures for the last three years are as follows :

Exports of butter in cold storage.

| Year. | |
|---|---|
| 1905 | $6,914,000 |
| 1906 | 4,581,000 |
| 1907 | 996,000 |

Thus, notwithstanding the enormous exertions of the Minister of Agriculture and all his coadjutors, the exports of butter in cold storage for 1907 fell to one-seventh of what they were two years before.

I wonder if there has not been something in addition to the hand of the minister that has caused this prosperity, this increase in our exports. If the minister claims credit for these increased exports during all these years, he must take the bitter with the sweet, and if he is responsible for any of this increase he must be responsible for this enormous decrease, the falling away of this trade until we are exporting practically no butter at all, notwithstanding what has been said of cold storage.

So with cold air; there was a time when it was not possible to ship apples to the old country in any condition at all. All that was required was the ventilation of the ships, the maintaining of the compartments in which the winter apples were stowed, at ocean temperature. Ventilation was all that was required, but the minister thought that was not good enough; he had not originated it, and so he instituted another system and arranged for the installation of cool air plants on the steamers, a hybrid between cold storage and ventilation. What has been the consequence? Very little fruit was sent in these cool chambers because it is an expensixe method of shipping, owing to the room taken up by the plant and because the same results can be achieved by ventilation. An examination of thermograph records show that the ocean temperature for practically every day in the summer is sufficiently cool and that in the ships without expensive plants for the production of cool air satisfactory average temperature could be maintained at very little expense by mechanical ventilation. No extra charge is made for shipment in ventilated chambers, it is an inexpensive method and people avail themselves of it. Many of our ships are now ventilated in this way, although some are not. There is no rule or law governing the matter, the government simply writes occasionally to the steamship companies asking them to be good enough to put in these plants. Some companies have done so and are well equipped but, as I have said, many are not, there is no certainty, there is no rule governing the installation of ventilation.

Another thing for which the minister has claimed credit is the Fruit Marks Act. I have several times pointed out that whatever there is of good in the Fruit Marks Act, and I think it is a good Act, is the result of the deliberations of the fruit growers of this country who met on two different occasions and practically framed this Act. The last time they met was a couple of years ago when the minister called a delegation of fruit growers here, paid their fares, and, I think, their time, in order to consult together on various matters in connection with the fruit industry. We have not had any more of these conferences. We hoped at that time that we should have further conferences of that sort; they would be productive of good I am sure. I wonder if the reason is that although the gentlemen were the guests of the minister and he was practically their host, they met him in his own house practically in Ottawa, they still had the hardihood to condemn the minister in a resolution and therefore have not been again called together.

At present the fruit industry is under the dairy branch of the department and the fruit growers of this country thought the time had arrived when the industry had become important enough to have a branch of its own and not be subservient to the dairy branch, and so a resolution was passed condemning the minister for not taking heed of the representations made to him in this respect. The minister has not called these gentlemen together since, and I wonder if there is any connection between the two things. At that conference, what was considered certain improvements to the Fruit Marks Act were suggested, but I think it was a mistake to provide for a third grade. The minister cannot be blamed for that as he merely took the suggestion of the fruit growers. However, the minister has had all to do with the administration of the Act, and I am sorry to say that his administration of it has been disastrous, and Canadian apples have this year received such a bad reputation in the English market that it will take them years to live it down. Surely when the minister took this Fruit Marks Act entirely under his control not only in Canada but in England, and when he appointed government inspectors to carry it into effect, surely we had a

right to expect that our apples would be honestly packed and that their high grade would reflect credit on the country. But such has been the result, that even the very servants of the government have been loudest in their condemnation. I do not need to express my own opinion or the opinion of those in the apple business, I need only quote what Mr. Jackson, Manchester, Eng., says, and Mr. Jackson is a representative of the Trade and Commerce Department which the member for Brandon wants to abolish. I would not be surprised if the Minister of Agriculture would look for its abolition too. Mr. Jackson says :

Canadian apples on the British market.

The closing weeks of the apple season are now at hand, and it is with much regret that I have to report that Canadian apples have not maintained their well-known reputation on the British market this season. Indeed, speaking from a knowledge of the principal markets in this district which include such important distributing centres as Leeds, Hull, Newcastle-on-Tyne and Sheffield, very many complaints have been against the packing and grading; in fact, the shipments this season are looked upon by the best judges in the trade as not only inferior in quality to those received for many years, but that the grading and packing has scarcely ever been worse.

Faulty packing and grading.

Various complaints have reached this office from the leading houses in the trade, which, after being fully investigated, all point to the one regrettable fact, viz.: that the Fruit Marks Act has not been complied with. Different kinds of apples appear to have been indiscriminately packed together without any due regard to the grading. Especially does this apply to No. 2s., which has caused the merchants here to go to the trouble and expense of having the apples repacked before they could be successfully disposed of to the retail trade. It must be remembered that packing of this kind is equally as disastrous in its effects to the merchant on this side as it is to the exporter in Canada. When the customers purchase a barrel of apples, which judging from the surface appearance, are of good sound quality throughout, but find, on investigation further, that this applies to the top layers only, then not only does this seriously injure the trade of the merchant, but, in the same way, materially lowers the reputation of Canadian fruit in his own estimation.

The 'British Fruit Grower' of January 9, 1908, says :

Nova Scotian and Canadian apples.

During the present season for Canadian and Nova Scotian apples our market representative has on two or three occasions called attention in his notes to the grading of these apples, the marks on the barrels (owing to the small size of the fruit in the crop) not representing the character of apples which had come to be associated with No. 1 and No 2 grades in previous seasons. As the season has been accentuated by a distinct falling off in the actual grading of the apples, the first grade varying considerably in size of fruit, and in some cases the contents of the barrels should, in the opinion of some of the best judges in the trade, have been marked No. 3 instead of No. 1, and in a few instances No. 2 were found to be superior to the best mark.

It seems to us that, following the excessively dry season and the consequent all-round smaller size of the fruits, the Nova Scotia growers have failed to realize that the No. 1 grade of other seasons was not to be found and that, in fact, there should have been none or very few of No. 1 marked. The 'large' apples of 1907 should have been packed as second grade. This explanation will, of course, not cover the instances where No. 2 and No. 1 have come mixed indiscriminately in one barrel. Some of the Nova Scotia fruit growers are as blind to their own interests as are their brothers on this side, and nothing short of coercion will ever make them pack fair and square. Nova Scotia has had a good name for square dealing in the past, but we would remind our friends on the other side that to be 'ill deemed is to be half hanged.'

Redeeming features.

The only redeeming feature to the whole disagreeable business is that the shipments sent into this district by some of the reputable apple shippers of Ontario have been all right in packing and grading, taking into account the average size of the Canadian apple of this year—but even these did not realize the prices which should have been obtained owing to the false, fraudulent and slipshod methods of those who were responsible for the actual packing of the majority of the fruit.

American apples.

Canadian apples are to-day a poor second in this market to American apples, which have this year been better packed and graded than ever before.

Is not that a sorry condition of affairs. A few years ago when everybody packed their own apples and shipped them without government inspection to the old country, Canadian apples ranked high in the British market, but after some years experience of this Fruit Marks Act which was passed in the hope of making our apples vastly superior to the American apples—and the soil and climate of Ontario and Nova Scotia grow better apples than the Americans can produce—and yet notwithstanding the fact that a large number of inspectors are scattered throughout the country, Canadian apples have gone from bad to worse until the American apples outrank them. We do not complain of the amount of the expenditure in this country so much as we do of the useless manner in which the money is expended. And here is an instance of it. No one will deny that the fruit industry deserves every encouragement and that money may be spent almost lavishly if wisely spent on its improvement, but after the expenditure of thousands of dollars for fruit inspectors we find that no good results have been obtained. The Fruit Marks Act

is a good Act if it is properly administered, and I urge the Minister of Agriculture to make a stronger effort towards giving effect to it. Whether his inspectors are incapable or not I do not know, if they are political appointees the chances are that they are no good, but at all events the result is deplorable. Let the minister appoint more inspectors and better inspectors; let him if necessary spend a little more money and try if he cannot restore the good name of Canadian apples. The Fruit Marks Act applies to other fruits than those packed in close packages such as apples; it requires all fruits to be packed honestly but so far as I know there has been no one in the Niagara district since the Act came into force, to see that it is properly administered. We want an inspector or two in that district to see that the Act is carried out better than it is, but I warn the minister that his inspectors will have to show better results than they did in other directions last year. Then, again, the penalties provided in the Act are too small. The fine is 25 cents a barrel and it was imposed only in the case of ten barrels or so that were examined, and so people began to think that the Act was practically a dead letter. Probably that is one of the reasons why this year the packing all over the country was so defective. What I suggest is that he increase the fine and that instead of fining for a few barrels he should collect that fine for a carload. It is no great deterrent for a man to pay 25 cents a barrel for half a dozen barrels but it is if he has to pay 25 or 50 cents a barrel on a carload he will be more careful to observe the Act.

I intended to devote a few remarks this evening to a criticism of the Department of Militia and Defence, but as the minister (Sir Frederick Borden) is not here I will reserve them until a future time. I had some remarks in regard to several of the ministers, but as they are all away I am rather afraid that if I have to wait until they all come back I shall have to cut my speech rather short.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many ministers are there present now?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) seems to occupy the seats of all the other ministers for the time being. We had a good deal of criticism the other night because my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was absent from his seat for a short time. A large part of the speech of the hon. Minister of Customs was devoted to a criticism of the hon. member for North Toronto because he was not in his seat. Whatever is the reason we find that the seats of hon. gentlemen opposite are largely vacant at the present time and especially those of the ministry. However, I must say a word or two in regard to the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) or in regard to his department. The minister was here during a large portion of the afternoon and I had hoped he would remain a little longer That department has under it the carrying out of a very important Act, the Adulteration of Foods Act. The Adulteration of Foods Act is an Act which has been on the statute-books a great many years, it has been amended at various times until to-day, if it were enforced, it would be of very great benefit and it would bring about a better condition of affairs in regard to the purity of food in this country. There is no doubt that something is needed in that regard. We know that in the United States the condition got so bad that a wave of indignation swept over the country, the consequence of which was that very severe laws were passed. I am very glad to see that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is now in his seat. Very stringent laws were passed in the United States, and I believe it is generally conceded that an injustice has been done in some cases. We have on our statute-books a law that might be improved. Even as it is, if it were enforced, it would be of very great use. It provides that foods that are not pure must be marked with the word 'compound.' That does not signify enough, in my humble judgment, but even if it were marked in plain letters on all foods that are compounds and which come under this Act there would be a vast difference in the conditions that prevail in this country at the present time. But that law is practically a dead letter. What do we find? We find that the minister has a number of inspectors all over this country. They get salaries, and what do they do? They gather together some samples, they send these down to Ottawa and they are analysed. The analysis is published in a bulletin, that bulletin is in the distribution office or in the Department of Inland Revenue and anybody can get it who applies for it, but the public know nothing about it. There is no punishment for the manufacturer. I asked the other day in the House how many had been fined in the last two years. How many do you think have been fined in the last two years? Eight. How many cases of adulteration did the government find by this extremely flimsy method of having a man go around Toronto, and other cities, take samples from stores once or twice in the year and send them down to Ottawa? We have in Bulletin 119, fifteen cases of adulteration; Bulletin 115, 4·4 per cent of the cases marked adulterated; Bulletin 120, maple sugar, 65·58 per cent; Bulletin 22, nine cases; Bulletin 123, 51 cases; Bulletin 124, 11 cases; Bulletin 121, 18 cases; Bulletin 13, 7 cases; Bulletin 140, 87 cases; Bulletin 141, 130 cases, making in all several hundred cases that the minister found by this extremely flimsy method, and still he tells me that among all those cases there are eight fines imposed. That is the way the Act is carried out. He says that there were sixty

or seventy cases in which they had to pay the cost of the analysis. That was the extent of the fine. How much of a deterrent does the minister think it would be to a manufacturer to have to pay $5 or $6 for the analysis of a pot of jam once a year, or whatever the article might be? The fact of the matter is that the Act is absolutely a dead letter, whereas it is a good Act if it is enforced. If in all these cases the offenders were punished and if the minister had his inspectors go around where he found these cases to ascertain if there were more adulterated goods in the same store or in other stores some good might be accomplished. One manufacturer puts up the genuine article, it costs him a good deal and he sells it at a high price, but it is genuine food for the people. Another manufacturer puts up an adulterated article compounded of various mixtures and it is cheap. But, it is marked the same as the pure article, it goes on the shelves of the dealer, the consumer is told that it is pure because it does not say that it is compound as the law requires, the householder is not an expert, he is not able to detect the adulteration, he takes it home and consumes it and it proves to be an extremely unsatisfactory article for the price. I have no objection to anybody making any mixture he likes if he marks it 'compound,' but if it is not marked 'compound' it is an injustice to the manufacturer of pure goods and to the consumer as well. It is one of the duties of the Minister of Inland Revenue to see that the Act is more strictly enforced. I am told that the Minister of Agriculture proposes to strengthen the hands of the Minister of Inland Revenue by doing something along that line. I hope he will bring in a Bill on this line that it will be more stringent in its provisions and that it will be strictly enforced.

I was going to have a word to say in regard to the Department of Public Works. Our expenditures have grown very largely in that department. We are expending very large sums of money on public works and if these moneys were expended judiciously, economically and to the advantage of the country, if the bridges, wharfs, post offices, and other public buildings that are built were absolutely required in the interest of the country nobody would find any fault with it. But, we find that the men who are put in charge of these different public works are of such poor ability, the natural inference being that it is because they are political appointments and that they have not been selected on their own merits, that a great many of these works are not only extravagantly built but they fall down when they are built. You can pick out scores of expensive works of various kinds that have fallen down. Why? We have an example right here in parliament square, and we have other examples all over the country. In my own constituency there was a lighthouse built not long ago, and shortly after it was built it fell over into the water. Several hundred thousand dollars were spent in improving the piers in Burlington canal, and a large portion has slid into the water. It is not a difficult matter to build a pier there, but the man who was appointed to look after that particular public work was a man who had been a farmer all his life and had never built lighthouses. He had a fifty-acre farm, and for the last few years was appointed to a post office at $50 a year, which he ran in connection with his little farm. Well, this is the man who was appointed to look after this great public work and a large portion of it fell into the water. What else could you expect? If the minister had put this work in charge of somebody who understood building and could be relied on as an expert, this structure would not have fallen down a year or two after it was built.

Mr. McKENZIE. Did not that occur during a great storm?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Why, my dear friend from the county of Bruce (Mr. McKenzie), could you conceive of a storm so severe that it would cause a pier built in still water, in the channel of a canal, about 150 feet wide, to slide into the water, or does my hon. friend think a lighthouse should only be built for fair weather? Yet that is the condition which existed there, and that is only on a par with the piers and works built up in the county of Huron. Why, the hon. gentleman who then represented the county of Huron in this House, had not the hardihood to stand up here and defend these works. He left the House when the discussion was going on because he could not support the expenditure. In fact, the following year he condemned it. That is a sample of the way the people's money is spent on public works, and then they ask us: Do we object to the expenditure of these large sums, over $94,000,000 taken from the consolidated fund during the past eleven years and spent on capital account.

Speaking of these expenditures on capital account, what is our position? The Minister of Finance pointed out some time ago—and it semed to me, when he pointed that out, that he was preparing for an election at a very short date—that the public debt of this country had only increased some $5,000,000 while the present government was in office. Further on he pointed out that the increase in the public debt this year would be $12,000,000. A little further on, he admitted that next year the expenditures out of consolidated fund would probably about equal the revenue. In other words, the total amount next year spent upon capital account will have to be borrowed. What is the amount? $42,961,220 is the amount, according to the estimate of the

Finance Minister, which next year we will have to add to our public debt on that head. So that a year from the end of this month we will be in this position that we will have added $60,135,000 to the public debt of this country since the Liberal party came into power, and we will only have partially constructed the Grand Trunk Pacific. I mention that particularly as it has a bearing on his statement that the public debt per head has been decreasing under Liberal rule. The Finance Minister pointed out that the debt per head in the year the present government came into power was $49, and that to-day it is only $43. But a year from now we shall have increased our public debt $60,000,000. Taking our population of 6,000,000 people, that is $10 per head. Add that to the $43. and you have $53 a head a year from now as against $49 when the Conservatives left office in 1896. That will put a considerably different complexion on the argument that the capital debt per head has decreased under the present administration. What will it be a year after when we spend another $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 on the Grand Trunk Pacific and what will it be the year following that?

And speaking of the Grand Trunk Pacific reminds me that we have very large expenditures in this country to meet. Well, I do not object to large expenditures if they are in the interests of the people. But here is an enormous expenditure which is absolutely unjustifiable. The Grand Trunk Railway would have built that road from North Bay to Winnipeg for a very small sum—a sum not very much exceeding the amount which the right hon. the leader of this House said the Grand Trunk Pacific would cost, namely, $13,000,000. For $15,000,000 we could have had all we can get out of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and that is another competitive line through the Northwest. That line would open up the same country that the Grand Trunk Pacific will and would give us connection at North Bay with the great railway companies, and besides would not have given us a competitor to the Intercolonial Railway. It would have increased instead of decreased the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway, and we would have had nearly $150,000,000 to spend on other purposes, if it were wise to spend it.

There are other purposes on which we could have spent it, which we see staring us in the face, some of which at least we ought to engage in at an early date. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) to-night spoke of one of them, namely, the construction of a railway to Hudson bay. I believe that is something we shall have to undertake at an early date. I agree largely with the hon. member for Brandon in his statement regarding that enterprise. And if we had not squandered our $150,000,000 in the construction of this totally unneeded road from North Bay east, we would have sufficient to construct a railway of 600 miles long to connect Hudson Bay with the terminus of the Canadian Northern and build wharfs, elevators and other harbour facilities. That would require, according to the estimate of the hon. member, some $30,000,000. We would also have enough to build the Georgian Bay ship canal, if we thought it wise to build it, and it is a question whether that would be a wise undertaking. But if not, we could spend a portion of the $150,000,000 in deepening the Welland canal, in building locks large enough to allow vessels drawing twenty-five feet to bring down the grain from Chicago, Duluth and Port Arthur to Kingston and unload it there into barges, and it is just as easily unloaded into barges and vessels as it is into and out of elevators. For a moiety of the amount squandered on the Grand Trunk Pacific, these great undertakings could be carried out, and you could have absolutely the cheapest means of transportation from the Northwest to the sea-board that can possibly be devised.

What is the position we are in to-day? We have enlarged the Welland canal within the memory of the youngest man in this House to 14 feet. We have an advantage in that respect over the old Erie canal—a very small advantage. But that advantage, small in itself, is practically offset by the cost of ocean carriage on our products from Montreal to Liverpool, as compared with the charge from New York to Liverpool. In the near future the authorities in the United States will have the Erie canal deepened to such an extent that the advantage we now have to the Welland canal will be entirely wiped out, with the result of doing away with the trade which we now carry by the Welland canal. Practically the whole trade will then go by way of Buffalo and the Erie canal to the sea-board unless we do something to retain this trade. So that we can see that in the near future there will be a demand for large expenditures. This being so, it was the bounden duty of this government to have conserved the large sums of money that have been raised from the taxes of the people. If we must go into the money markets of the world, it would be better to do it for these really valuable undertakings than to have wasted our money on this Grand Trunk Pacific scheme. Of course, now we must build the Grand Trunk Pacific. Hon. gentlemen opposite ask us: If you get into power, are you going to throw up the work on the Grand Trunk Pacific? We cannot do that. We have assumed the obligation, and the work must be gone on with. But we have before us the prospect of enormous expenditure for the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway, including the necessary expenditure at Fort Churchill, and also either the enlargement of the Welland canal or the construction of the Georgian bay canal. Our expenditures might have been much more moderate but for this wildcat scheme, as I call it, of the

Grand Trunk Pacific, which is a political scheme and forced upon the government under political pressure. The government brought it forward simply as opportunists, men who, for the sake of remaining in office, were willing to sacrifice the best interests of the country. What were millions to them if they could retain office? What were tens of millions if they could placate their followers in Quebec and, going a step further, could placate their followers in the maritime provinces?

Now, I had intended to take up a number of subjects, but the hour is growing late, and I will not weary the House with many further remarks. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) made a declamatory speech the other evening. He replied to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), criticising that hon. gentleman for the length of his speech, figuring out that each gentleman was entitled to three hours and forty minutes, and as the hon. member for North Toronto had exceeded that time, he had to borrow from other hon. members on this side. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) that if the hon. member for North Toronto had required further time for the discussion of these important questions, there is not a member on this side of the House but that would have given up every minute of his time. The Minister of Customs indulged in certain criticisms of the hon. member for North Toronto—I was going to say puerile criticisms. There is not a man in this chamber, though we have some able men here, there is not a man in politics in the Dominion of Canada, I believe, who could have crowded into five hours and a-half the unanswerable arguments, the keen criticisms of the government, which have not yet been met, that the hon. member for North Toronto crowded into that speech. Feeling himself utterly unable to answer, the hon. Minister of Customs devoted a large portion of his time to such statements as that I have referred to, that the hon. gentleman was taking up the time of hon. members on this side.

I would like to deal with such arguments as the Minister of Customs did use. He read from the platform of the Liberal party, as adopted in 1893, and said that all but one plank had been carried out. He did admit that one plank had not been carried out—the renovation of the Senate. But he seemed to excuse that on the ground that some Liberal members of the House were still discussing it, and he appeared to hope at some time in the future that there would be an amendment of the constitution of the Senate. The hon. member tried—it was only a try, because not a member behind him would agree with his statement—to make the House believe that these planks have been carried into effect, one of the most important being the plank on the fiscal policy. He read that plank of the platform, which declares in favour of eliminating the principle of protection from the tariff, and he had the hardihood to say that that plank had been carried out, and that the principle of protection had been eliminated from the tariff. Only a year ago the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who would be one of the last men in the House to make the admission if he could have avoided it, admitted that the principle of protection was in the tariff. Behind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) are many strong protectionists who would hardly agree with him in saying that the principle of protection did not appear in the tariff. I wondered, when the hon. member was speaking, why it was that he had raised the tariff on woollens from 23½ per cent to 30 per cent. Was it to produce revenue or was it to give some small protection to the woollen industry, which he knew was being smothered in this country? Was that a revenue tariff? I wonder if the hon. minister would actually have the hardihood to take up the various items of the tariff and say that the principle of protection has been eliminated from the tariff?

Prohibition was another of the planks of the platform. They declared that if, on a plebiscite being taken, the people declared in favour of prohibition, they would give prohibition. The plebiscite was taken and the vote was favourable, but the promise made in the platform was not carried out. Another plank was reciprocity with the United States. I mentioned that this afternoon, showing that it had not been carried out. Purity of administration was another of these planks—and practically the whole session thus far has had to be devoted to exposing the continuous, day by day, corruption and extravagance of this administration. The platform declared for the strictest economy and decreased expenditure. And our expenditure has reached $110,000,000 where it was only $40,000,000 in 1896. Another plank was the land for the settler—and a great part of this session has been devoted to showing the enormous grants of lands in the Northwest that were taken away from settlers and given to favourites. Enormous areas of timber limits have been almost given away. I have not time to dwell upon these matters. But just a word with regard to fishing limits. It seems to me that is the greatest outrage that has ever been perpetrated, and it is one that ought to condemn this government in the eyes of every man in the Northwest and throughout Canada—the outrage of handing over for sixteen and twenty-five years, fishing rights in almost all the great lakes and rivers of that great north land, for practically nothing. These fishing rights will be worth hundreds of thousands of dollars in the near future. They will be worth tens of thousands annually, and they could be sold for that to-day if they were properly put up to tender. Yet these

fishing rights over that vast area have been almost given away to friends. I think that act alone ought to condemn this government in the eyes of the people of this country to such an extent that they will be driven from power the first time that the people have occasion to express their opinion.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON (Yukon Territory). I shall not detain the House at any length at this hour. I would like to make a few observations upon the interesting budget which was presented the other day by the Minister of Finance. It is a budget that to my mind will set the people of Canada thinking. I have been looking over the yearly expenditures since 1896, and I find that in that year the expenditure amounted to $44,000,000, when we had about 5,500,000 people. In the present year the expenditure is estimated at $110,000,000, and I am informed we have about 6,800,000 people. That was the statement made the other day before the Agriculture Committee by a gentleman who had inquired from the census bureau. Now this is an enormous sum of money for 6,800,000 people to raise. Roughly speaking, it is $16 per head, or $80 per family. It may be all right for the people of Canada to contribute yearly to the public treasury that amount of money in fat years. We have had several fat years recently. But I do not know that Canada to-day is greatly different from Egypt in ancient times when they had their fat and their lean years. You probably, Mr. Speaker (Mr. Galliher)—for I know you are a Bible student—will recollect the vision of the fat and lean kine, and the interpretation thereof. You will remember that while they had their fat years they also had their lean years. Now I am not one of those who look forward with fear that Canada will have seven lean years, or any other number of lean years; but the part of wisdom for every Canadian is to prepare his financial accounts so as to anticipate any lean years that may come, when, if they do come, he will be in a position to balance his accounts as they have been in the past.

There is one item mentioned in that budget which I strenuously object to, and that is the amount of money that has been paid for bonusing immigrants coming into this country. The history of immigration into this continent is rather an interesting subject. It is not necessary to recall the settlement of the New England states with English people or the province of Quebec by French people, or to recall the fact that the people in the New England states crossed the Alleghanies and invaded the valleys of the Mississippi and the middle west. It has been a question why the United States during these years have succeeded in getting a larger number of immigrants from the old land than we in Canada have done. Personally I think the great attraction were the cheap lands that were then given away by the United States to people who came from Europe, where the remains of the old feudal system were still in existence. There were other causes, however. The climatic conditions have had something to do with it; they have a better climate than we have and they have a different form of government. A republican form of government no doubt attracted some people from countries where the monarchical system was still in existence. We then saw the tide of immigration rolling across the Alleghany mountains, across the middle plains, and away out to the west. That was not arrested even by the Rocky mountains, but it crossed to the Pacific slope. You remember that about the year 1849 the gold rush to California was across the plains instead of going by way of Panama. Well, what was the result? The cheap lands of the United States have been occupied; they are now no longer cheap. Lands that a few years ago could be bought at $5 or $10 an acre are to-day worth $100 per acre in the middle west. The consequence is that those people are turning north. We have two tides of immigration into this country to-day, one from the east and one from the middle and western states. Why are they going north? Because we have the last and the only west. We have in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan a territory of 100,000,000 acres of fertile soil capable of raising wheat and other grains and supporting an enormous population. Why then is it necessary for us to pay $5 per head, or any other sum, to induce immigrants to settle that land when we know that we have on this continent the last great region of arable land open to settlement? It is, to my mind, not only not necessary, but it is a bad advertisement for Canada. What is the situation in the republic to the south of us to-day? Are they bonusing immigrants to come to their shores? Not at all; they charged them $2 per head some time ago, and to-day they are charging them $4 per head for the privilege of coming into that country. It strikes me that the time has now come when we might very well abolish this bonus system for immigrants, and personally I would abolish it for all immigrants. I think our status in this world is so high to-day that the tide of immigration has permanently set in toward our shores, and there is no doubt that the time is not far distant when those sections of our western country will be very popular indeed. The east, of course, will always be the manufacturing centre, but the great wheat raising centre will be in the west.

Another thing I would like to refer to in passing, is the manner in which the government have been parcelling out the great natural resources of the west. The great asset of this country is its people, the people who have developed Canada from what it was to what it is, and who will carry on the

development until they make this country a great nation. But there are other resources that should be fostered, I refer to the timber lands and the fishing wealth of the west. Now I come from a country where the policy of recent times was adopted some ten years ago in the Yukon, where large tracts of the public domain were alienated to people who were not residents of the country in many cases, but still held them purely for speculative purposes, and did not develop them until they were either forced to do so or to relinquish their title. Judging from the evidence that has been adduced, I have no doubt that the lands which have been alienated from the public domain in the west are alienated to men who, while they may develop them in time, will not develop them with the haste which is necessary for a growing country like Canada. So it is with this and with many other great natural resources of Canada.

I have little further to say, except to state from my place in this House that I consider the bond which bound me to the independent party which I represented when I came here is now dissolved and from now on I shall support the Conservative party and the principles laid down by the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden).

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, as it is now nearly half past ten on Friday night, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.18 p.m.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 23, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### PRINTING OF ORDER PAPER IN FRENCH LANGUAGE.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the government to the fact that 'the orders of the day' have not been printed in French, as I supposed they were to be after the discussion which took place in the House the other day. The King's Printer is required to print them in French, and I desire to know what rule is to be observed in future.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am pretty sure that the orders of the day have been printed in French. If they have not been it must be an error of some kind. The deputy clerk has just handed me a copy printed in the French language.

Mr. THOMPSON.

### DISTRIBUTION OF SEED GRAIN IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. BOYCE. I would like to ask the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether it is the intention of the government to extend the provisions of the Seed Grain Act to the unorganized districts of Ontario or any portion of Ontario, or if any promise has been made in that connection directly or indirectly ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have received no representations from any of the provincial governments upon this matter and it has not been taken into consideration.

### ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES AT SOREL, &c.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) if the report of Mr. Gaudet, appointed a commissioner to inquire into the padding of pay-lists at Sorel, the non-delivery of stone and some other matters, has yet been made to the department, whether Mr. Gaudet has been paid and if so, what fees have been paid to him ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). An interim report has been made. I had it with me the other day and I think I brought it down, but I will make inquiries.

### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I inquire if there is any news as to the date at which the Civil Service Commission report will be brought down.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). A report has been received from the Civil Service Commissioners but it is incomplete. No doubt it will be completed shortly and will be brought down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You mean that the commissioners presented it in an incomplete state ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think there are some portions that were accidentally omitted ; no doubt they will be supplied.

### PRIVATE BILLS.

### INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Institute of Architects of Canada—Mr. J. C. Walsh.

On section 4 : Membership.

Mr. GERVAIS. I move that the section be struck out.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask if this section is not an infringement of provincial rights ? It occurs to me that this is a matter that ought to be dealt with by the provincial

government, and while I do not wish to criticise it too closely, I think it requires some explanation and I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the Bill whether that point has been considered ?

Mr. GERVAIS. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I am in charge of the Bill and have been opposed to it all through. I have moved that this clause be struck out and would wish to have the whole preamble and the Bill defeated because it is an infringement on the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature, for this parliament has no power to legislate on matters affecting education. This contention was granted by the Private Bills Committee ; so much so good. It is now the duty of this House to say that this parliament is powerless to incorporate social clubs, as the present architectural institute.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As the promoter of the Bill is not here I would ask to have the Bill stand.

Progress reported.

## SHUSWAP AND THOMPSON RIVER BOOM COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Company—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like information from the gentleman in charge of this Bill as to the exact extent to which it has been amended. I understand that when it was before the committee there was a good deal of objection to it.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. This is a Bill introduced for the purpose of authorizing the lumbering industries in that particular locality to make such improvements along the streams as will enable them to float their logs to the various mills. When the Bill came before the Private Bills Committee as it was an important measure it was thought better to refer it to a sub-committee. The sub-committee, in conjunction with the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) discussed the various clauses and introduced such amendments as they thought were necessary to protect the interests not only of the public along those streams but also of other smaller industries that might not be included among the applicants for this measure.

The chief amendments will be found in subsection 3 of clause 9 of the Bill as reprinted, authorizing the Governor in Council to make such orders and regulations as are necessary for the expeditious handling of lumber, pulpwood, &c., in clause 10, which provides that the works are to be open to the public and that in case of dispute the Minister of Public Works will have the right to settle the dispute and in clause 11 which provides that all tolls, dues and charges are to be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. Then it is provided by clause 14 that if the company does not carry out whatever regulations the Minister of Public Works or the Governor in Council decides to impose upon the company such portions of the works of the company as are not observing those rules and regulations shall be confiscated. These amendments leave the Bill in this position that these various lumber companies are combined together for the purpose of making the necessary improvements in these streams. They cannot begin to make any of these improvements without the consent of the Minister of Public Works, and after the works are constructed the Minister of Public Works makes the regulations as to how they are to be run, what tolls are to be charged, and unless the company carry out these regulations the works are confiscated. The subcommittee and the Minister of Public Works, I think did everything possible to protect the interests of the public in the preparation of this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. If I recollect aright, there was before this House last year a Bill to give similar powers to what are given here, to a company that had been operating on the Thompson river for several years. I am not sure whether that Bill passed this House, but it did not become law; and it would appear that the company which is asking for this Bill is the same company which raised serious objections to the Bill of last year. I believe that one of these rivers, the Shuswap, and may be also the Thompson, was worked earlier by the company promoting last year's legislation than by the company which is promoting this legislation. Certainly it was operated for four or five years, and improvements were made by the former owners of the lumber there, and I believe they found no great difficulty in bringing down their lumber. I understand that representatives of that company were here this year when the matter was before the Private Bills Committee. I would like to ask whether this Bill is framed so as to protect the rights of the former operators, and the present operators under a different name, on that river, and whether the consent of those who applied for the Bill of last year is given to the provisions of this Bill as amended ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. What the hon. gentleman says is in a measure correct; but since the former company secured legislation from this parliament in 1904 authorizing it to carry on booming works in the North Thompson river, the ownership of these mills has passed into the hands of other people, and when these people bought the mills they bought the booming rights at the same time. Last year, when this company asked for legislation, the milling companies that controlled all the large mills took very strong exception to it, claiming

that if any booming legislation were to be granted, it ought to go to the active mill operators, and not to anybody who, though having had large interests previously, had no very large interests in the country now. The Bill did pass here under representations that the mill-men were interested in it; but when the mill-men came down and made representations to the Senate, the Senate advised the lumber interests to get together and ask for such legislation as would enable them to carry on the improvements subject to regulations of the government. The old company this year renewed their application for a charter, and the mill-men, in order to protect themselves, asked for the legislation suggested by the Senate last year. The sub-committee believed that if any legislation of this kind were granted—and I am perfectly willing to concede that it is rather dangerous legislation to be granted at any time—it should be granted to the men actively engaged in the lumber business, subject to such regulations as would protect the interests of the public. The sub-committee believe that we have such regulations, and that the company, when incorporated, can do absolutely nothing without the express will and under the control and regulation of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have the matter a little further explained. The hon. member intimates that the company which formerly operated on this river is not now an active company. That is not the fact. The company that owned large interests on that river operated there and was the old Kamloops Lumber Company, which had its mill at Kamloops. They operated for a considerable length of time, I do not know exactly how long. Then their mill at Kamloops was burned down; but they immediately replaced it with a large and better one, and they have never ceased to operate that since, as the Kamloops Lumber Company, or as their successors. At that time there was no question of any other parties operating on that river. During these years they were the sole operators, operating both in shingles and in large lumber, having their shingle mill at Shuswap and their large lumber mill at Kamloops. The successors of that company came to this parliament last year and asked for certain rights as the original operators and the active present operators, claiming that these rights, if granted at all, should be granted to them; but they were denied legislation last year. This year, other operators on the Thompson and Shuswap rivers come here and ask for the very legislation which they opposed last year, and it does not seem to me to be quite fair that the original operators and the constantly continuing operators should be denied legislation which is given to others.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I do not understand the hon. gentleman. To whom does he refer as the Kamloops Lumber Company ?

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that there is only one Kamloops Lumber Company.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The assets of that company were sold, as I understand, to the Lamb & Watson Company, who are operating there, and are now applying for this legislation.

Mr. FOSTER Who were the applicants for the incorporation last year ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Mr. J. C. Shields was the principal applicant, as being interested in the Monarch Lumber Company, which has a small mill at Savona at Kamloops lake. The Lamb & Watson Company who were the opponents of the legislation of last year, and who ask for the legislation of this year, have bought all the assets of the Kamloops Lumber Company.

Mr. FOSTER. If that be true it puts a different face on the question.

Mr. COPP. The promoters of this Bill are the Lamb & Watson Lumber Company. There are four companies operating on these waters. I am speaking on behalf of three of these companies, and have been trying before the Private Bills Committee and before the sub-committee to get this Bill into shape to protect the operators on these waters. I am on behalf of the Thompson River Lumber Company, which two years ago had a Bill before this House. But what happened was this : Under that Bill they had to commence their operations in two years.

Mr. FOSTER. Did that Bill become law?

Mr. COPP. That Bill became law. But they had to get from the engineer in British Columbia the approval of their plans, but he did not approve of them for some six months. They were filed here at Ottawa, but as there was no Minister of Public Works at any time up to the time of the expiration of the Act they could not have their plans approved in order to begin their work.

Mr. FOSTER. Your plans?

Mr. COPP. The moment the two years expired and they were unable to get their plans approved on account of their not being any Minister of Public Works at the time, this company, which had opposed them in every shape and form when they were trying to secure their Bill, came to this parliament and got its application for a private Bill in first. Their Bill came before the Private Bills Committee, it was reported by that committee and is now before the House.

Mr. LENNOX. The other Bill is still before the Private Bills Committee for consideration.

Mr. COPP. Yes; the parties who had the first Bill are asking for a renewal of it before that committee.

Mr. FOSTER. What party?

Mr. COPP. The Thompson River Lumber Company. They have a saw-mill at the city of Kamloops. There is the Monarch Lumber Company, which has a paid-up capital of $140,000; and the Sovereign Lumber Company, which has a paid-up capital of $50,000. These three are opposing this Bill. There is only one company to-day before this House asking for this charter in opposition to the other three. Therefore, I cannot understand how the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Ross) can say that this Bill is joined in by all the lumber proprietors on that river. No one company should have the power this is asking for. This is an American company entirely who have bought the mills of the Kamloops Company. They came over to operate a mill, and they even asked that clause 127 of the Company's Act should not apply to them, that is the clause requiring that the majority of the directors should be British subjects. The committee, after it was fought out for days, finally conceded that, and it was struck out.

Mr. GALLIHER. Try and be fair. When you say that the question of their being British subjects was fought for days, it was not fought for a minute, but settled without argument.

Mr. COPP. It went from the Private Bills Committee to a sub-committee, and there it remained. It came back to the Private Bills Committee, and it was there struck out after it had passed the sub-committee. I have given notice of two amendments to this Act. I have done everything I could to get this Act into some shape to protect the interests of the other operators on these rivers and also the public. I am opposed to the Bill in principle as unfair to the other operators and the public. If there is any company which should be protected by the House, it is the one which first got its Bill through and could not take advantage of it because there was no Minister of Public Works to approve of its plans. The renewal of that Bill is before the Priviate Bills Committee, but it will remain there.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is it not here?

Mr. COPP. Because the committee have not acted on it. They have taken up this Bill, a Bill from a company which two years ago fought the other company tooth and nail in opposition to their securing the very rights they claim now for themselves.

Mr. MORIN. Is there another dam on the Thompson river below this dam we are now talking about?

Mr. COPP. I think not.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. There is no dam on the Thompson river below Kamloops.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no interest one way or the other, except to see the interest of all parties fairly protected; but I do think, after the two statements made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Copp). we should hesitate before proceeding further. There are different parties applying for legislation on these streams, one of which was precedent to the other to the extent the hon. member for Digby has said. That Bill is still before the Private Bills Committee and ought to be reported, so that we might consider the two measures together. The other statement is this, and it is a pretty strong allegation to make, that one company got certain standing ground. It went to work, it got a proper engineer in British Columbia to do his preliminary work, and it sent down to the Minister of Public Works here for a formal act of approval. But the approval could not be got because there was then no Minister of Public Works. Then, time having expired, the second company comes in and obtains the rights of the other. If both those statements are true, we should move a little carefully. We ought to have the other Bill, we ought to have the case of each party before us so as to come to a proper decision. The first applicant, against whom there seems to have been no objection, performed his part, he furnished his engineer's report, and then came for the formal work but could find no minister. The time expired and then the other company came in. That is rather an act of injustice, and we should carefully inquire into the status and circumstances of all the parties looking for this legislation. I have had several letters in reference to this, but they have escaped my mind, and I am at a loss with regard to information.

Mr. LENNOX. We are told that the only reason why this charter expired, after the company had expended large sums of money on the undertaking and were in a position to submit their case for the approval of the Minister of Public Works, was because there was no Minister of Public Works to attend to the matter. That being the case, the government should insist, before we proceed any further, that the equitable rights of these parties who got a charter two or three years ago should not be lost sight of. Further than that, it seems to me that when two parties are seeking to control this river, it is important that their actions and applications should be reported before we deal with this matter in this House. It is an every day occurrence that we renew charters where the parties cannot give one single

ground of excuse for not having proceeded with and carried out their Act of incorporation. Parties come back year after year, after five, ten, or even twenty years have elapsed from the time of their incorporation, and, on the most flimsy excuses, or, sometimes, even without even the most flimsy excuses, they get their time extended. Notably, this session, we are extending charters almost on sight. Because, of course, we recognize the financial stringency that, perhaps, prevents the parties from putting their charters in operation at this time even more than under ordinary conditions. At all events, we have the fact that, only two years ago, we incorporated a company, and they immediately put their engineer at work, who devoted his time, and, within six months completed his surveys, so that they were in a position to lay before the Minister of Public Works their plans. Before these could be considered by the Public Works Department, the charter limit expired. I submit that we ought not, at this time, to proceed against the interests of that company, without having their rights, at all events, considered by the Private Bills Committee and ultimately by the House. I have no interest in this matter. Or, if I have any interest at all, it is that I got some instructions from the other side, from those who are promoting this Bill, stating reasons why it should pass. In that sense I have no interest against the passing of this Bill, but I have a feeling that if there was a prior company incorporated only two years ago, and if they have been delayed by reason of the fact that the government or the Public Works Department were not in a position to consider their plans and so on, and even if it should turn out that there was a possibility of them getting them to consider before the expiry of the two years, I would be inclined rather to consider the rights of the prior company than those of the subsequent company, and this more emphatically when I find that it is not denied, in fact, it is admitted I think, that the very people who are promoting this legislation at this time were among the people who, two years ago were alleging reasons why this legislation should not be passed. I think that the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should take this matter in hand and declare that it should not be proceeded with until we have the report of the Private Bills Committee upon the application for renewal of the charter of the prior company.

Mr. GALLIHER. As a member of the Private Bills Committee, also a member of the subcommittee appointed to deal with this matter, and further, a member of the subcommittee of the subcommittee appointed to deal with it, I think I am entitled to conclude that I have some knowledge of what took place on this Bill.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. FOSTER. How big was the subcommittee of the subcommittee ?

Mr. GALLIHER. The subcommittee had seven members ; the subcommittee of the subcommittee consisted of myself and Mr. Pringle, our report to be submitted to the Minister of Public Works, which was done. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Copp) has made the statement that, two years ago, the company now known as the Western Rivers Improvement Company, who are applying for the second Bill, which has not been dealt with, are the same as the company incorporatel in 1904. Now, I had charge of the Thompson River Bill in 1904. Names of the incorporators of that company are as follows :

George W. Fowler, of the town of Sussex, in the province of New Brunswick; George McCormick, of the town of Orillia, in the province of Ontario; William Irwin, of the city of Peterborough, in the said province; Peter Ryan, of the city of Toronto, in the said province; John Shields, of the city of Kamloops, in the province of British Columbia, and James C. Shields, of Sicamous, in the province of British Columbia.

Now, let me read the names of the incorporators of the present Western Rivers Company, that we may see whether they are or are not the same. The parties applying for incorporation as the Western Rivers Improvement Company are as follows :

James C. Shields, of the city of Regina, in the province of Saskatchewan; George L. Ormsby and Alfred Bauman, of the city of Kamloops; Hubert T. Warne, of the town of Annis, and Denis Murphy, of the town of Ashcroft.

Thus we see that J. C. Shields is the only name that is mentioned in both concerns.

Mr. SPROULE. Did these people buy out the rights of the original company ?

Mr. GALLIHER. The Lamb-Watson Company bought out the rights of the Kamloops Lumber Company——

Mr. FOSTER. The Bill of 1904 was the Kamloops ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes. Those rights were bought out by the Lamb-Watson Company——

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) will allow me to explain. The Lamb-Watson Company bought out the rights of the Kamloops Lumber Company, and the people who applied for the Act of incorporation in 1904 were the people who owned the Kamloops Lumber Company and were using this legislation in connection with their undertaking of lumbering. The Lamb-Watson Company paid their money for everything that the Kamloops Company had, and they understood

they were getting the booming rights along with the mills, limits and everything else connected with the industry. But, after they went in and took possession, this Western Rivers Bill was resurrected, changed hands, and they tried to revive it here as against the people actively engaged in the lumber industry. It was all right in 1904, when the same people had the lumber mill and the booming legislation, but it was all wrong in 1906 when they attempted to revive the booming legislation as against the people who bought the mills.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who did ?

Mr. GALLIHER. The Western Rivers Improvement Company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When you use the word 'they' meaning two or three different bodies of people, it is a little difficult to follow.

Mr. GALLIHER. The explanation given by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) is a little more extended than the one I gave, but it is still the same.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And I cannot understand either of them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GALLIHER. If some hon. members behind me who are so clever will take the opportunity of speaking later, I will endeavour to make myself clear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) please state it clearly.

Mr. FOSTER. How many companies are in the Bill, as opponents or otherwise—four or three ?

Mr. GALLIHER. In the Bill that is before the House now, there are several lumber companies.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Five.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Which Bill before the House ?

Mr. GALLIHER. The one we are now considering, the Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Company.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the Western Rivers Improvement Company ?

Mr. GALLIHER. No, that is the Bill that still remains in the Committee on Private Bills.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this the Lamb-Watson Company ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes—now named the Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Company. In 1904, these men whose names I have just given here, under the name of the Thompson River Improvement Company obtained a charter. That is practically the Kamloops Lumber Company with some others. Now the Kamloops Lumber Company sold out to the Lamb-Watson Company, as my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross), has said, their whole outfit, including, as they believed their booming privileges. The Lamb-Watson Company, the Bowman Lumber Company, and some others, five companies in all, now come to parliament asking for the Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Bill, the one now before the House. The Western Rivers Company came last year, their Bill is the second Bill, the one that has not been disposed of by the committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to understand the hon. gentleman before he goes further The Kamloops Lumber Company sold out to the Lamb-Watson Company?

Mr GALLIHER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN Then the Lamb-Watson Company came here for booming purposes?

Mr. GALLIHER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, it comes here with four other lumber companies.

Mr. GALLIHER. That is what I say. But last year the Western River Company came for a Bill that did not go through the House, and they are coming again this year with a renewal of that Bill, No. 55.

Mr. COPP. Is not that the same company that was here in 1904 and got its Bill through?

Mr. GALLIHER. No, it is not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask just one question? I gather that some company came here in 1904 and got legislation.

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes, that was the Thompson River Company?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then the Kamloops Company, under some other name, came in 1904 and afterwards sold out to the Lamb-Watson Company, and the Lamb-Watson Company now comes with four other companies?

Mr. GALLIHER. Exactly, for this particular Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. What did the Thompson River Company get in 1904?

Mr. GALLIHER. They got a charter, and this charter they have not carried out or acted upon. Now, two Bills come before the committee for consideration and were represented by parties who were heard both for and against. On account of the difference of opinion, the committee deemed it advisable to appoint a sub-committee to look into the whole matter and report back to the committee. The sub-committee agreed that

it was useless to give charters to two companies over practically the same ground, and decided that they would grant to the Shuswap and Thompson River Company the right to do those works on certain specified waters. They decided at the same time that the Bill as it was originally drafted was not stringent enough, and they suggested certain amendments. The hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Pringle) and myself were appointed the special committee to put those amendments in shape, and we drafted some amendments which were submitted to the Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works was not satisfied with one of the sections and struck it out and substituted a section of his own, to which we agreed. This was all reported to the sub-committee, the sub-committee reported to the committee and the report of the committee was adopted, with certain amendments with regard to British subjects being directors. Now I may say that I have read this Bill from end to end; I have discussed it on many occasions in the sub-committee and in the general committee, and the only freedom or privilege that this parliament seems to be granting to these people that they can exercise of their own free will is the privilege of spending their own money, and that is all. If any hon. gentleman in this House will read that Bill from end to end and will not admit that it is practically a government Bill, giving the government all possible control over the company, then I have nothing further to say.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not section 8 interfere with the rights of other people to fish and to navigate?

Mr. GALLIHER. If you give to a company the privilege of erecting works of this nature, you cannot give to other companies the privilege of erecting works that will interfere with their works. All you can do is to protect the public with regard to receiving their logs and with regard to tolls.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that we only gave them the privilege to spend their money and not to interfere with the rights of others. I claim that this Bill does give the right to interfere with the rights of navigation and with the right of fish to go up and down.

Mr. GALLIHER. To make a Bill of this kind operative at all, you must give the company the right to construct the works and to maintain them.

Mr. SPROULE. But not to stop every one else on the river.

Mr. GALLIHER. It does not stop every one else on the river.

Mr. SPROULE. Cannot this company, with its booming privilege, take control of every log or stick above that river and charge a toll on it?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes, but is not that the case in all booming Bills of this kind? I did not say they did not interfere with the rights of others. I say that practically all you gave these men was the right to spend their own money. But read clause 14. After we have placed everything in the hands of the Minister of Public Works with regard to how these works should be located, where they should be located and the discretion of approving the plans and with regard to tolls that should be charged, giving him the right to exempt anybody from tolls that he wishes —with all these safeguards for the public, we go still further, and in section 14 we say:

In the event of the company not complying with the orders and regulations which may be made with respect to it by the Governor in Council, or in the event of the company not conforming in all respects to the provisions of this Act, the Governor in Council may, if he deems it in the public interest to do so, after notice to the company and giving it a reasonable opportunity of being heard, declare the works with respect to which orders and regulations have not been complied with, to be vested in the Crown, and thereupon all the rights, powers and privileges conferred upon the company by this Act in so far as such portions of the company's works are concerned shall cease and be void.

What is the effect of it ? Not only have the Governor in Council and the Minister of Public Works the power to regulate the tolls, the power to say where these works shall be and how they shall be placed, but they have the power, if at any time the provisions of this Act and the regulations are not carried out, to declare that the works of this company are forfeited and that their charter is null and void. What more protection is it possible to place around the company ?

Mr. SPROULE. It gives the Governor in Council the right to approve of their tolls, but once they are approved I see no provision whereby they may be revised or reduced.

Mr. GALLIHER. Let me read that section.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, that is section 11.

The company levy and collect tolls, dues and charges upon all saw logs, &c.——

Mr. GALLIHER. (reading) :

—such tolls, dues and charges to be fixed by the company in accordance with a tariff, which shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and when so approved, the said tariff, together with any alterations or amendments thereto, shall be published in the 'Canada Gazette' and the British Columbia 'Gazette,' &c.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the hon. gentleman see that this is just exactly in the

same shape as the tolls in regard to railways ? It has been claimed and, I believe successfully held, that once a toll was approved of by the Governor in Council the Governor in Council had no right to reduce that toll and could not touch it unless the railway company submitted another tariff.

Mr. GALLIHER. If my hon. friend does not think that is sufficient protection, after his remarks, I am quite sure that this company will be willing to accept any amendment that will, from year to year, give the Governor in Council the right to alter these tolls.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be much better.

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not think the company will have any objection to accepting a provision that the Governor in Council shall have the right to revise the tolls. All we can do in parliament is to give the Governor in Council the power and he will exercise that power if he thinks it right. I wish to refer particularly now to what was said by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). If he will take the Western Rivers Improvement Bill for 1906 that did not go through this House and compare it with this Bill as amended, I think he will agree that the two Bills are absolutely on a different footing. There has been attempted to place around this Bill every possible safeguard that will secure the interests of everybody who is seeking to do business on these waters.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose there were no boom at all would not all the timber run through all right as it has done for many years ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I will tell you the difficulty. Take the mill at Kamloops ; that mill had a boom some distance up the North Thompson. The North Thompson flows into the South Thompson a short distance, probably a mile, from the town of Kamloops. This mill at Kamloops, which is a large mill, and has a big cut, has big interests on the North Thompson river. If there is no boom a short distance up the North Thompson, or at its confluence with the South Thompson, all these logs will run down and out into the lake and there is no means of collecting and holding them for the mill at Kamloops. They will either have to build a mill to saw them there or tow the logs back.

Mr. FOSTER. The old company had its own piers and booms.

Mr. GALLIHER. Let me tell you what happened to these piers and booms. They brought action in the courts of British Columbia and they were compelled to take them out.

Mr. FOSTER. When was that ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Last year. The committee looked into that very thoroughly and decided that it was absolutely necessary that the mill at Kamloops and the interests there should have the privilege of putting on the North Thompson river a boom for retaining logs. I might say to my hon. friend that the Bill as it is now and the Bill as it originally came before the Committee on Private Bills are very different in effect indeed. It was not the intention of the committee to favour one company more that the other. The committee felt that it was desirable to give to only one company operating on these waters the right to control this boom, surrounding it at the same time, with all safeguards in so far as the public or other operators were concerned. That question was carefully considered and the committee did not grant everything that the present company were asking for. This Bill has been fought in the committee just as hard as it is possible to fight any Bill and the committee bent its efforts to securing the rights of the public. Once we made up our minds that we would give these rights to the Shuswap Company then the efforts of the sub-committee were applied to making this Bill as stringent in protecting the interests of the public as possible and the recommendations of the sub-committee were adopted by the committee. If there is anything that any hon. gentleman thinks should be done further in that direction which is reasonable—and I think that the suggestion of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is—I am sure that the company will have no objection, but we thought that we had spent a lot of time and that we had brought down a pretty perfect Bill.

Mr. COPP. If we have a perfect Bill it is not through any efforts of the promoters to make it so. The question which I submit to this committee is : Which company has priority of rights in this matter ? The Western Rivers Bill which is before the committee now is the old Thompson River Bill that was passed two years ago and that was before parliament last year again.

Mr. GALLIHER. That is not so.

Mr. COPP. This is an entirely new Bill, but when we found that the committee was in favour of passing this Bill and that we had no chance whatever of having our Bill renewed, we set ourselves to work to make this Bill as perfect as we could possibly make it. If you will compare the Bill which is now before the House with the Bill that was first before the committee you will see that a number of changes have been made in it. But I still submit that the old company have rights that should be protected by this parliament. They are the largest operators and have the greatest interests on this river. They own sixty square

miles or more of timber while the company represented in this Bill only own about twelve square miles.

Mr. FOSTER. On what river ?

Mr. COPP. On the Thompson river.

Mr. GALLIHER. That is absolutely wrong.

Mr. COPP. I have it here.

Mr. GALLIHER. You may have it there but it is absolutely wrong.

Mr. COPP (reading),

The Thompson River Lumber Company has a saw mill at the city of Kamloops, and supplies practically all the lumber required for local use at that point. The timber holdings of the Monarch Lumber Company comprise 44 square miles of timber held under provincial license on the North Thompson river, and six different Dominion government licenses, approximating about 20 square miles in area also on the same river. It is thus entirely limited to the North Thompson river for its supply of saw logs. The Thompson River Lumber Company owns considerable timber along the north Thompson river and secures a certain amount of logs from the South Thompson river. The Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Improvement Company's application is supposed to represent a number of companies doing business over the waters in question The Lamb-Watson Lumber Company is the only concern interested in this charter who have any timber holdings on the North Thompson river or who operate on that river to any extent whatsoever. Their only timber holdings up this river are some ten or twelve miles.

Mr. GALLIHER. You do not cut half as much lumber as one mill owned by this company cuts.

Mr. COPP. The Bill before the House only represents twelve square miles. Some of the incorporators of this company do not own or operate a foot of land tributary to these waters. I refer to Samuel H. Bowman, James P. McGoldrick, and Thomas Kilpatrick ; they are not interested in any sawmills operating in that district or on these waters whatever. Still they are represented here as operating and having interests on these waters. I fully agree with the suggestion made that the other Bill should be here and should be considered together with the Bill which is now before the committee. If we had the two Bills and the parties who are interested in them before the committee we could get a great deal more information probably for this committee than we have at the present time. That Bill is still before the committee and is likely to remain there unless some action is taken in order to get it before the House. As I have said, the Bill as it now appears before the committee is not at all in bad shape. It is beyond question that we have succeeded in having the rights of the operators and the public along that river guaranteed to some extent, but there is one thing to which I object, that is the placing of the authority to make regulations and cancel the charter itself in the hands of the Minister of Public Works or of the Governor General in Council. I think that this parliament has a duty to perform and whatever we do should be placed in the Bill itself, and then the public would know exactly what rights they have under the Bill and govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is left out ?

Mr. COPP. The free right of way of the river should be certainly protected to the individual operator, to the individual citizen and to the public at large. That is not guaranteed by the Bill in any respect. That will come up later in my amendment, of which I have given notice and which I certainly think should be inserted in this Bill.

Mr. GALLIHER. Read section 8.

Mr. COPP. I have read it and there is nothing in it.

Mr. GALLIHER. That section reads :

Nothing in this Act shall authorize the exercise of any power of the company so as to interfere with the free navigation of the said rivers, streams or bodies of water, or any of their branches or tributaries, or so as to impede the free passage of fish.

Mr. COPP. That is only free navigation.

Mr. SPROULE. And the right to fish.

Mr. GALLIHER. What else do you want ?

Mr. COPP. We want the right to use it in any way, in the rafting of logs, &c.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that deny the right of any other member of the community who may be operating along the river above it, to take lumber or supplies up or down the river ?

Mr. COPP. Yes, they have to pay tolls.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it interferes with the right of the individual.

Mr. COPP. If it is possible for any booming company to protect its rights and not interfere with the rights of others——

Mr. GALLIHER. If my hon. friend knew the nature of the Thompson river, its swift current, he would know that it would not be possible to send logs down the river for one operator and not for the others ; they must be sorted.

Mr. SPROULE. I am seeking information. How long are the two branches of the river, the South Thompson and the North Thompson ? Are they not several hundred miles long ?

Mr. COPP. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these companies to control the rivers to the exclusion of every one else ?

Mr. GALLIHER. The North Thompson is only navigable for 70 miles north of Kamloops and that is all we have jurisdiction over.

Mr. SPROULE. And the South Thompson ?

Mr. GALLIHER. We have only two miles of the South Thompson west of Kamloops.

Mr. COPP. And 300 or 400 miles in the other direction, covering nearly 1,000 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it to be almost absolute control over the river to the detriment of others and if this could be drafted without granting that privilege it would be most desirable to do so. That other company had prior rights. Through no act of their own they were prevented from keeping within the provision of the law in respect to commencing operations. I understand it was by an act of the government in not having a Minister of Public Works to approve their plans——

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Perfectly absurd

Mr. SPROULE. They were making a reasonable effort and if they had succeeded they would have been in possession of vested rights, and why should we take away their rights of equity if not of law, owing to an act of the government over which they had no control. They were making a reasonable effort to keep their Bill still operative by commencing operations, but there was not a Minister of Public Works to consider their plans and specifications and approve of them ; if there had been I apprehend they would have commenced work.

Mr. GALLIHER. But they are not the same people.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It appeared before the committee that the charter of the Thompson River Company granted in 1904 was considered so drastic that the company decided not to operate under it and the committee were certainly not given to understand that that company was in any way opposing this Bill ; that was a company incorporated under a different name altogether and it had no connection with the Western Streams Improvement Company, it was composed as the committee was informed of different people altogether.

Mr. SPROULE. What prevented the company of 1904 from starting operations on these streams ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were of the opinion that the terms of the charter were so drastic that they could not operate under it and they abandoned that charter altogether.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Two important statements of fact have been made, both of which have been controverted. One is that those who represent the competing company, the Western Company I think it is called, own 44 square miles on the river, whereas those behind this company have only 12 square miles. The other statement is that the company whose Bill is now before the committee really represent the interests of the Thompson River Company as incorporated in 1904. Both those statements have been made and controverted. If possible it would be well for the gentlemen to come to some conclusion as to what the facts really are in regard to these matters.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. This is the unfortunate part of having a discussion of this kind in the House after all the merits of the case have been discussed in the committee where we had the maps, the materials, and everything of that nature. It is rather difficult to answer statements made by an hon. gentleman who knows nothing whatever of what he is talking about.

Mr. COPP. I know what I am talking about better than you do.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Copp) made similar statements before the committee we could answer whatever we thought necessary. This Bill was before the committee for two or three weeks. Representatives of both parties were before the committee, the merits of both Bills were fully discussed, not only before the general Private Bills Committee but before the sub-committee and mountains of information were given to the committee with reference to this matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have seen mountains of information that did not amount to much.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. As is known to some hon. gentlemen in this House that certain lumbering interests in the district of Yale-Cariboo were acquired about 1903 or 1904. The same parties who acquired those lumbering interests came before parliament in 1904, having as incorporators, G. W. Fowler, George McCormick, Wm. Irwin, Peter Ryan, John Shields and James C. Shields, to ask for booming legislation that was to be ostensibly used in connection with their lumbering operations. Anybody who knows anything about that country knows that it is absolutely impossible to carry on a profitable lumbering industry there unless you improve the streams to expedite the floating of logs. These were the people interested in this lumbering enterprise at that time,

and parliament in its wisdom gave them that legislation. What happened? The Lamb-Watson Company, an American concern acquired their interests.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman tell just what the Kamloops people got in 1904?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. They got very little. At that time, I think about the time the sale was occurring, the settlers on the North Thompson river sent a representative down here to protect what they considered their interests. And there is a clause in the Act of 1904 which practically wipes out any thing that this paraliament gave the company and section 8 was inserted instead of it. The clause was to the effect that the booms were not to interfere with the rights of anybody else to drive logs down the stream, so they could not have done anything under the Act they obtained in 1904. All the teeth were drawn out of the Bill by the Senate.

Mr. COPP. We are willing to put the same clause in our new Bill.

Mr. GALLIHER. Wait till you get your Bill down. The Lamb-Watson people and the A. R. Rogers people bought these mills and these timber limits.

Mr. FOSTER. And bought that legislation.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. They did not buy the legislation.

Mr. FOSTER. They bought all they had.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Do not misunderstand me. Although I say that the people who were interested in the mill at Kamloops at that time incorporated themselves by an Act of this parliament into a booming company, it was an entirely different company, and the Lamb-Watson Company did not buy the charter of the Thompson River Improvement Company. Well, what happened? In 1906, Mr. Shields, who was associated with the original promoters of the Thompson River Lumber Company in 1904, and some other incorporators, came to this parliament, and gave assurances to the Private Bills Committee that they were acting in the interest of the lumber industries in that country, and were getting this legislation solely for the purpose for which the legislation of 1904 was got, and that their only object was to carry on the works that were authorized by the legislation of 1904. Mr. Shields and young Mr. McCormick, who was acting manager of the Kamloops Lumber Company at that time, went before the Kamloops Board of Trade, and assured that body that their company was so much interested in that legislation that if it were not put through they could not carry on their business, and the result was that the Kamloops Board of Trade endorsed the legislation of the Western Rivers Lumber Company. What happened? The Lamb, Watson Lumber Company, the Rogers Lumber Company, the Bowman Lumber Company, the Adams River Lumber Company, and the Shuswap Lumber Company, having timber limits with 11,000,000,000 feet of lumber on those streams, mills with a capacity of 230,000,000 feet a year, and an invested capital of nearly $6,000,000, found that people who had a very slight interest in the lumber industry had come to parliament in the year 1906 and had asked for legislation which would give them a right to control all the areas of the north and south Thompson rivers and all their tributaries. They did not ask for power to exact tolls imposed by the Governor in Council, but put the tariff in the Bill. These lumber people became alarmed.

Mr. FOSTER. Were they all on the two rivers mentioned?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Yes. They found that people who had but very little interest in the lumber industry in that country, people who had sold out to them in 1904 or 1905, had come here and applied for a blanket charter for booming privileges all over that country. The Bill went through this House. I had charge of the Bill and carried out the instructions of the Kamloops Board of Trade, who were vitally interested in the matter, and acted on the representations made by the local manager at Kamloops; but when Mr. Lamb came down here and told me the particulars, we stopped the Bill in the Senate, and the Senate Committee took the position that booming legislation of any kind is always dangerous and has to be very closely guarded, and that if it was absolutely necessary to have these improvements on these rivers, either the government would have to undertake them, or, if legislation were granted at all, it should be granted to the bona fide lumbermen in that country, who had their timber limits and were operating their mills, and that it should be subject to such regulations as parliament might impose, in order that the interests of everybody should be protected. The Western Rivers people renewed their application this year, and their Bill (No. 55) is now before the Private Bills Committee. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Copp) talks about his improving our Bill. Why, Sir, there was not a single reasonable suggestion made by the Minister of Public Works, the hon. member for Digby or anybody else, to improve this Bill, or to protect the interests of everybody, that we did not cheerfully accept, because our instructions from the lumber companies were: We have not asked for any legislation of this kind, but we have been forced into this position by the people who were asking for it; they went to the courts last year and got an order to tear out our boom,

which had been put into the river without the authority of parliament, but which we thought was legally put there, and allowed four million feet of our logs to float down to the Kamloops lake; we have been held up and persecuted by the very people whom we bought out, and we are asking for this legislation in self protection, so as to be enabled to carry on our lumber industry; we do not ask for special privileges, but only to be left alone to carry on our business; and you can impose any restrictions you choose so long as you put us in that position. These people have amalgamated in order to get this legislation; and hon. gentlemen can readily understand that an industry with mills turning out 230,000,000 feet per annum is an industry which ought to receive fair treatment from this House. When the lumber companies saw that the people who were here last year asking for legislation were renewing their application this year, what were they to do? All they could do was to act on the suggestion made by the Senate last year, and unite together to ask parliament that if any legislation should be granted at all, it should be granted to the lumber companies and not to outsiders.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do you include all the lumber companies?

Mr. GALLIHER. It is open to anybody to buy stock in these companies.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. We include all the big lumber companies operating in that country. A letter was sent to Mr. Shields, who represents the Monarch Lumber Company, which operates a small mill at Savona, stating that that company would be permitted to come in on a pro rata basis if it wished to do so. These two Bills came before the Private Bills Committee; all these companies were represented to the committee; Mr. Shields and his solicitor were before the committee, and Mr. Warren, one of the directors of the Western Rivers Lumber Company, was before the committee. They were given every possible opportunity of presenting their views, the discussion was a long one and the committee decided to refer the whole matter to a sub-committee of eight members. The sub-committee had half a dozen sittings before they got the Bill into its present shape. The representatives of the Western Rivers Company went before the sub-committee and were given every opportunity to make every possible suggestion to protect their interests. The Bill was reported to the sub-committee and afterwards by the Private Bills Committee. The sub-committee unanimously decided that legislation should be granted only to one company, and that was the company representing the lumbering interests. And that it should be granted this company only under the most strict supervision and rigid regulations. As I have stated, settlers on the North Thompson river petitioned in 1904 against the Thompson River Improvement Company people and got an amendment into the Bill which practically killed it. Since then the Lamb-Watson Lumber Company, who own the Kamloops mill, have been purchasing logs from the settlers from 40 to 80 miles up the river. In order that these logs might be got for the mill, it is necessary to have a boom a few miles above the Kamloops, and nearly every settler on the North Thompson signed a petition asking that this legislation be granted the Lamb-Watson Company in order that they might be able to sort their logs. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Copp) made some reference to the amount of lumber which the Monarch Company have up there. I have a telegram from Mr. L. B. Gibb, president of the Savona Land and Lumber Company, a Portland concern, saying they have twenty-three miles up there.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the aggregate mileage?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. They have twenty-three square miles. W. B. Tyson has eight miles of timber on the North Thompson. McArthur and Harper have ten miles. The Lamb-Watson Company have a large number of limits, the people who are interested in this Bill having eighty-three miles of good timber up the North Thompson as against sixty-three or sixty-five these other claim. I want the House to understand that while the North Thompson river is the important portion to be operated under this Bill, this Bill is in the interests of all the mill men within a radius of 100 miles. Some of the waters are 200 or 300 miles away from Kamloops. The booming privileges are not in one particular spot. They have to go to different places in order that the logs may be brought down the different streams. All the lumbermen within a radius of 100 or 150 miles of Kamloops have combined to ask parliament to allow them to make the necessary improvements on those rivers, subject to any regulations parliament may see fit to impose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether the question of priority is of much importance, but there was a company known as the Kamloops Lumber Company which got a charter in 1904 and operated on Thompson river in virtue of that charter. Afterwards the Lamb-Watson people bought the mills of the Kamloops Lumber Company.

On section 8,

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the law provide that you cannot interfere with the fish?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Mr. Venning asked that a clause of that kind be put in and we put it in. It will not hurt anybody.

Mr. LENNOX. Section 8 of the Act of 1904 provides that there shall be no interrup-

tion of navigation and that the channel shall be kept clear. Hon. gentlemen who have discussed this so far have said that there is sufficient protection in this clause No. 8 of this Bill. I am not sure whether there is or not. The Act of 1904 says that whenever a boom is so situated as to interfere in any way with the channel the company shall keep a sufficient number of men stationed at the boom for the purpose of opening and closing the dam. In other words, anybody can pass his logs down without being interfered with by this boom and need not subject himself to the tolls. It is now proposed to incorporate the Western Rivers Improvement Company, and section 9 provides that the works shall be open to the use of the public at all reasonable times on equal terms, and the logs, &c., shall not be subject to toll without the consent of the person using the works. I understand that to mean that if a person does not want to use the improvements he need not do so. He can insist on the dams being open so as to allow him to navigate his logs as he thinks fit without his having to pay any toll. This carries out the idea referred to by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) when he called attention to the fact that this gave very large powers to this company. As late as 1904 our policy seemed to be to allow parties to incorporate themselves only for the purpose of constructing booms to facilitate their own work and not to interfere with the navigation of these rivers. I call attention to the fact that we are going a great deal further.

There is one other point which I might mention before sitting down. I find in this Western Rivers Improvement Company the following section:

7. Nothing in this Act shall authorize the company to acquire or take possession of, or in any way injure or interfere with any mill site upon which there exist any mills or machinery or hydraulic works, other than those intended to facilitate the passage of timber.

There is nothing of that kind in this Bill.

Mr. COPP. That is the amendment I propose to make. That same section exactly is in the Edmonton Power Company's Bill passed in 1905

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) pointed out that this clause was in the Bill of 1904. Well, that is the very reason why they did not go ahead with the work. Under the advice given us by the hon. member for Nipissing, who is an old lumberman, the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Caldwell) and Mr. Green of the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company, which company has similar legislation for the driving of logs down the Ottawa river, the committee decided that the only possible thing we could do to have the works built, and, at the same time, to protect the interests of the public, was to have the works properly regulated. The House will understand that the logs start coming down at any point along seventy or eighty miles of the river, and logs from all sources come down together, for they are not going to sort logs up the stream. They all come down to the sorting boom. If the minister chooses to say that farmers' logs or any one else's logs shall be exempt from toll, no objection is raised to that. But the committee decided, under the advice of experienced lumbermen, that it was not wise to put any restrictions in this Bill such as were put in the Bill of 1904, unless, of course, you wish to make the Bill quite inoperative.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a fact that in the old McLaren Streams Bill case, it was finally decided by the Privy Council that McLaren had no right to obstruct the stream?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am not a lawyer. I decline to be drawn on that subject.

Mr. GALLIHER. To put the clause of the Bill of 1904 in this Bill would render the measure useless to the people, as any hon. member can see who will study the matter. The North Thompson river is a very swift-running stream. There are fifty or sixty settlers at different points from ten to a hundred miles sending logs to the Kamloops mill. There are also the logs of the company themselves that have to be sawn in the same mill. These logs are run down all mixed together. If you have to swing your boom open to let out logs not only the logs owned by certain men will go through, but those of others as well.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not possible to run them down in rafts?

Mr GALLIHER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. They must go down in single logs?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes.

Mr. CARVELL. After you get below the sorting works, is there water at any time throughout the year to allow the logs to go through to their destination, or is there a time when they are hung up?

Mr. GALLIHER. No. After they get through the sorting works they come down the river and out into the lake. The Kamloops mill want to saw the farmers' logs as well as their own, but the trouble would be that, instead of stopping their logs where they want them, at the mill, the logs would all go down to the lake. Either they would have to build a mill on the lake or tow the logs back again. We all know that that proposition could not be carried out.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member (Mr. Duncan Ross) who has charge of the Bill tells us that great care was taken to safeguard the interests of the public in every way. Here is a provision that might well

have been introduced in the Bill in the interests of the public. I find, in the Bill of 1904, there is provision as follows:

The company shall make full compensation for lands, works or improvements occupied or injuriously affected, and for any loss or damage, caused by the construction, existence, maintenance or operation of any of the company's works or improvements.

There is no such provision in this Bill and I do not see why there should not be.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Section 12 will cover that. It provides :

Nothing in this section shall authorize the company to acquire or take possession of, or in any way injure or interfere with, any mill site on which there exists any mill or machinery or hydraulic works other than those intended to facilitate the passage of timber.

Mr. FOSTER. That is only for a mill site.

Mr. GALLIHER. It is provided also :

All the provisions of the Railway Act which are applicable to such taking and acquisition of lands, so far as they are applicable thereto, shall apply with the same force and effect as if they were included in this Act, and all the provisions of the Railway Act which are applicable hereto shall in like manner apply to the ascertainment and payment of compensation for or damages to lands arising out of such taking or acquisition, or out of the construction or maintenance of such works or improvements of the company, or out of the exercise of any of the powers of the company under this Act.

Mr. LENNOX. That applies to expropriations. But there are cases of injury to property

Mr. GALLIHER. The owners have the common law right.

Mr. LENNOX. But we give a statutory right to do certain things, and, in such cases, the railway companies often plead that they have a statutory right and that there is no provision for compensation. It should be provided that the company shall make full compensation for injury caused by their works.

Mr. GALLIHER. It was decided by the committee that, instead of putting in subsection 3 of clause 8, it would be better, for the protection of the interests of the public, to put in the usual expropriation clause. In the Bill of 1904 there is no expropriation clause except 3. The sub-committee thought it better to put in the usual expropriation clause.

Mr. FOSTER. What is there on these rivers to be compensated for ? Is there danger of flooding the land ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS It is farming land. And it is necessary, at times, to tie a boom to a man's farm. Of course, there are incorporated cities and town whose interests come in. But the committee decided that they were best covered by the usual expropriation clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is intended by the expression :

Nothing in this Act shall authorize the exercise of any power of the company so as to interfere with the free navigation of the said rivers, streams or bodies of water, or any of their branches or tributaries.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The intention is that the company may not put in any works on any of those streams that will interfere in any way with navigation. There are boats running up and down the rivers all the time. I know of an application that was made two days ago before the Department of Public Works to put in works near there, and they have to drive their piles outside the regular channel; they have to put in their works in such a way as not to interfere with navigation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As it stands at present, it does not exactly express that idea. I would suggest to put in another word in line 45, so that it shall read :

Nothing in this Act shall authorize the exercise of any power of this company so as to interfere with the free navigation of the said rivers, streams or bodies of water for any purpose by the public.

Mr. GALLIHER. That would practically cut us off and leave us as we were before.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. When a man's logs float down the stream, do you call that navigation?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood the member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) to say that the booms were to extend across the river at certain places, therefore I wanted to know what was the meaning of the words 'free navigation.' He says that it is not intended to interfere with steamers, for example, which go up and down the river. In that case, the booms cannot extend all the way across the river.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. They have to provide a gate in the boom.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is no use to say 'free navigation' without understanding what the words will mean when the court comes to construe them. If it means that the river is to be open so that steamers can go down, then it must necessarily mean that it shall be open for logs to go down, for a log is smaller than a steamer. What is intended in that regard?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. We are willing to take our chances.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not.

Mr. GALLIHER. The effect of my hon. friend's amendment would be to leave everything open. I think what is intended by this is that it shall not interfere with navigation

by steamers. Now, it is a question as to what constitutes navigation on a stream; that is an arguable point. What is intended by this is that where a steamer is passing they have to swing their boom and let her through. But it is not our understanding of this clause that every man who may come along with logs or something of that kind shall have a right to demand that the boom be opened and let him through, because, if we did that, we would have to let our own logs through.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand that it is the intention of the promoters of the Bill to have what are known as sorting works on one side of the river, and on the other side there will be sheer booms to swing out. These sheer booms do not in any way obstruct navigation, but they have the effect, as the logs come down, to swing them over to the other side of the river where they come into the sorting works, and then the logs will be passed on without interruption.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not this give them power to stretch across the river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would say not, because that would obstruct navigation. As I understand the way lumbering operations are carried on now, they have their sorting works on one side of the river and they have their sheer booms on the other side, on all the large lumber streams now. Modern operations are carried on by the use of these sheer booms. They simply throw the logs over into the sorting works, and if they are properly handled there is very little delay. Logs intended for people down below are passed on, while those intended for the mill where the sorting works are are detained by the men who are in charge.

Mr. COPP. Suppose I bring logs down that river and want them to go right down through, am I then to pay tolls on those logs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see how it would be possible to get them by if the sheer booms are swung out, because they necessarily throw all the logs over into the sorting works. At that particular point they would command the stream. When the Bill was before the committee, a largely attended committee, all the parties were heard. The matter was fully threshed out, and we came to the conclusion that in order that lumbering operations might be successfully carried on we must give the right either to one company or to the other. Mr. Shields, on the one hand, was claiming those rights for his company, the Lamb-Watson Company, and made it appear to the committee that they had invested very large sums of money in lumbering operations, that they must have sorting works at all events. The committee decided to give the power to this company, and at the same time proceeded to guard the interests of the other company as best it could. Hon. gentlemen will see that the interest of the other company, and of all other people operating there, are about as well guarded as they can be. We provide that the Governor in Council shall have the fullest power to make all regulations for floating down properly all logs with the least possible delay. Then when Mr. Shields represented that possibly, by reason of there being other sorting works up the river, they might make the tolls too heavy, we provided that in a case of that kind the Governor in Council might exempt altogether logs of any other person from tolls. The next question that arose was as to how we could ensure the carrying out of the regulations of the Governor in Council. We felt that to impose penalties would not be sufficient, and we therefore provided that if the regulations were not carried out the Governor in Council might declare their works forfeited; we thought that would be a good safeguard. I may say that there is one thing that struck me very forcibly when the subject was before the committee, and that was that there ought to be power somewhere to appoint a boom master, one who could take charge of the sorting of the logs. But the majority of the committee thought that the power given to the Governor in Council to make regulations carried with it the power to appoint a boom master, but I was not entirely satisfied myself to leave it so. Upon the whole, I am inclined to think that this committee, however, will be safe in acting upon the report of the Private Bills Committee, where the matter was carefully gone into and all parties were heard.

Mr. LENNOX. According to the way it has been presented this afternoon they intend to command the whole river.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see how they can. The Minister of Public Works must approve of the proposed works before they are undertaken.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman has just said that the boom would be constructed, he apprehended, in such a way that it would catch all the logs that came down?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Well, if it would catch all the logs that would come down, so that no logs could pass except by the opening of the boom, the conclusion is that no vessel could pass.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That does not flollow. It is a sheer boom which only runs out a certain distance. Vessels may pass up and down without being interfered with.

Mr. LENNOX. I quite apprehend that, but suppose that a sheer boom extends half way across the river and the other half it does not touch at all; a vessel can navigate on the other side of the river. If a

vessel can navigate that part of the river, surely logs can be floated.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If they were under regulations, or if they were being controlled, but the log follows the sheer boom.

Mr. LENNOX. If the log is uncontrolled it will naturally run into the sheer boom.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Exactly.

Mr. LENNOX. But I am speaking of the case where a person does not want his logs to go into the boom ; can they pass by ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. No.

Mr. LENNOX. Then we come back to section 7 which provides that the company can make any kind of boom they like and collect tolls and they will construct all booms in such a way as to extend across the river completely, I should think. I understand the drift of the hon. gentleman's whole argument this afternoon to be in that direction, that they expect to command the river and my hon. friend has pointed out that by reason of the Act of 1904 providing for the opening of the boom from time to time it did away with the whole benefit of the Act. The whole argument of the promoter of the Bill has been that the boom that is to be placed there under this Bill will be different from the boom that could be placed there under the Act of 1904 in that it will command the whole river, that because the Act of 1904 provided that the company shall open the boom from time to time as navigation requires it is no good and that if we put a similar provision in this Bill it will be no good. They want, I apprehend, to command the whole river and they intend to command the whole river.

Mr. FOSTER. This allows booming to go on through the length of two miles below the confluence of the two Thompson rivers ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a fact that above that two miles there is navigation, that it is possible for steamers to go up or down for any distance either the South Thompson or the North Thompson ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. All these waters are navigable for 40 or 50 miles up the North Thompson to Sicamous. We first asked for a booming privilege below Kamloops, but as Mr. Shield's mills is there and we had no interest there we cut it off. But all these waters up the North and South Thompson are navigable.

Mr. FOSTER. If they do stretch booms to command the whole river there it will be a distinct interference with navigation and it will destroy any idea of there being free navigation on these rivers.

Mr. GALLIHER. Section 8 protects navigation, and the company will have to take their chances under that provision.

Mr. McCOOL. You may put in a boom to intercept logs without having the boom across the river. There is a gap for the passage of boats left in the boom. Free navigation means that the company will have to provide means for opening and closing this gap without interfering with the boats in passing. Sometimes one boom overlaps the other. There is one boom set out from the shore and another a little lower down but it does not interfere with navigation. As I understand it, that is the provision that is made for non-interference with the navigation of the river. It means the adoption of either one method or the other. They cannot stop steamers from either going up or down the river.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Must it be a continuous boom right across the river ?

Mr. McCOOL. It may or it may not be. It is sometimes done with a sheer boom and sometimes with a narrow gap, and provision is made for opening and closing the gap so as not to delay boats. I was on the sub-committee and I have some knowledge of what is necessary for the driving of logs and of works of this kind. I had no interest in the Bill further than to assist in putting it into such shape that the company would be allowed to carry on its business and that the rights of other companies and of the public generally would be protected. We took the greatest care in that connection. I do not think that there was anything left unconsidered in regard to all the interests affected.

Mr. LENNOX. The provision contained in the Act of 1904, section 8, subsection 2, is as follows :—

> Whenever a boom is so situated as in any way to interfere with the channel, the company shall provide at their own cost and expense a sufficient number of men and stationmen at the boom for the purpose of opening and closing the boom.

And then it provides that the opening shall be of a sufficient width. Whether it is necessary or not to put in that specific provision, the argument that I have been endeavouring to refute is refuted by what has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. If the boom is so situated that vessels cannot pass then the company are bound to open the boom or do something that will enable vessels to pass up and down without interruption ; I am inclined to think that this provision which was incorporated deliberately and clearly in the Act of 1904 is a necessary provision to have in this Bill—a distinct provision that whenever a boom is so constructed as to interfere with the navigation of the river there must be men put in charge who shall

open the boom to a sufficient width to enable a vessel to pass up and down without delay.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. We admit that, but we say that the Minister of Public Works and the Governor General in Council have absolute power, under another section, to make such regulations. There is no question about that and before any boom can be operated these regulations have to be in force.

Mr. COPP. That is exactly the amendment of which I have notice, and the necessity for which these hon. gentlemen have disputed.

Mr. LENNOX. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will read it.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. We have not reached that point yet.

Mr. LENNOX. We are at section 8.

Mr. COPP. You will find the same clause in the Act of 1904 and you will find the same clause in the Edmonton Boom Company Act of 1905. I have given notice of my intention to move this amendment, but I was going to move it as a new clause at the end of this Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. There would be no harm in reading the amendment.

Mr. COPP. The amendment reads :

Wherever a boom is permitted to be placed in such a position as to in any way interfere with the channel, the company shall provide at its own cost and expense a sufficient number of men, and there station them for the purpose of opening and closing the trip of the boom, which said trip shall be of such width as is determined from time to time by the Minister of Public Works, and the same shall be opened promptly so as to cause no delay, and the necessary steps shall be taken for keeping the channel clear for the passage of vessels, sawlogs and rafts; and, in addition to any claim againt the company for damages, any officer or servant of the company in charge of such boom who neglects to carry out the provision of this section shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding thirty dollars, which may be recovered before any justice of the peace in a summary manner.

Mr. GALLIHER. You ought to go a little further and send them to gaol without the option of a fine.

Mr. COPP. What reason have the gentlemen promoting the Bill for objecting to placing this in it if it is in the public interest?

Mr. FOSTER. Would not the boom company be bound to do that anyway?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Of course they would.

Mr. FOSTER. Then what is the objection to putting it in?

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. We have threshed this out in the Private Bills Committee. It was agreed that the Governor in Council should have power to frame regulations to govern this. Under this amendment, instead of having the proper operation of the booms so that the logs can be taken to their proper destination, some cantankerous fellow like the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Copp) would order us to open our boom and permit everything to go through. We are bound to see that the boom does not interfere with the free navigation of the river, that boats can pass up and down, and if it is necessary for us to have twenty men on the works to do this we must have them. The object of the amendment is to make the Bill nugatory. It is very cleverly drawn, but we have looked into it and if it is to be inserted in the Bill we might as well move the rising of the committee, because we will have no Bill. We are willing to submit to any regulations imposed by the Governor in Council, and surely hon. gentlemen have sufficient confidence in the Governor in Council to believe that the public interest will be properly protected.

Mr. GALLIHER. This would be all right with regard to vessels, but this covers the rafting of logs, &c., and it is impossible to comply with it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why can you not raft on a river where vessels can ply?

Mr. GALLIHER. On part of the river you can, but not where a great many of these logs are taken from; you would have to build another boom higher up to hold them to form a raft. If the company had to open the booms every time saw logs came down then its own logs would be permitted to go down and the company could not operate unless they built another boom farther down to catch their logs.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What about the Edmonton Company?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. They never operated under their Bill.

Mr. BLAIN. Personally I think it is the duty of this committee to insert in this Bill whatever protection is necessary in the interest of the public.

Mr. GALLIHER. Is it right for this parliament to insert a clause in this Bill rendering it absolutely unworkable with regard to the people who are sawing most lumber in the district?

Mr. BLAIN. This question has received great attention in Ontario in connection with the lumbering industry. There is great complaint that in the northern part of Ontario the former administration of that province granted timber limits and operating rights all in the interests of corporations, and that the interest of the public and of the small dealer was not protected. What-

ever regulations are necessary to protect the interests of the public against this corporation ought to be placed in the Bill rather than having it left in the hands of the Governor in Council. Then there would be no doubt about it. For my part, I want to enter my protest mildly but emphatically and to say that I think this is wrong legislation and legislation that will bring difficulty to this government and will not satisfy the people. It is time that the public interests were taken care of in connection with these matters. The government have had fair warning of this. Case after case has been brought to their attention where private individuals have received concessions from them and are acting under legislation received here from this government in which the public interest has not been taken care of. The government should step in in this case and say to the company that they shall not have absolute control of this river.

Mr. GALLIHER. Why should you put this clause in this Bill making it absolutely useless to this company for the purpose of getting their logs down?

Mr. BLAIN. Will they cease doing business altogether?

Mr. GALLIHER. No, but they will have to build mills farther down to saw their logs. They are a part of the public and when you talk of protecting the rights of the public you have to exercise fair play towards the people who are getting the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the Edmonton Company operate under their charter?

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not know anything about that, but I do say that if you place that clause in this Bill you practically prevent this company from retaining their logs above their mill. To say that the boom should be thrown open every time logs come down would not be fair legislation. Protect the public, including the settlers along the river, who are asking for this legislation, by every possible means, but in protecting the public do not go so far as to nullify the privilege which you are granting to the company. If you put into this Bill a clause compelling this company to open its booms every time logs came down the river, the Bill will be rendered absolutely useless.

Mr. CARVELL. I am not a member of the Private Bills Committee, but I have listened carefully to this discussion. It seems to me that we might as well admit at once that this Bill is for the purpose of creating a monopoly, in the sense of giving this company the right to stop everybody's logs going down the river, and unless it is given that right, the Bill will be of no use to them. I submit that there is a point in every river on which any large lumbering operations are carried on, where it is necessary to give to some corporation or to the government such a right as is asked for in this Bill. The difficulty here is that there is a difference of opinion as to where this point is on this river. I asked whether there was plenty of water below the point at which these works are placed, and I was told that there was. I assume that the locus in quo is practically at the end of the river navigation, for a short distance below that you come to the lake. If that be so, there is every difference in placing the booms at this point, and placing them, for instance, in the Saskatchewan river at Edmonton. In this case, if the logs are allowed to float further down, they float out into the lake, and the works are practically useless. Therefore in every river on which there is a large quantity of lumber cut, it is necessary to have a point where some power shall have the right to stop the logs in order to have them sorted. If you turn logs loose in a river a hundred miles above that point, it is a physicial impossibility for anybody to take out his logs and keep them together. It is necessary to have some point where they can be collected. That point ought to be at the head of tide water in a tidal river, or at the entrance to a lake in such a river as the one in question. If this be so, there can be no objection to closing navigation so far as logs are concerned. In fact, you are compelled to close the navigation in order to sort the logs. I think there is a misapprehension in the mind of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), as to how these logs are stopped. It is not by swinging a boom across the river, but by placing a number of sheer booms, one on each side of the river, and another on the other side, and placing one boom below another, so that if a log is not caught in one boom, it is caught in another. The hon. member for North Toronto knows that there are several booms placed in this way in the St. John river between St. John and Fredericton, by which every log is caught; and yet the navigation of the river for steamers is uninterrupted; they ply between St. John and Fredericton every day, both up and down the river, without any trouble.

Mr. FOSTER. That is because the navigation is outside of the booms.

Mr. CARVELL. No, it is because one sheer boom goes part of the way across the river on one side, and the next boom below it goes part of the way across on the other side; and a man coming down the river in a canoe or a vessel of any kind, can guide it through the booms without any trouble, by making several twists or tacks. These booms are absolutely useless unless they are placed in such a position that they can capture every log as it comes down. Section 8 of the Bill protects the navigation, and section 7 gives the company the right to place the booms in such a position that they will capture all the logs, and it is left

to the Minister of Public Works to provide the necessary regulations.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no difficulty with a system of sheer booms.

Mr. CARVELL. I assume that the Governor in Council will exercise ordinary precautions in detailing what kind of works there shall be. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Copp), with whom I am sorry to disagree, has given notice of a proposed amendment; but the difficulty with his amendment is that it says that there shall be no interference with the navigation of the logs. That would render the whole Bill nugatory. We have exactly the same kind of law as this in New Brunswick. We have a law which gives the right to capture every log that comes down ; and yet lumbermen bring rafts down through the booms from 150 miles up the river.

Mr. COPP. Do they pay tolls ?

Mr. CARVELL. They do not pay tolls, and in this case the Governor in Council has the right to say that these logs shall not be subject to tolls. It seems to me that if this Bill is to be of any good at all, the company must be given the right to capture every log that comes down, and the Governor in Council can say whether certain logs shall be exempt from tolls and how these booms shall be placed.

Mr. LENNOX. What the hon. gentleman has said may be quite correct, but what I was pointing out is that section 8 provides that the company shall not interfere with the free navigation of the river, and we ought to have a guaranty in this Bill that these booms shall be constructed in such a way that boats may navigate the river without interruption. The hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill says that the Act of 1904 was a gold brick given the company and was not intended to be of any use. Well, in 1905 there was an Act to incorporate the Edmonton Boom Company, and although provision is there made for the collection of tolls and the exercise of powers by the Governor General in Council, just as in this Act, all the same we find there a provision obliging the company to open the booms when required, so as not to interfere with navigation. That Act also provides that everybody can float their logs down independent of the booms of the company, and the company are obliged to have a sufficient number of men on hand at their own expense for the purpose of opening and closing the boom. We should have in this Bill a provision for the free passage of vessels, at all events, without the necessity for any resort to the Governor in Council or anybody else.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I have not the slightest objection, but that is fully covered by section 8.

Mr. CARVELL.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am sure the company will be perfectly satisfied to accept an amendment providing that nothing in this Bill shall interfere with the free navigation by vessels.

Mr. LENNOX. We should have a provision such as is found in the Act of 1904 and the Act of 1905. That is large enough to cover the case of logs as well as of vessels.

Mr. CARVELL. How would the hon. gentleman amend the section ?

Mr. LENNOX. I would amend it by providing that whenever a boom is so situated as in any way to interfere with the channel, in so far as vessels are concerned, the company shall provide at its own expense a sufficient number of men stationed at the boom for the purpose of opening and closing it for the free passage of these vessels.

On section 11,

Mr. LENNOX. What does the promoter mean by the expression 'and the products thereof' in line 48 ? We have here the expression 'and the products thereof' following the words 'saw-logs, poles, pulp wood, ties, timber, lumber.' What is meant by 'products thereof'? It would cover almost everything that could be made of wood—even a table, a dresser or a rocking chair. As you have the word 'pulp wood,' even a roll of paper intended for a printer would be included.

Mr. CARVELL. If it were floated down the river, that would be all right.

Mr. LENNOX. It might be floated down in a vessel.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I think the idea is to cover square timber, planks, boards or anything of that kind. But surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) would not seriously say that the words would cover furniture and that kind of thing—that these would be floated down the stream.

Mr. LENNOX. Then, what is the necessity of having these words in the Bill ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I fancy it is because a lawyer drew up the Bill and a lawyer always sticks in a lot of things the need for which is not very plain to other people.

Mr. LENNOX. But we have all these other expressions here which seem to cover everything that is necessary. We are trying to get this Bill in as good shape as possible. The question whether it is drawn up by a lawyer or any body else has nothing to do with the case.

Mr. CARVELL. I could point out one instance in which this expression would be necessary. On many lumbering rivers, lumber is rafted in large rafts, after it is sawed

and floated down the river. If the company were compelled to perform service in getting these rafts through the booms under the direction of the Governor in Council, their right to charge toll should be made clear.

Mr. LENNOX. But it should not have a right to collect toll because it assisted in the navigation through its works of a vessel carrying any of these products. This expression 'products thereof' complicates the matter in such a way that, possibly, they might be able to make a charge that we do not contemplate. I move that this expression 'and the products thereof' be struck out, as no good reason for it has been shown.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No notice of that amendment has been given.

Mr. LENNOX. I move it at the suggestion of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is that no important amendment can be moved without notice.

Mr. LENNOX. It is a question, then, whether this is important or not.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I consider it important enough to have notice. But, with unanimous consent of the committee, we can go beyond the rule.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I have no objection to the question being put.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the promoter of the Bill should give an explanation of the scope of these words. The words seem unnecessary and should be struck out. They seem to me to involve, possibly, an extension of the monopoly I have already referred to, which may be greatly to the disadvantage of the small dealer.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I think we have endeavoured to meet hon. gentlemen opposite and give them all possible information. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) does not suggest that striking out the words 'products thereof' is of sufficient importance to be presented as an amendment at five minutes to six. I do not think it makes any difference whether the words are in the Bill or not. It is evident that the hon. gentleman jumps at this merely to delay the Bill further after three hours of discussion.

Mr. BLAIN. I take exception to the hon. member (Mr. Duncan Ross) suggesting that this question is brought forward at five minutes to six in order to delay the Bill. I can say for myself that I have no such thought. If, as the hon. gentleman says, it makes practically no difference whether these words are in the Bill or not, then, I take it, they are unnecessary words and ought to be struck out.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am not enough of a lawyer to know, but I do not think it makes any difference whether the words are there or not.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, the hon. gentleman will not object to their being struck out. I see danger in these words if they are retained, as they may extend this monopoly. I can see very little in this Bill except an effort on the part of the promoters to secure a monopoly of the timber in that section of the country, and, in fact, of the river, so that the smaller dealers would have no opportunity to carry on work except by arranging with these monopolists. I enter my protest against such a monopoly being granted by this parliament. We have had examples of this before, as I pointed out earlier in this discussion. Whatever may be said, I do not wish to put myself in a position to be taunted afterwards for allowing this to pass unnoticed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend laughs but we understand that. He may think that he has his duty to perform in this matter. But I have my own rights here, and I say that when the hon. gentleman cannot give a reasonable explanation to the committee why these words should be in the Bill, the objection of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is well taken, and his suggestion should be acceded to.

Mr. CALDWELL. I was a member of one of the sub-committees appointed to consider this Bill. The men appointed on that committee were men having some knowledge of the lumber business, and they went carefully over the Bill. More than that, a sub-committee was appointed to draft a Bill, and this draft was submitted to the first sub-committee who again went over it very carefully, and afterwards submitted to the general committee and passed.

Mr. BLAIN. Was it passed unanimously?

Mr. CALDWELL. Except on one or two points. One was the question whether it should be terminated after a certain number of years, and a proposition to that effect was defeated by the chairman's vote. Now, after the Bill has been considered with such great care by men who have experience in the lumber business, and who had no interest except to protect the rights of the public, I think the opposition this afternoon is not treating that committee fairly. Surely all the consideration that was given to that Bill in the committee should not be lightly thrown aside.

Mr. BLAIN. For my part, I consider it a very dangerous practice to submit legislation to sub-committees to the extent it has been done during the last few years. I regard this practice as affording greater facili-

ties for getting monopolistic legislation through this House. The custom that has grown up of delegating important questions to sub-committees is, in my opinion, a dangerous one. I accept the suggestion of my hon. friend that possibly gentlemen who understand the lumber business looked into this matter carefully, and while I bow to their superior knowledge, I feel it my duty to enter my protest, because I see nothing in this Bill but an attempt to acquire a monopoly in that district, not only a monopoly against the smaller dealers, but a monopoly of the products of the whole section of country.

Mr. CALDWELL. Would the hon. gentleman have no respect for the opinion of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle), who was on the sub-committee and who recommended the Bill?

Mr. BLAIN. I have nothing to say about the opinions of other hon. gentlemen, I have only to discharge my own duty in the course I take upon this Bill. I think the government will be brought to task in the future in consequence of their action on this Bill, and I may suggest to the Minister of Public Works, who wants to see this Bill pass, that he will be brought to task for sanctioning this kind of legislation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in no sense a government measure.

Mr. BLAIN. It has received the sanction of the hon. gentleman, who is Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A member of the committee.

Mr. BLAIN. And who was selected for a place on the sub-committee to take care of it. What these gentlemen had in view in selecting the Minister of Public Works is not for me to discuss.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

## After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 11,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of Mr. Lennox to strike out the words 'and the products thereof' in the forty-eight line.

Mr. LENNOX. I wanted to point out before six o'clock that the only cases that have come to my hand show that we have no such expression as this. There has been no one as yet who has given any reason why those words should be there and they appear to open too wide a field. I point out that in the Act of 1905 the expression used in the corresponding section is 'on timber, saw logs, pulp wood and other lumber.' In the Act of 1904 the language employed is 'on timber, saw logs, pulp wood and other lumber,' exactly the same. In the Bill that was referred to this afternoon and that is now before the Private Bills Committee, the expression is the same, while in the Bill that we are now considering we have a more ample expression as regards the particular class of things upon which tolls may be levied, 'saw logs, poles, pulp wood, ties, timber, lumber,' so that the necessity is less even that in the other cases of having these words which are of very doubtful import 'and the products thereof.' Therefore, I think that these words should be struck out.

Mr. MORIN. It appears to me that there are some things with regard to this clause that ought to be determined now. Clause 11 says that:

> The company may levy and collect tolls, dues and charges upon all saw logs, poles, &c.

What will be the charge? I do not see anything in this Bill saying that the company may charge so much. Why not settle this now and say what the company may charge? If we do not, there will be trouble about it. The boom company may say they want so much per thousand feet board measure, and the owner of the logs may say that is too much. Then the result will be that they will have to come down to see the Minister of Public Works or Governor in Council and probably neither of them will be able to tell what the right charge is per thousand feet. I may say to the committee that the general charge by boom companies for saw logs is from 60 to 75 cents per thousand feet board measure. There is another question to be determined and it should be settled now. A man, we will suppose, has a lot of timber standing. He gives a contract to another man to cut, we will say, a million feet. This man goes to the woods and cuts the logs and the government scales them. Then the government scaler gives a statement that he has scaled a million feet. These logs go down to the boom and the boom company have a scaler on the boom to scale the logs. The scaler who scales the logs in the woods and the scaler who scales the logs at the boom never agree. There is always a dispute. This should be settled. The man goes to the woods and puts in a million feet. There are cases in which the contract is given on the condition that you take the boom scale whatever it may be. The parties agree in that way. But in this case the government send a scaler to the woods who scales the logs and he reports that he has scaled a million feet. The logs go down to the boom and there is a difference of 40,000, 50,000 or 60,000 feet between the results arrived at by the two scalers. Who is going to settle that part of it? Then there is nothing in the Bill to say who shall be the scaler at the boom. The boom company have a scaler of their own. The scalers should be appointed by the government in the woods and on the boom. The

parties will come before the Minister of Public Works or the Governor in Council and the boom company will say: We have so many thousand feet board measure. The man who cut the logs will say: I have so many thousand feet. How will the Minister of Public Works or the Governor in Council know who is right or who is wrong? Both parties cannot be right and one must surely be wrong. Why not settle this now and settle the price that the company shall charge? If this is left open the company may say: We will charge $1 per thousand feet. The man who owns the logs will protest that this is too much and how will the Governor in Council be in a position to determine what the charge should be?

Mr. GALLIHER. That is all provided for by the fact that the charges proposed to be levied have to be submitted to and approved by the Governor in Council before they can charge a cent.

Mr. MORIN. Very well; now, I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) what the Governor in Council knows as to what is right and what is wrong?

Mr. GALLIHER. He will hear both sides. He can only judge from what he hears from both sides.

Mr. MORIN. Yes, but he will hear so much that he will get mixed up and know nothing whatever about it. Settle that question now; say that they will not have the right to charge not less than 60 and not more than 75 cents per thousand feet.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. That no doubt would be the proper way if there were only one boom to be considered, but there are three or four different streams and the mills are in three or four different places. One mill may be a hundred miles away from the others, so that if you try to fix arbitrarily the price in your Bill that would be applied to all booms, it might be an exorbitant price in one case and too little in another. I can understand my hon. friend's position. If all the logs were going to be gathered at some particular point my hon. friend's argument would apply. But that is not the case there. The streams are like feeders and a boom will be required at each stream for the particular logs coming down that stream. Possibly 25 or 50 miles away there is another stream with a sorting boom for another set of mills. Thus a set of fees fixed here might be altogether outrageous. Last year a tariff of fees were inserted in a similar Bill and the lumbermen said that they were outrageously high.

Mr. MORIN. The proper way to do this is to have scalers scale the logs as they are sorted out and rafted. This requires the services of men of experience and knowledge of the trade. If lumbermen have to come to the Minister of Public Works or the Governor in Council to have every little dispute settled it will be a constant source of annoyance.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of Mr. Lennox; I understand the committee is unanimous on that point.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Oh, no.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Then as there is no notice of the amendment and this is a private Bill, I cannot accept it.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to move an amendment to section 11 providing that the Governor in Council may have the power to revise the dues from time to time.

Mr. GALLIHER. We will have no objection to that. I would move that after the word 'Governor in Council' in the last line on page 3, we should insert:

Who may from time to time revise the same.

And then later on it should read:

And when so approved the said tariff together with any alterations or amendments thereto or any revision thereof shall be published in the 'Canada Gazette.'

That makes the revision subject to the same conditions of publication as the tariff.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the trouble about fixing the tolls? In Ontario a boom company before it can charge for slidage or boomage must come to an agreement with the county council as to the prices to be charged for passing the logs. The Governor in Council here has no means of knowing what would be a fair charge for pilotage or passage of logs down the slide.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. As I explained the greatest possible objection was raised to a Bill last year in which we inserted such a clause. The committee will understand that few people know anything about the details of the cost of boomage on these rivers. It would seem to be reasonable to permit the company to make about 4 or 5 per cent on the moneys invested in each boom. It is an innovation in that province and it is necessary that the Governor in Council should receive information from the people interested to enable a proper judgment to be formed of what would be a reasonable charge. The people asking for this legislation are the lumbermen themselves, they simply want to expedite their lumbering operations. We might fix unreasonable tolls.

Mr. HAGGART. This might be used for the purpose of controlling the whole timber business on the river unless a reasonable rate is fixed.

Mr. GALLIHER. They could not fix an unreasonable rate as it is subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. McCOOL. The custom regarding the fixing of these tolls at all booms is that it is done by regulation of the Public Works Department. They have to publish these tolls in newspapers indicated by the department for a certain length of time before they are approved. This is not a question of a company organized for the purpose of making money. It is merely for the purpose of expediting the separating of logs on this river. The same thing is done on the Ottawa river, where there are five different booms in a distance of 100 miles, where logs have to be sorted in the same way that this Bill provides for. The Bill was most carefully gone into by the subcommittee, on which there were men who had some acquaintance with the lumber business, some of them having spent their whole lifetime in it.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that merely a portion of the Thompson river is navigable, while a great deal if it, and many of the streams running into it, are not navigable. The company is handling timber belonging to the province and the province is interested in the streams that are not navigable.

Mr. McCOOL. This Bill does not deal with streams or portions of streams that are not navigable. This House has no authority to legislate in regard to these.

Mr. GALLIHER. It is specifically stated in section 7 that the Bill deals only with the navigable portions of the rivers and streams named.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood a gentleman explaining the Bill to say that it dealt with several small streams, which are not navigable, emptying into the Thompson river.

Mr. MORIN. The promoter of the Bill said this was a new country and a new company. Well, I do not endorse that. The country may be a new country, but the company are too old, and too wise, and too sharp. The Bill has too many details. The company have a right to do as they please on land and water. I have worked on booms that boomed 600 million feet of lumber, and I never knew of a boom where machinery was used; but this company have the right to use machinery to put up buildings, and to operate roads, tramways, docks, wharfs and telegraph, telephone and electric lines. These people are from Minneapolis, and they are too old and sharp. They have a boom at Coon creek, eighteen miles above Minneapolis, built in 1845. I know some of the men from Minneapolis, and if the country is a new country, the men are old men, and sharp enough to blindfold most of us.

We ought to hear from the Minister of Public Works. These things may all come before him later on and he will then say that he did not know anything about them.

Mr. GALLIHER. While we are discussing this Bill, the minister ought to give us the benefit of his views.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister is not given to talking unnecessarily.

Mr. MORIN. You will be wakened up badly after a while.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There has been a good deal of discussion about fixing the tolls? Under section 11, the Governor General in Council is to approve or revise the tolls. Under section 9 he has to approve the plans and the plans are to be advertised in certain newspapers, and any one who desires to object to them shall have the right to do so. But it seems to me there is quite as much reason for advertising the tariff of fees. Obviously this is a matter as to which the minister will not have any official knowledge nor will any officer in his department. Where will he get his information?

Mr. GALLIHER. He could make it a regulation that before he is asked to approve the tariff, the tariff must be advertised.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where has he any power to make a regulation of that kind?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see why the tariff of tolls should not be advertised in the Canada 'Gazette' and a British Columbia newspaper, say at Kamloops or some other point, before application is made for approval.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I have no objection.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend the leader of the opposition draft an amendment to that effect?

Mr. COPP. The first amendment I propose to move is one I have taken from the French River Boom Company Act passed in 1894, and which is also included in the Edmonton Boom Company's Act of 1905:

Wherever a boom is permitted to be placed in such a position as to in any way interfere with the channel, the company shall provide at its own cost and expense a sufficient number of men, and there station them for the purpose of opening and closing the trip of the boom, which said trip shall be of such width as is determined from time to time by the Minister of Public Works, and the same shall be opened promptly so as to cause no delay, and the necessary steps shall be taken for keeping the channel clear for the passage of vessels, saw logs and rafts; and, in addition to any claim against the company for damages, any officer or servant of the company in charge of such boom who neglects to carry out the provision of this section shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding thirty dollars, which may be recovered before any justice of the peace in a summary manner.

I cannot see any good reason why a clause of this kind should not be inserted in this Bill. The promoter is willing that this section should apply but wants all the articles struck out except vessels. He knows that they could not prevent a vessel going down a navigable river, but the intention is to prevent rafts of timber or saw logs unless they pay toll. But if I want to bring a raft down that navigable river, this company should have no right to place a boom across it and thus prevent my raft going down unless I pay toll. I move that the clause I have just read be added to the Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. Do any rafts go down ?

Mr. GALLIHER. They never have.

Mr. COPP. There may be some. I am speaking on behalf of the operators on that river and I do not see why they and others who do not use the booms put on by this company should be liable to a toll.

Mr. HAGGART. You would render their powers useless altogether if you gave every individual the right to take down his logs independent of the boom.

Mr. COPP. I do not see that.

Mr. HAGGART. Better regulate them in some manner.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. COPP. I beg to move a second amendment :

The existence of the company shall be limited to a term of fifteen years from the 1st January, 1909.

In the Act we passed in 1904, incorporating the High River Lumber and Development Company, the limitation of existence was fixed at fifteen years. In the charter of the French River Boom Company, the limit is fixed at ten years. I have put the limit at fifteeen years.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The difficulty is this. We can only carry on those works under regulations fixed by the Governor in Council. All we are permitted to do is spend our money in quasi public works and the government fix the tolls and tell us how to run them. If it is a monopoly and the government regulates the monopoly in the public interest, then these works will serve the public, and the longer they continue to serve the public under government regulation, the better. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Copp) wants us to put in cheap, temporary works, having no longer life than the term he seeks to impose upon us. As they fall into disrepair in ten or twelve years, we shall have no further interest in them and are not likely to maintain them in the condition to be most useful to the public. We are not likely to keep them in as good state of repair as would be the case if we had permanent tenure in those works. If the public is duly protected, then, it is more in the interest of the public that the works should be carried on by us for thirty, fifty or a hundred years than that the company's operation of them should be terminated within a short period.

Mr. COPP. There is nothing to prevent them coming back and having their charter renewed.

Mr. LENNOX. It seems to me there is a great deal in the motion of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Copp). The hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) speaks of government regulation. But I do not see anything in the Bill about regulations that would assist us in this matter. Plans of alterations have to be submitted to the Governor in Council, but the Governor in Council cannot inaugurate any alterations.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Yes. I would refer to subsection 3 of section 9.

Mr. LENNOX. That provides that the Governor in Council may make orders and regulations for the expeditious rafting, driving, and so on, of these saw logs and other things. But this is a different matter. In fifteen or twenty years the conditions along these rivers may have greatly changed. A city may spring up where some of these boom works are to be located. Though it may be quite proper at this time to have these booms placed there, in fifteen years it may be they will be a hindrance to some rising community. We are conferring a perpetual franchise, and the government is divesting itself of power in this matter. The object of the amendment, as I understand it, is to provide that in fifteen years this company shall come back to parliament, when, if the conditions justify it, their rights can be renewed ; whereas, if the conditions are not favourable to the continuance of the franchise, the company's rights will have expired. I understand that this matter was the subject of keen debate in the committee, and that it was carried by a majority of only one.

Mr. COPP. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. In all matters of legislation we exercise important functions, but in nothing do we run greater risk of going wrong than in dealing with navigable rivers. We can construct railways in many places, but the highway by water is a limited thing, and if we hamper the rights of the public by legislation we shall do injustice to the people of the future. In all such cases parliament should limit the franchise given to people who propose to interfere, to a certain extent—for it cannot be denied they will interfere—with the ordinary rights of navigation. Speaking for myself, I think we are unwise in granting this monopoly, but, if we must grant it, then we take a wise precaution in limiting it to

a certain time. Let us keep it, say, at fifteen years.

Mr. GALLIHER. I would point out that the lumber interest of British Columbia is one of its greatest interests and will so remain. It is absolutely necessary to the lumber industry that some company or combination of companies shall provide these works. In granting this permission we necessarily create a monopoly if we are going to make our grant effective. I dare say that for the next fifty or sixty years their timber will be coming down from the rivers tributary to those upon which these works are to be made. These works should benefit, not only the men applying for this legislation, but all the parties who are driving timber down that river. Our care should be to grant only such rights to this company as will meet the interests of these parties and of the public generally. And so long as these works are operated absolutely under the control of the Dominion, I do not see that it makes any difference whether this charter is for ten or for fifty years. Some consideration must be given to the people who come into our country and spend six or seven million dollars in getting out the wealth that grows there. Of course, the public interest must be protected. But we cannot compare the North Thompson river with such a river as the St. Lawrence, with great cities on its banks.

Mr. LENNOX. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) mean by speaking of investments of six or seven millions of dollars?

Mr. GALLIHER. I say they have invested that in the country.

Mr. LENNOX. I see that the capital of the company is only $100,000.

Mr. GALLIHER. My hon. friend does not know, but I do, that the companies interested in this matter have millions and millions invested in British Columbia. It does not matter whether they are Canadian, British or American companies. I tell my hon. friend what I know—that these concerns have millions invested in British Columbia, not only in limits, but in mills as well. There is no danger of what my hon. friend mentions occurring, that this will interfere with the growing up of any big city where they propose to put this dam. The main object, after all, is obtained, looking at the thing fairly from the point of view of the public and of the people who invest millions of money in this country, if we induce them to improve that river, to put in more permanent works, to establish works beneficial to all who use that river, then I think we are doing a better thing than by confining them to any particular time, when they will not know whether, at the end of that period, they may get their rights renewed. We have an absolute safeguard in our own hands. In section 14 we provide that whatever regulations, whatever impositions are put upon this company by the Governor in Council, should they not live up to these regulations, or should they treat the public unfairly, all their works and all their rights with respect to which they do not observe those rules and regulations are absolutely forfeited, without a dollar of compensation, and their charter as regards those works becomes null and void. Now, have we not there the whip in our own hand? The Governor in Council can exercise that power, not only in ten years, but in two years.

Mr. LENNOX. They can only make limited regulations.

Mr. GALLIHER. There is nothing that limits the regulation, the Governor in Council can make in regard either to rafting, towing booming or anything else.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to tell the promoter of this Bill that he has too many details. Here we read:

> The Governor in Council may make such orders and regulations for the expeditious rafting, driving, towing, collecting, carrying, booming, storing, holding, protecting, sorting, and delivering.

Well, you are going to charge so much per log when you look at it, so much when you drive it, so much when you sort it? In all the booms I know anything about, people pay sixty, seventy or seventy-five cents per thousand feet board measure, and that includes everything. The boom company takes the logs in the boom and sorts them out and raft them, then the owners of the logs come and take them away. But in this Bill who is going to regulate these matters? We cannot get the Minister of Public Works to speak one word now. What will he say hereafter when all these questions come before him? He will have to get a Dutchman to tell him what is what.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) that there is too much verbiage in the Bill. That is following the lawyers, and we laymen have to put up with it.

Mr. MORIN. Are you a lawyer?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. No, I am not.

Mr. MORIN. Thank God.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a growing feeling in the country against giving perpetual franchises of this nature, the trend of the age is to limit them to reasonable time, I should say twenty to twenty-five years at the outside. If there is any urgent need for a renewal of the rights, and the company are carrying on the business properly without detriment to the country, there will be no difficulty in getting a renewal from

parliament. Parliament has never refused, so far as I know, the renewal of any franchise that is in the public interest and that was carried on properly. But if the reverse should be the case, then it is important that the time should be limited. We give them the right to maintain and operate roads, tramways, docks, wharfs, piers, and all similar works and we give this right perpetually. As soon as they build these docks and piers they may charge for every bag of potatoes or bushel of wheat that goes over them. I take it the government would have no control over these.

Mr. GALLIHER. It is only in connection with the carrying on of the undertakings of the company that they have a right to do these things. It is not a part of their undertakings to become freighters, or wharfingers, or anything of that kind.

Mr. SPROULE. But boats coming there could not land at their docks without permission. Take for instance Kamloops, where this company is operating at present. Does the hon. member not know that in the future there will be a great deal of produce carried into Kamloops from the farms in that rich valley, and in all likelihood this produce will be carried on boats navigating those rivers.

Mr. GALLIHER. Kamloops is some miles from where it is proposed to put these works.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. This is a boom company. Read the clause:

In connection with and in carrying on its undertakings, the company may acquire, hold, maintain and operate lands, buildings, water-powers.

And so on. They may put up wharfs where they have boom works. That is all they have authority to do under this Act, they have no authority to put up a wharf at Kamloops where they have no booms. If it is necessary to have a steamboat to hold the logs at the boom, they are allowed to do so under this Act.

Mr. HAGGART. Are all these things necessary for the accomplishment of the work?

Mr. GALLIHER. It is so stated in the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. If they have a sawmill at Kamloops are they not carrying on operations there, do they not handle saw logs at that mill.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. This company is not allowed to run a sawmill under the Act. This company is not the sawmill company, it is made up of all the sawmill companies for the purpose of expediting logs. Therefore this company could not have a sawmill, but the people who are interested in this company will have a sawmill.

Mr. GALLIHER. This company, while incorporated as a boom company, is made up of men who have a very large sum of money invested in the company, and we should give some consideration to the rights of men who have invested their millions of money.

Mr. SPROULE. Did not the hon. gentleman tell us that there were five companies interested in timber, and they all wanted to use these booms and to build sawmills because they have timber there? What are they going to do with the timber if they do not cut it? But, before six o'clock the hon. gentleman contended that when the Lamb Company purchased the other company they believed they had purchased the rights of the boom company as well, as part and parcel of the lumbering business that they had contracted to purchase. This company, composed of five different companies, as sawmill and timber limit owners, intend to operate their mills, and if so are they not going to use these rivers, booms and piers? Will they not have boats on these rivers as well?

Mr. GALLIHER. If you will look at section 11 you will not find any wharfs mentioned as being among the things upon which these people can charge tolls.

Mr. SPROULE. I have seen wharfs built before by individuals and it is very rarely in our country that an individual owning a wharf does not charge tolls. If you go up to the Soo or to Port Arthur you will find it and I presume you will find the same thing at Kamloops. The hon. gentleman says that there are no thriving towns and cities on these waters. What will there be in future? Will there not be towns, cities and great interests along these streams that do not exist to-day and which will make it necessary to the people using these streams to have ingress and egress over these wharfs. All these are public interests and will you lock up these waterways for ever by giving into the hands of one company a perpetual right? The sentiment of the age is against giving perpetual franchises and I do not see any reason why you should give it in this case for more than twenty or twenty-five years.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are the British Columbia government agreeable to this Bill? In clause 7 the company is given the right to carry on its business on the following streams and bodies of water:

The Thompson river for a distance of two miles west of the confluence of the north and south Thompson rivers, the north Thompson river, the south Thompson river, Shuswap lake and its several arms, the lower Spallumcheen river and the navigable tributaries of each thereof, and the navigable bodies of water connecting therewith and their respective navigable tributaries.

Would that take in lakes like the Arrow lakes ?

Mr. GALLIHER. No. As to the first question, we have specifically excluded any thing in which the British Columbia government could be interested. We are confining our works to the navigable waters of British Columbia. In answer to the second question the Arrow lakes are merely expansions of the Columbia river and are not included in this section.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you any charter for non-navigable waters from the local government ?

Mr. GALLIHER. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are there not large lakes that empty into these rivers that would be included ?

Mr. GALLIHER. There is Shuswap lake, of course, that is mentioned here.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does not that include the whole of these rivers.

Mr. GALLIHER. As far as Kamloops lake is concerned and on which is the mill of one of the companies opposing this Bill, it is an expansion of the Thompson river practically. The south Thompson river and the north Thompson river join a short distance west of Kamloops. These works that the company is authorized to construct do not go any farther west than two miles west of the confluence of these rivers. This Bill does not interfere in any way with Kamloops lake and after the logs are sorted in this boom on the north Thompson they can pass down to the lake and to the mill without obstruction whatever.

Mr. J. D. REID. These are long rivers that are mentioned and you include the navigable tributaries of them. That might extend for hundreds and hundreds of miles.

Mr. GALLIHER. It certainly takes in a good deal of territory but my hon. friend will understand that very often you do not find right on the shores of the lakes good timber areas. You probably have to go some miles up small streams for the timber and these areas may be scattered over fifteen or twenty different streams that enter into these rivers or lakes. Most of these streams are not navigable and we are not asking to be allowed to do anything on these streams except on the portions that may be navigable.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why would not this include lakes thousands of miles away up north in British Columbia ? The Grand Trunk Pacific is hundreds of miles north of the Canadian Pacific Railway. These lakes will become navigable within a few years. Will not this clause take in all these lakes?

Mr. GALLIHER. There are mountain divides in that country. On one side of the mountain divides the streams run in one way into lakes and on the other side they run the other way. It is impossible to connect them for thousands of miles. I know the topography of that country fairly well and I can assure my hon. friend that there is no fear of what he suggests.

Mr. J. D. REID. This is a very wide clause.

Mr. GALLIHER. It sounds more formidable than it is. It is worded in that way in order to avoid missing out a link which might shut off your timber berth from access to a river or your mill.

Mr. HAGGART. In Ontario these works are generally constructed by the government. British Columbia does not seem to be getting its full share in this matter. It would be a legitimate enterprise to press upon the government the building of these booms.

Mr. GALLIHER. We did so.

Amendment (Mr. Copp) negatived, nays, 25; ayes, 15.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Reference was made to section 11. I would move to insert at the bottom of page 3, after the words 'Governor in Council' on the last line of the page, the following :

> Who, before approving thereof, shall require the company to give public notice of the application for such approval in such newspapers, for such time and in such manner as the Governor in Council shall direct and shall give an opportunity for all interested persons to be heard on such application.
>
> The Governor in Council may also revise the said tariff from time to time.

The last few words to take the place of an amendment already introduced.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I accept the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would call attention to the peculiar wording of subsection 2 of section 10. The words 'navigation' and 'navigable' are used in this Bill without any definition, so in the end their construction will have to be determined by the courts and I foresee a rich harvest for the legal profession in determining just what meaning the words have. Do the hon. members promoting this Bill imagine that this parliament can overturn the British North America Act by saying that the Minister of Public Works shall be the judge as to whether or not the water is navigable or not ?

Mr. D. ROSS. I think the intention is that for the purpose of carrying on this company the Minister of Public Works can judge upon this point. It is a matter of regulation not of law, as I understand it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is a matter of law. If the government or some citizen of British Columbia should contend that certain waters are not navigable and deny the exercise of this jurisdiction, then the question would arise as to whether it is navigable water within the meaning of the British North America Act. Does any one suppose that this parliament can change the British North America Act in that regard ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Certainly not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then why put anything like this in the statute?

Mr. GALLIHER. If a dispute arose upon this point between the company and some one else, the Minister of Public Works could decide as to whether it was navigable or not as between these two, and he would be given power by this Act to do so, because the company only have the power we choose to grant them by this Act. I quite agree that as to anything between the government of British Columbia or any individual and the company, we could not interfere.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The language is not confined to this company. This company is bound to construct booms on any particular piece of water if it is navigable; at all events section 10 seems to contemplate that. An individual who desires this service to be rendered makes his demand upon the company and the Minister of Public Works is empowered by this statute to say that it is not navigable and so you are not bound to erect booms. This section declares that the decision of the minister as to whether the water is navigable or non-navigable shall be binding and final upon the disputants.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The word 'company' would do instead of 'disputants.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The present language will have no effect except the effect of making this parliament ridiculous by enacting it.

Mr. GALLIHER. I can see no reason why this clause should be put in unless it is that if the company wants to build on a particular stream and the minister says : No, that is not navigable, then the company would be bound by his decision. If it is for any other purpose I quite agree that the clause can have no effect.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I think if the word 'company' was put in instead of the word 'disputants' it would probably convey the meaning intended.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think it would have its use as between the minister and the company. If the company wanted to infringe on what was not navigable water, they might come up against the provincial authority, but it should be in the power of the minister to say : That is not navigable water, and you cannot put your works there. To that extent it would have some use.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You might argue that the company, having accepted a charter, would be bound by the terms of the charter, and therefore would be bound by the decision of the Minister of Public Works. I would suggest that in the last line the word 'disputants' be struck out, and the word 'company' be inserted in its place.

Section 10 amended accordingly.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not see in the Bill any provision giving the government the right to take over this property at any time.

Mr. GALLIHER. The government do not seem anxious to take it over, or at least the Minister of Public Works does not. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) and myself drafted a clause giving the government the right to take over the works on paying the company a reasonable compensation ; but the minister thought the provision was not drastic enough, and he had one inserted providing that if the company did not carry on the work in the public interest the government would have the right to confiscate their plant.

Mr. HAGGART. The government should have the right to assume the works at any time on payment of a fair compensation, which should be fixed in the Act.

Mr. REID (Grenville). My idea was that the government should have the right to take it over at any time on payment of the amount expended.

Mr. GALLIHER. We have no objection to that. It was proposed by the sub-committee and struck out by the committee, and section 14 was inserted instead.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What position is the government in with regard to taking over the works ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It has no power to take over the works, but the public interest seems to be sufficiently safeguarded. In the first place the Governor in Council has absolute power to decide where the works shall be situated, and what their character shall be. In the second place, the Governor in Council has control of the tariff of tolls and may revise it from time to time. In the third place, if the company fail to comply with any regulation of the Governor in Council, in the operation of the works, the works may be confiscated. So, on the whole, the public interest is pretty well safeguarded. At the same time, I would have been very glad to have seen a clause in the Bill empowering the Governor in Council on fair and reasonable terms to take over the works. In Great Britain

the general rule in such cases is to add ten per cent to the actual value of the property when taken over.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. To show the attitude of the mill men who are interested, I will read an extract from one of their letters :

We would much prefer to have the matter of transport of timber by flotation wholly in the hands of the government, but inasmuch as that would be somewhat of a task for the government to undertake at this time, we have outlined what we believe to be the best measure possible. . . . We stand ready, at any time the government decides to make the matter of booms a government affair, to turn the works over to the government.

As stated by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher), they were perfectly willing to have such a clause in the Bill ; but we cannot have a clause providing for the government expropriating the works, and another clause providing for the government confiscating them. The Minister of Public Works, in order to have the whip hand over the company, preferred to have a clause providing for the government confiscating the works if the company did not operate them in the public interest.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The two clauses are not inconsistent with each other.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I can see the distinction. The people interested have not the slightest objection to the government taking over these works. On the contrary, they would rather see the government do the work now, if they could be induced to do it. But as this is not practicable, these men are willing to do it under government regulation. They are perfectly willing to have a clause inserted providing that the government may at any time take over the works on payment of fair compensation.

Mr. LENNOX. I think it would be well to have such a clause in the Bill. It would not conflict with the provision about forfeiting the works in the event of the company not carrying out the regulations. But they may be carrying out the regulations satisfactorily, and yet something might arise that would make it in the public interest to take over the works on reasonable terms.

Mr. SPROULE. Such a clause could be put in on the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. GALLIHER. We have spent a good deal of time in committee on this Bill, and for my part, though not in charge of it, I am very much interested in supporting it, because a number of the people interested in it have mills in my section of the country, and I would like to see it proceeded with and if possible passed to-night.

Mr. LENNOX. If we agree that there should be such a clause properly framed and inserted, no time need be lost in adding it before the third reading.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I have no objection to that clause being added on the third reading. This company have several applications for improvement absolutely necessary to be carried out immediately. These applications are before the Department of Public Works. This Bill has been in the Private Bills Committee nearly two months, and the company are anxious it should become law so that these applications will be dealt with. We have only one day for private members now, and it will be two weeks before the amendment can be added.

Mr. J. D. REID. No one wants to injure the people at British Columbia, but I think it would be better to have that clause in.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Agree to add it in the Senate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Third reading to-morrow night.

Bill reported.

## SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 125) respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 128) respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—Mr. Michaud.

Bill (No. 129) to incorporate the London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 127) respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.—Mr. Pringle.

Bill (No. 126) to change the name and head office of the Anglo-Canadian Insurance Company.—Mr. Gervais.

Bill (No. 124) for the relief of Andrew Walker.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 131) respecting the Occidental Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 132) to incorporate the Standard Accident and Guarantee Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

## QUESTIONS.

### WHARF AT DESCHAMBAULT.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

1. How many tenders had the Public Works Department received in 1904 for the construction of the wharf at Deschambault, in the county of Portneuf?
2. What was the name of each tenderer and the amount asked by each of them?
3. To whom was the contract awarded?
4. Were there any extras paid to the contractor? If so, what amount?
5. Apart from the amount expended on the construction of the wharf, what amount did the Public Works Department spend at Deschambault, county of Portneuf, from the 1st

May, 1904, to the present date, and what was the nature of the works that it had done in that locality?

6. What are the names and residences of the engineer and the inspector or inspectors who had the superintendence of such works?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I would ask my hon. friend to put this in the form of a motion for a return.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL SURVEY.

Mr. WHITE asked:

1. Has the final report of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian bay canal survey been completed?

2. When will said report be presented to parliament?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The plans are very nearly ready. They are being lithographed. But the report will not be ready for some few weeks. I thought probably I would submit the plans and then the report just as soon as ready.

NEW BRUNSWICK INLAND WATERS—WHARFS.

Mr. WILMOT—by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

1. Will the Department of Public Works continue the existing policy of requiring a joint appropriation from the provincial government for constructing wharfs on the inland waters of New Brunswick?

2. Has the attention of the Minister of Public Works been directed to the dilapidated condition of the wharf at Douglas harbour, Queens county, New Brunswick?

3. Does the minister know that the traffic at the above point is one of the largest on the Grand lake?

4. What is the policy of the department regarding the repair of such wharfs?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The Department of Public Works has not pursued the policy indicated in the first paragraph of the question. For some years past appropriations have been made by parliament to pay one-half of the cost of wharfs constructed by the government of New Brunswick in the tidal waters of the St. John river and its tributaries. Apart from this, the Department of Public Works has borne the whole expense of constructing several wharfs upon the inland waters of the province. The question as to whether or not this policy will be departed from has not been considered by the government.

To the second part of the question: No.

To the third and fourth: The minister has not had occasion to inquire into the amount of traffic at Douglas harbour, the wharf there being constructed and owned by the provincial government, and the view of the department would be that any necessary repairs should be made by that government.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY ASPHALT.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. How many station platforms of the Intercolonial Railway have been built or rebuilt of asphalt during the years 1905, 1906, 1907, and at what stations?

2. Was all this work let by public tender and contract? If not, were tenders asked from particular companies or parties? If so, what are the names of the parties asked to tender in each case, to whom the work was awarded, and the price paid per square yard?

3. Did the Department of Railways and Canals supply any gravel or other material free of charge to any of the contractors? If so, what material was supplied in the several cases?

4. Was the work referred to guaranteed for any term of years? If so, for what term?

5. Has the work proved satisfactory in each instance? If not, at what stations has the work proved unsatisfactory?

6. Did the Barber Asphalt Company, of Philadelphia, do any of this work? If so, at what points, how many square yards at each place, and at what price per square yard at each place?

7. Did P. S. Low do any of this work? If so, at what points, how many square yards at each place, and at what price per square yard at each place?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The department accepted an offer from Mr. R. S. Low to build part of a tar macadam platform at Sydney at $1.50 per square yard, including 4½ inches of concrete foundation. 2,474 yards were built at $1.50, equal to $3,711. There is a percentage of asphalt and bitumen in the composition, and it is sometimes called 'mastic.' It has so far proved an excellent platform. The price was very low, for the reason that the builder wanted to introduce this particular kind of platform, and it was especially made as a sample.

2. Public tenders were not called for.

3. No.

4. Yes, for three years.

5. Yes.

6. No.

7. Yes; all particulars answered by No. 1.

ISLANDS FLAGGED BY CAPTAIN BERNIER—ARCTIC EXPEDITIONS.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What islands have been flagged by Captain Bernier as the result of his three cruises in the northern waters?

2. How many whalers have been licensed each year, and what amount of money has been collected therefor?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Baffin, Bylot, Russell, Louther, Griffith's, Cornwallis, Bathurst, Byam Martin, Melville, Cone, North Lincoln and adjacent

islands were flagged during Captain Bernier's only trip to northern waters.

2. Licenses issued 1906: 'Eclipse,' 'Albert,' 'Diana,' 'Beleana,' 'Morning.' Licenses issued 1907: 'Diana,' 'Morning,' 'Beleana,' 'Eclipse' and 'Albert.' Amount collected, $500.

IMPROVEMENTS AT RIDEAU HALL.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What is covered by the capital of $26,900 for providing or improving grounds in connection with Rideau Hall?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The principal portion of the amount, namely $25,409.09 for the construction of a conservatory. The balance of $1,491 is for minor constructions in the grounds.

BURLINGTON CHANNEL LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. E. D. SMITH—by Mr. Cockshutt—asked:

1. When did the lighthouse at Burlington Channel fall over?
2. When was the lighthouse erected?
3. What did it cost?
4. When is it proposed to re-erect it?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. The extremity of the Burlington breakwater on which the front range light stood was carried away by storm on the afternoon of the 4th of December, 1907, and the lighthouse was carried away at the same time.

2. The light was erected and put in operation in November, 1905.

3. The total cost of the tower including the preparation of the foundation was $1,949.65.

In May and June, 1906, the tower was moved to a new position at a cost of $544.84, as the breakwater was being destroyed and the tower was in danger.

4. The lighthouse cannot be re-erected until the new headblock, now in course of construction, is completed. In the meantime temporary lights are being placed on the northern side of the entrance.

A. BEAUCHEMIN, SOREL.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

Is A. Beauchemin, of Sorel, an inspector of machinery on the St. Lawrence Ship Channel? If so, what salary is he paid, and what are his duties?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). No. Mr. Beauchemin is local superintendent of dredging below Quebec. His salary is $1,500 per annum.

TRIPS ON GOVERNMENT STEAMERS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. How many trips did Mr. Cowie take on government steamers during the season of navigation in 1907, for the purpose of pleasure or for inspection, respectively?

2. On what steamers did he make such trips?

3. On how many of those trips did Mr. A. Beauchemin, of Sorel, accompany him?

4. How many other persons did accompany him on these trips, and what are the names of such persons?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. 33. They were all on trips of inspection.

2. 'Lady Grey" and 'Frontenac.'

3. None.

4. From 1 to 12. Minister, acting minister, deputy minister, members of Shipping Federation, board of trade, chamber of commerce, party of English engineers, English journalists, presidents of pilots, members of the engineering staff.

REJECTED PASSAGES TO CANADA.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Cockshutt—asked:

How many passages to Canada were rejected at the agencies of the several steamship companies in European cities during the twelve months previous to August, 1907?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The government has no information.

RAILWAY STATION AT RIVIERE DU LOUP.

Mr. GAUVREAU—by Mr. Talbot—asked:

1. Has the Department of Railways been informed of the reported deplorable condition of the approaches to the Intercolonial Railway station at Rivière du Loup?

2. If so, does the Minister of Railways intend to macadamize, or cover with asphalt or with any other material the land around the said station? If so, when?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Some complaints have been made against the bad state of the roads behind the station.

2. Repairs will be made in due course, when the weather permits.

GRANTS OF COAL AREAS—AGENTS FOR APPLICANTS.

Mr. LAKE—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

In respect of each of the under-mentioned coal areas,

(a) What was the name and address of the party who acted as agent in making application on behalf of the original grantee; and

(b) What is the name and address of the present holder:

1. South half of section 18, township 5, range 1, west of 5th meridian.

2. North half of section 5, township 5, range 1, west of 5th meridian.

3. West half of section 32, township 6, range 3, west of 5th meridian.

4. West half of section 15, township 6, range 4, west of 5th meridian;
5. South half of section 24, township 7, range 6, west of 5th meridian;
6. East half of section 19, township 8, range 3, west of 5th meridian.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. (a) Application not made through an agent.
(b) Patented to A. A. Klaver, Pincher Creek, Alta., 5th July, 1902. The department has no information as to present owner.
2. (a) Application not made through an agent.
(b) Patented to C. B. Snider, Pincher Creek, Alta., 1st June, 1903.
3. (a) C. Remy, Frank, Alberta.
(b) Jules Justin Fleutot, Blairmore, Alberta.
4. (a) C. St. Barbe, Nelson, B.C.
(b) Hastings Exploration Syndicate and Brock, Marshall and Cockburn. Address: Care Messrs. McGiverin & Haydon, barristers, Ottawa.
5. (a) Application not made through an agent.
(b) Legal subdivisions 4 and 5 only. British American Coal Company. Address: Care Messrs. Kingsmill, Hellmuth, Torrance and Saunders, barristers, Toronto.
6. (a) Application not made through an agent.
(b) West Canadian Collieries, Limited, Blairmore, Alberta.

Mr. AMES asked:

In respect of each of the under-mentioned coal areas:
(a) What was the name and address of the party who acted as agent in making application on behalf of the original grantee; and
(b) What is the name and address of the present holder:
1. West half of section 14, township 8, range 4, west of 5th meridian;
2. East half of section 21, township 10, range 3, west of 5th meridian;
3. East half of section 22, township 10, range 4, west of 5th meridian;
4. East half of section 7, township 11, range 3, west of 5th meridian;
5. East half of section 3, township 11, range 3, west of 5th meridian;
6. East half of section 28, township 12, range 3, west of 5th meridian.
7. East half of section 4, township 13, range 3, west of 5th meridian.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. (a) A. W. McVittie, Cranbrook, B.C.
(b) Patented 25th April, 1907, to The West Canadian Collieries, Limited, Blairmore, Alberta.
2. (a) M. McKenzie, Macleod, Alberta.
(b) Wesley Bick, Ottawa.
3. (a) McGiverin and Haydon, Ottawa.
(b) F. E. Kenaston (Minneapolis, Minn.), Care Messrs. McGiverin and Haydon, Ottawa.
4. (a) McGiverin and Haydon, Ottawa.
(b) Western Canada Development Company, Limited, care of Messrs, McGiverin and Haydon, Ottawa.
5. (a) McGiverin and Haydon, Ottawa.
(b) F. E. Kenaston (Minneapolis, Minn.). Care of Messrs. McGiverin and Haydon, Ottawa.
6. (a) Hough, Campbell and Ferguson, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
(b) F. E. Kenaston (Minneapolis, Minn.). Care of Messrs. McGiverin and Haydon, Ottawa.
7. (a) Hough, Campbell and Ferguson, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
(b) F. E. Kenaston (Minneapolis, Min.). Care of Messrs. McGiverin and Haydon, Ottawa.

## COAL SHIPMENTS FROM NOVA SCOTIA AND CAPE BRETON.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked:

1. Has the government received a copy of the following resolutions passed by the Charlottetown Board of Trade on the fifth instant?
2. If so, what action does the government propose in order to give them effect?

Charlottetown Board of Trade.
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island,
March 7, 1908.

At a meeting of the council of this board, held on the fifth instant, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas the system of the coal mining companies in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton give a loading preference to steamers over sailing vessels at their respective piers, and said discrimination mitigates against the owners and charterers of sailing vessels;

And whereas the greater part of the coal imported to this province is freighted in sailing vessels, and owing to the condition of our harbours, must continue to be freighted by vessels of shallow draught;

And whereas such system may compel sailing vessels to abandon the coal carrying trade to the great detriment of this city and province;

Therefore, resolved that the Charlottetown Board of Trade respectfully request the federal government to pass such legislation as will give to sailing and steam tonnage equal rights in their proper loading turns at the coal ports in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, steamers when taking in bunker coal to have preference only.

Resolved, that the council of the Charlottetown Board of Trade respectfully and urgently request that the federal government give at once a definite reply to the representation made regarding freight and passenger rates by the delegates of the Board of Trade of Prince Edward Island at a meeting held in Charlottetown last June, at which the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals and the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries were present, so that the concessions that the board of trade confidently expect may be made known at the opening of navigation.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes.
2. Under consideration.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—REVENUE FOR USE OF TERMINALS.

Mr. STANFIELD—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

What revenue is the Intercolonial Railway receiving for the use of terminals by (a) the Canadian Pacific Railway at St. John, New Brunswick; (b) the Canadian Pacific Railway at Fredericton, New Brunswick; (c) the Halifax and South Western Railway at Halifax, Nova Scotia; (d) the Sydney and Louisburg Railway at Sydney, Nova Scotia?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. (a) For wear and tear of tracks, buildings, &c., $1,200 a year, and a share of the station expenses in proportion to the use the Canadian Pacific Railway makes of the station.

(b) The Canadian Pacific Railway do not use the Intercolonial terminals at Fredericton.

(c) A proportion of the interest at 4 per cent on the value of the premises, used jointly by the Intercolonial Railway, Dominion Atlantic Railway and the Halifax and Southwestern Railway. The proportion being in accordance with the use made of the premises by the Halifax and Southwestern from time to time. A share of the station expenses in proportion to the use the Halifax and Southwestern Railway makes of the station and premises.

(d) The Intercolonial Railway receives from the Sydney and Louisburg Railway at Sydney $65 per month.

OTONABEE POWER COMPANY, PETERBOROUGH.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

What amount of horse-power was paid for by the Otonabee Power Company, of Peterborough, in last fiscal year?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The lease to the Otonabee Power Company of Peterborough, was for the right to use all the surplus water, estimated at the time at 625 horse-power.

DREDGING AT VERNON RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. A. Martin—asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to dredge the river at the end near the pier built at Vernon river bridge, Prince Edward Island?
2. Is the government aware that in order to give the necessary shipping accommodation at the pier, dredging is necessary?

Hon. Wm. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. Matter under consideration.
2. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.)

BREAKWATER AT TRACADIE HARBOUR.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. A. Martin—asked:

1. Have petitions been received from the inhabitants of Tracadie and Blooming Point, Prince Edward Island, for the construction of a breakwater at Tracadie harbour?
2. Has any survey been made with a view to the construction of said work?
3. Was an estimate made of the cost of the work? If so, by whom and what is the amount of such estimate?
4. Is it the intention of the government to place an amount in the estimates this session for the construction, and to proceed with the work?

Hon. Wm. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1 and 2. Yes.
3. (a) Yes. (b) J. B. Hagan, resident engineer. (c) $27,000.
4. Matter under consideration.

POST OFFICE, PARISH OF THE SACRED HEART.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. For what reason did the government establish six post offices in the parish of the Sacred Heart, county of Saguenay, where the population comprises only 640 souls?
2. Instead of establishing six post offices in the parish of the Sacred Heart, where the mail is only received four times per week, why did not the government establish in that locality, according to the request of those interested, a six mails per week service?
3. Who recommended the establishment of the six post offices in the said parish?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The hon. gentleman is misinformed. There is only one post office in the parish of Sacred Heart, county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

PRINTING FOR OUTSIDE POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Cockshutt—asked:

1. What is the nature of the printing for outside postal service, and is it let by tender, what is the name of the firms doing the printing, what was the amount paid for such printing in the years 1905 and 1906?
2. Is the stationery in the Postal Department, outside service, purchased by tender? If so, what is the name of the firm supplying the department?
3. Where are stamps and stamp paper manufactured, what is the name of the firm manufacturing same, and is the work done by tender?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1 and 2. As regards questions 1 and 2 all printing and stationery is furnished to the Department by the King's Printer, who allots all work without consulting the Post Office Department.

3. As regards question 3, all stamps are manufactured for the Post Office Depart-

ment under a contract passed between the Finance Department and the American Bank Note Company who supply, without reference to the Post Office Department, the paper.

MR. R. DALY, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Cockshutt—asked :

1. Was Mr. Reginald Daly, employed in the Geological Survey and Interior Department, paid for full time for the financial years 1903-4, 1904-5 and 1905-6?
2. Was Mr. Daly acting in the service of the government during the whole of those three years, or if absent, during what time was he absent, and for what cause?
3. Was he absent during any part of this time as a paid lecturer in California? If so, when and for how long?
4. When was his salary increased from $2,000 to $2,500, and why was it so increased?

Hon. Wm. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Dr. Daly lectured during six weeks in California. He had leave of absence from the minister of the department in which he was employed. Dr. Daly spent four months of that season in the field. Do not know if he was paid for the time he lectured.
4. From the 1st July, 1906. For ability and good service.

DR. A. E. BARLOW.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Cockshutt—asked :

1. Did Doctor A. E. Barlow, while in the service of the Geological Survey Department, investigate a belt in Lake Temagami district, the property of the Honourable Sir William Mulock and Mr. Daniel O'Cannor, and run lines and trenches across the property?
2. Did Doctor A. E. Barlow make a report of this investigation or survey?
3. Did he make a map of the property, and is it available?
4. What was the total cost of the work, including Doctor Barlow's salary?
5. Was Doctor Barlow, while engaged in making examination of nickel deposits in Sudbury region for Doctor Mond, paid a salary and allowance for expenses by Doctor Mond, in addition to the salary paid by the government?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Mines). This involves an inquiry of Dr. Barlow, who is not now in the service of the government, and must stand until he can be communicated with.

MR. DONALD FRASER, HUNTINGDON, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Was Donald Fraser, customs officer at Huntingdon, British Columbia, dismissed? If so, for what reason was he dismissed?
2. Was any investigation held in the matter? If so, what was the finding?

Hon. WM. PATTERSON. Minister of Customs). If the hon. gentleman will consult 'Hansard' of March 18, he will find the answer to these questions, as given to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—RUNNING TRAINS—OFFICIAL CARS.

Mr. FORGET—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Is the Minister of Railways aware that the regular passenger trains between Halifax and Montreal on the Intercolonial Railway very seldom reach Montreal on schedule time and run late on a great portion of the line? If so, what reasons have been given by the officials for allowing this?
2. Does the minister intend taking any action to see that in future this is not to be a constant occurrence, thus inconveniencing the public?
3. Does the government allow private or official cars to be attached to the Ocean Limited train and other very fast schedule trains?
4. Is the government aware that this delays said trains and prevents them running on time?
5. Is the government aware that other railways in Canada do not allow private or official cars to be attached to limited trains?
6. Does the Minister of Railways intend to allow official and private cars to be continued to be attached to fast through limited trains?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The trains on the Intercolonial Railway, between Halifax and Montreal, are run as regularly on time, as any other railway in the country, considering the length of road and the exigencies connected therewith.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. No private official cars are attached to the Ocean Limited.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. Yes, it is learned that the Grand Trunk Railway do not attach private or official cars to their international limited train, or on the 8.30 a.m. train leaving Montreal for Ottawa, or the 4.45 p.m. train leaving Ottawa for Montreal.
6. Answered by No. 3.

TREADGOLD COMMISSION—SERVICES OF MR. JUSTICE BRITTON.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Has Hon. Mr. Justice Britton been paid in full for his services and expenses on the Treadgold Commission?
2. What amount has been paid him for services as commissioner?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.
2. $3,000.

## MR. P. HOLLIDAY.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Was Mr. P. Holliday, during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1907, a single or a married man?

2. What was the ground upon which he was paid additional living allowance of $538.71, as stated on page L—36 of the Auditor General's Report, 1906-7?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. A single man.

2. The mining recorders located at Duncan Creek, Glacier Creek and Conrad, in the Yukon Territory, were in receipt of an allowance of $125 per month because of the additional cost of living in these remote portions of the territory, and as the mining recorder at Kluane seemed to be in the same position, the comptroller recommended that Mr. Holliday, the mining recorder at that place, which is the most isolated of all, be paid a living allowance at the same rate, his predecessors in office having received an allowance of $175 per month. This recommendation was duly approved, and on the 31st of March, 1907, a cheque for $538.71 was issued in favour of Mr. Holliday, being payment of the extra living allowance at the rate of $25 per month, from the 15th of June, 1905, to the 31st of March, 1907.

## FOREIGN PURCHASES.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

Referring to an item 'Collector of Customs, Ottawa, duty on foreign purchases, $1,543.27,' page L—39, Auditor General's Report, 1906-7, what are the purchases referred to in this item, and what were the purchase amounts paid?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mathematical instruments, clocks, photo plates, dry batteries, mirrors, &c., purchase amounts, $5,099.45.

## LOBSTER FISHING AND PACKING LICENSES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens) moved :

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, petitions, orders in council, applications for licenses, in possession of the government or any member or official thereof, respecting the granting of lobster fishing and packing licenses in Prince Edward Island for the years 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907-8 and the report of the inspectors thereon.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). This will be a very voluminous return, for there has been an extensive correspondence in reference to the matters covered by the motion. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Martin) will be kind enough to let me know particulars of what he would like especially, it will facilitate the work. Otherwise, the return must take some time.

Motion agreed to.

## EXPENDITURE ON WHARFS, PIERS AND HARBOURS.

Mr. BLAIN—by Mr. Taylor—moved :

For a return showing what amount has been expended on wharfs, piers and harbours each year since 1895, and the amount expended in each province.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Motions have already been passed for returns covering information very similar to this. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow it to stand ; and I will look up the previous motions.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

## MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing how much has been paid to C. Boone or the Boone Company since 1896, and the amount paid for work in each year at each point where same was performed by said party, firm or company.—Mr. Bennett.

For a return showing the expenditure of the government for food, clothing and other maintenance for immigrants after landing in Canada for the years 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, to March 1st.—Mr. Schaffner.

For a copy of all contracts, papers and other documents between the government or the Department of Militia and Defence, or any member thereof, or any one acting for or on its behalf, and the Sutherland Rifle Sight Company or any one acting for or on its behalf, relating to the purchase of rifle sights or any other materials.—Mr. Worthington.

For a copy of all contracts, papers or documents between the government or the Department of Militia and Defence, or any member thereof, or any one acting for or on its behalf and the Ross Rifle Company or any other company, or any one acting for or on their behalf, regarding the manufacture of bayonets for the militia of Canada, or any other materials other than the rifle itself.—Mr. Worthington.

For a copy of all correspondence, applications and all other papers and documents relating in any way to any and all applications for or in connection with or relating to the southeast quarter of section 14, township 12, range 6, west 4th meridian.—Mr. Herron.

For a return showing what coal areas are held by F. E. Keniston, of Minneapolis; said return to include a copy of all letters, documents and correspondence relating to the application, sale, lease or cancellation of the same, from the general file for each group of claims, and not the special file of each section. —Mr. Ames.

For a return showing what coal areas were obtained through the agency of Malcolm McKenzie on behalf of clients; and a copy of all letters, documents and correspondence relating to the application, sale, lease or cancellation of the same. Also the same information in regard to J. H. Moss, of Toronto. All from

the general file for each group of claims, and not the special file for each section.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all orders in council, reports, surveys, contracts, tenders, agreements, books, memoranda, documents, and papers of every kind, showing, relating to, or concerning the length of the National Transcontinental Railway from (a) Winnipeg to Quebec, (b) Quebec to Moncton, and the estimated or probable average cost per mile of the same, and all other information relating to the total cost or the cost per mile of the said railway.—Mr. Borden.

For a copy of all orders in council and regulations made by the Governor in Council, or prescribed by the Minister of Customs under the provisions of chapter eleven (11) of the Acts of 1907, (6 and 7 Edward VII.), relating to materials to be used in Canada for the construction of bridges or tunnels crossing the boundary between the United States and Canada, and all similar regulations or legislative or administrative provisions of the United States customs laws relating to such materials. —Mr. Clements.

## ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES AT SOREL.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Speaker, I was asked by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to produce before parliament the report of the commissioner appointed to investigate alleged irregularities at Sorel in connection with the building of piers on Lake St. Peter. I beg to move:

That an order of the House do issue for a copy of the interim report of the commissioner appointed to investigate alleged irregularities at Sorel in connection with the construction of piers on Lake St. Peter.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BRODEUR. I beg to lay the report on the table of the House.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will this report be printed in English?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

## METLAKATLA AND SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN moved:

For a copy of all opinions of the Minister of Justice or Deputy Minister of Justice or any official of the Department of Justice, to the Minister of the Interior or any official of the Department of the Interior, with respect to the Metlakatla and Songhees Indian reserves, or either of the said reserves, since the 1st day of January, 1906.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, this notice of motion has been on the paper for some time and it was indicated when originally called that it was not a matter that would go as an unopposed motion. It is a matter in which perhaps the Department of the Interior is more directly interested as the part which the Department of Justice has had in the business is indicated by the terms of the proposed resolution—simply the giving of advice and of opinions upon this question of law to the Department of the Interior. These opinions, however, and that advice, as the hon. gentleman must see, have been necessarily of a confidential character and it would be, as it seems to me, most certainly opposed diametrically to the public interest that, at this stage of the matter at any rate, these opinions and that advice should become public property. The question which is indicated in this resolution is, even at the present time, in course of negotiation with the provincial government in the expectation that it will be referred to the courts for decision and in the advice which the Department of Justice has given to the Department of the Interior and in the opinions expressed by the Department of Justice as to the legal rights involved there are many things said which, certainly it would not be judicious and which it would not be the course of any ordinary business man in the conduct of his own business, if he were in controversy with an adversary, to lay before that adversary or to give to the public. I must express the hope that my hon. friend who has moved this resolution will not press it. It would be, in my judgment, certainly highly detrimental to the public interest that these opinions of the Department of Justice should be made public at the present time. It is very likely that the negotiations which are pending for an amicable reference of the matters in difference to the courts for decision, will, before long, result in such reference being directed. If so the question of law involved will be for argument before the courts to which that reference is made and in that event it would be altogether an extraordinary proceeding that we should present beforehand to the adversary the arguments upon which we rely, stating our case and handing over our brief to the opponent. In these circumstances, it seeems to me that this is an order which it would not be right that the House should now make.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) was the very first one last session, or the session before, to give the House the benefit of his professional opinion upon the exact interests of the Dominion and the provinces with regard to one of these reserves unless I am very much mistaken. If he is at liberty to do that on the floor of this House one finds it a little difficult to appreciate the confidential nature of the more mature opinions or advice that he may have given later on. However, I would not be anxious, notwithstanding the somewhat curious change of attitude on the part of the Minister of Justice, to call for any documents which might affect the interests of the Dominion as con-

trasted with those of provinces. As far as I am concerned I did not know that there was anything in litigation. It is news to me to know that there is anything in litigation or in prospective litigation between the province and the Dominion in regard to either one of these reserves. In so far as one of them is concerned the Minister of the Interior has already brought down the opinion of the Department of Justice and laid it on the table of the House and I have had perusal of it during this session. I included these reserves because I was not sure if everything had been embraced. Therefore, the objection of the Minister of Justice comes a little late if he is making it on behalf of the Department of the Interior because the written opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice in regard to one of these reserves has already been brought down and laid on the table of the House. I am quite sure that it has reference to one of these very reserves. I do not want any document laid on the table of this House which relates to litigation or prospective litigation betweeen the Dominion and a province if there is any possible suggestion that the litigation is likely to take place. But, apart from that we have a perfect right to know what the view of the government is in reference to the title of this country to the public domain which it claims. Apart from the confidential considerations which the Minister of Justice has put forward, this House has an absolute right to know what view the trustees of the people take in regard to the title to the public domain. There is nothing confidential in such information and nothing in the nature of such information which has ever been held as a reasonable justification for withholding it from the House. I would suggest that the motion ought to pass and that the government, in the exercise of the discretion which always rests with the government under such circumstances, will withhold from the return it brings down any of these opinions which the public interest requires to be withheld. That is the course which I think is usually pursued in such cases.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Motion can pass with this reservation.

Motion agreed to.

## RELIGION OF EMPLOYEES OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey) moved :

For a return showing: 1. The names and salaries of the permanent and sessional employees of the Senate and House of Commons at this date.

2. The religious denomination they belong to individually, Protestant or Roman Catholic.

3. The date of appointment of each.

4. The names and salaries of the employees of the Printing Bureau, including the King's Printer and staff, at this date.

5. The religion of each, specifying whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, and date of appointment.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). I beg to move a couple of amendments to this motion. In paragraph 1 I would move to add after the word 'names' the word 'nationalities,' and after the word 'Commons' the words 'and of the various public departments.'

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I would like to suggest to both these hon. gentlemen that they withdraw from these motions so much of the language as calls for a return on religious lines. I think it is much to be regretted that we should attempt to classify our public service on religious lines. I do not see any good purpose that can possibly be served in the matter. I would call the attention of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to the fact that if we wish to classify them some of us would have to take exception to his manner of separating the people into two branches, simply calling them Protestants and Catholics. There is no Christian denomination which is known as Protestant. That class of people commonly and generally spoken of as Protestants are subdivided into many classes, and if it is important to show—I do not think it is—how many persons of a particular faith are to be found in the public service, then we would require to have a fair deal all around, and to have the returns show, not how many Protestants and how many Catholics there are, but how many Presbyterians, how many Methodists, how many Baptists, how many Lutherans, how many Christian Brethren and how many of each of all the various branches of the Christian faith—and for that matter, the number of those who may not claim to belong to the Christian faith.

Mr. TALBOT. What about the Atheists of the province of Quebec to which my hon. friend referred?

Mr. FIELDING. One part of the motion calling for the names, salaries, etc., is quite proper, but I think it is a pity to attempt a classification on religious grounds. I ask the hon. member if he has not been prompted in this motion by a little incident of the other day, and if his purpose would not be served by withdrawing the motion, or that portion of it which calls for the religion of the employees of parliament?

Mr. SPROULE. I was moved to this course by emphatic denials of my statement in regard to the House of Commons, which I believed to be absolutely correct. I therefore took the only means at my disposal of verifying my statement so that it could not be contradicted. The question I raised was with regard to the number of Roman Catholics and Protestants employed in connection with the service of this House. It was

afterwards extended to the Senate improperly by newspapers who attributed that statement to me, and I was offensively and insolently called to task by the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) and by a senator in the other chamber, who did not know whether the report of what I had said was correct or not.

With regard to the question of the propriety or the expediency of this motion, I may say that this is not the first time this course has been taken during my time in the House and on other occasions no objection was taken. I forget who moved the resolution for that return, but it was moved, and when the return came down I noticed that it was difficult, almost impossible to say to what nationality the employees belonged and attention was drawn to that fact. I would be glad to have all the information of which the Minister of Finance spoke if it is available. I noticed as well in that return that in many cases no religion was put down. My object was to verify the correctness of my statement. I have been in the House a comparatively long time and I never made a statement either in or out of the House with regard to proceedings in parliament that I did not believe to be absolutely correct, and I may say that very seldom have I been obliged to correct or withdraw any statement because of it being inaccurate. When I make a statement I am prepared to stand by it, believing it to be correct; but no one would more readily or more quickly withdraw a statement if I found it to be incorrect.

It has been repeatedly said to me as a prominent Orangeman, that the Orangemen do not want to do justice to the Roman Catholics. I have had to combat that statement I was going to say a thousand times over. It is said that we hold that the Catholics are not entitled to the same rights in the country as we are. I say: yes, they are in every respect. We are accused of holding that the Catholics are not entitled to their full share of office. I say: Yes, to the fullest extent, we have not the slightest desire or inclination to deny that right, none in the world. It has been said to me by Catholics: We have not our fair share. That statement was made only a short time ago in connection with the House of Commons that there is not a fair proportion of Roman Catholics employed in the House. I obtained a statement for my own information and I found that there are nearly three Roman Catholics to one Protestant employed in the House. Was I justified in saying so, or was I mistaken? According to the census, about 40 per cent of the population of Canada are Roman Catholics and about 60 per cent Protestants. If that is a fair proportion they are entitled to their proportionate share of all the offices of emolument under the Crown, and we do not desire to deny them that right; but when you come to examine into it, it is found that right in the House they have had more than their share, and when it was said to me that they had not their share and I contradicted this statement, then I wanted to be able to verify what I had said. I am doing nothing wrong in vindicating my own reputation for honesty and truthfulness and my own character in reference to what I have said. I do not desire to do anything improper but simply to show the people that we are not trying to deprive the Roman Catholics of what they are entitled to and of their just rights in full proportion.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. member said that in this House and out of it he never said anything but what was correct. I would ask him if he recalled his statement of three or four years ago in the House that the Catholic clergy of the province of Quebec had organized a fund in order to lend money to the French Canadians at a low rate of interest so that they might drive away Protestant farmers from the eastern townships?

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the statement I made at all. I said I was credibly informed that through some——

Mr. TALBOT. The old story.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me make my explanation. That I was credibly informed and believed that through some means or other throughout the church there was a fund available whereby whenever an intimation was given that a Protestant farmer desired or was willing to sell out, means were found to buy his farm, and for this reason, that as soon as a Roman Catholic become possessed of it, he paid to the church either tithe or other church dues in support of that church, while if it was owned by a Protestant there was no payment to the church. I give the Huntingdon 'Gleaner' as my authority for it.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. SPROULE. Whether it is right or not, the hon. member knows the editor of that paper better than I do. I have always been told that he is a very respectable, reliable and truthful man and I notice that others have said the same thing. Believing that the information was from a reliable source, was I very far astray in saying what I did? I do not think I was.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE (South Perth). Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two on this matter. I do not think it is a matter of first-class importance, but like many other questions that are small in themselves, it might, if unwisely handled, lead to a good deal of feeling. I listened with interest to the remarks of the Minister of Finance. I think he has taken the right stand. It is exceedingly desirable that we should not

bring up matters of this kind in a House like this without grave cause. The hon. member for East Grey has stated why he has brought up this question. Evidently it is not as a matter of principle at all, but simply because somebody doubted the exact truth or certitude of certain statements which he had made. The hon. member has and will have many opportunities of showing the correctness of the statements he makes, if he desires to do so, without bringing the matter before this House.

Mr. SPROULE. How can I do so unless I get information that is official ?

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. But there are certain other features which enter into the employment of officials about this House which I think should be borne in mind or otherwise the return asked for may be misleading. Ottawa is not representative of certain other portions of the Dominion. In certain large cities, such as Toronto, you will not find the same distribution of population, the same variety in race or religion. It naturally follows then, that if you choose sessional employees in this neighbourhood you will have a greater-variety in these respects or even a greater number of certain races or religions than you would if they were drawn from other portions of the Dominion. This also should be carefully borne in mind, that owing to the fact that the two languages have equal claims in this House, it is certainly useful that every employee should have a certain knowledge of both. It is true that the English-speaking employee seldom has any knowledge of French, while the French-speaking employee has a knowledge of both languages. For that reason he is the more valuable man, and, therefore, naturally a greater number of French-speaking employees will be found in employment about this House. This arises not from any favouritism of that class, but from the actual usefulness to the service of those who speak the two languages. This fact also, from the very circumstances of the case, would give a predominance to the adherents of a certain religion, owing to the fact that religion and race frequently accompany one another.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not object at all to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Bellechasse, except in so far as it may delay the return being brought down.

Mr. FIELDING. I think both hon. member had better withdraw their motions. They have made their speeches.

Mr. SPROULE. No I do not intend to withdraw.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I do not think we had better go any further with either the motion or the amendment. The necessity of the hon. member for East Grey verifying his statement would not have arisen if he had not made the statement.

Mr. SPROULE. I made the statement in answer to objections that were raised in regard to myself and the society to which I belong.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend had a perfect right to make the statement, but I am just pointing out the coincidence.

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. member ought to be fair enough to point out the reason why I was compelled to make it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know that the hon. member was compelled. He did make the statement, but I think it is unwise for a prominent man in Canada in this age to make a statement which will lead to such a result as we see to-night. We are talking about civil service reform, and the hon. member for North Toronto has a motion on the Order Paper on that subject. Now, civil service reform will be impossible if we have to line up every person and ask him where he goes to church—not, have you passed the civil service examination or are you fit to perform the duties assigned to you, but where do you worship ?

Mr. HAGGART. Don't they ask it now of every civil servant?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not as a qualification, but as an incident.

Mr. HAGGART. I am stating the fact.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is no more necessary, I say, to know where a civil servant or any other person worships, so far as the performance of his work is concerned, than it is to know where he buys his boots and shoes. If I have to be confined to any particular church in the selection of the employees in my department, then you do away with any idea of efficiency. This country is big enough for all classes, and in public affairs we have come to a time when we ought to cease to make a dividing line between people as to either their nationality or their creed. In Canada, while we are descendants of French, Irish, Scotch, English and other nationalities, we are above everything else citizens of Canada, and we are going back into the past ages when for any purpose whatever we try to make capital out of the fact that any nationality or creed has a preponderance over another in the public service.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the hon. minister this question ? Is it any more improper to bring this matter up here than it was to pass a resolution in this city the Sunday before last to the effect that the Roman Catholics had not their proper representation in this cabinet ?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will see that it was not a leading man of a political

party that passed that resolution. I am speaking of men who are prominent in the affairs of the Dominion endeavouring to make capital one way or the other in regard to the denominations or creeds of public officials. This Dominion of Canada is big enough to contain us all, and I think it would be better for the public life of Canada, better for both parties, and to the credit of the House of Commons if, after having had our little discussion, this motion were dropped and not placed on the records of the House in the way of a return at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the yeas and nays on the motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It would be a misfortune if we had a division on a motion of this kind. My hon. friend is entitled to some of the information he asks for: he has a right to have the names and salaries of the permanent and sessional employees of the Senate and House of Commons, The discussion that has arisen has simply been in regard to having a statement of the religious denominations of these employees. If my hon. friend would permit me, I will move the adjournment of the debate, and then perhaps we can come to some conclusion as to what course to take.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Just one word. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Railways is not quite fair in his imputation of motives to my hon. friend from East Grey. It was not exactly a speech that I would have expected from the hon. gentleman, so far as some parts of it are concerned.

Mr. GRAHAM. Neither expected nor wanted, I suppose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I do not know that there was any thing very crushing in it, if that is what the hon. gentleman desires to suggest; and I would tell him, so far as some of these matters are concerned, that, if he desires to cast imputations against this side of the House, he might look at some newspapers under the direct control of leading members of this government and find out whether or not they have engaged in warfare of this kind. Let him consider that for a moment, and I will give him illustrations later on if he wants them. I can give him illustrations directly to the contrary from newspapers under the control and inspiration of leading members of this government, and I can produce expressions and direct suggestions from them which do not harmonize very well with the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham). My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said he was taunted with a certain circumstance, that he denied that circumstance, and that he put this motion upon the order paper for the purpose of setting himself right as to the facts. While we may perhaps doubt sometimes the wisdom of introducing topics of this kind into this House, still the hon. gentleman had some reason for the course he took. So far as the imputation of motive is concerned, the Minister of Railways and Canals will remember that in the census taken by the government, questions with regard to the religious belief of every man in this country are put, as a matter of form, and under the law of this country. That surely is not done with any idea of creating religious dissensions or making party capital, and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) simply adopted this course in order to put himself right with regard to a particular statement of fact as to which he had been contradicted. For my part there is one portion of the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals with which I heartily agree and it is that in connection with appointments to the public service, we should put absolutely aside questions of this character and look only to fitness without regard to religious belief. That would no doubt be the best course in the interests of the people, but we know that there are certain susceptibilities and feeling in the minds of certain persons in this matter and that these will probably continue for many years to come. We have therefore to reckon with considerations of that kind to a certain extent. I would not have said a word on this matter except for the rather unfair way in which I thought the Minister of Railways was inclined to treat my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Enough has occurred in the few minutes this subject has been under discussion to demonstrate to every one how dangerous it is to introduce any such subject into this or any other deliberative assembly. Whoever does so is simply playing with coals of fire. I object very strongly to this resolution, and if it be put to vote I shall oppose it, and I could not content myself with giving a silent vote. We know that in our census returns the adherents of the respective religions are given, so that we may have an idea of the relative numbers of the congregations of the different churches; but as regards representation in this House or qualifications for any public position or office, it has been for years past judged wise, not only by our Canadian parliament, but by the parliament in the old country, which we look to as our model, to abolish all distinctions of this character and every form of religious test. Is it then to any purpose that statistics should be asked for by any member of this House which can have no other possible object—at all events, no other possible result—than to afford means to those so disposed to institute comparisons to the detriment of one or an other class in this country? If this resolu-

tion is to pass, and if every one in the public service is to be asked to what church he belongs, why not go still further? If it be the object to see whether this, that or the other denomination has its share of public offices, why seek to divide the whole country into two races or creeds? Why assume that every person who is not a Roman Catholic is of necessity a Protestant, or that every one who is not a Protestant is of necessity a Roman Catholic? Why not go further and set about getting statistical information to show whether or not the Methodists, or the Presbyterians, or the Salvation Army, have their fair representation in any department of this government? It is a new and an improper thing to endeavour to introduce anything of this nature.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not a new thing, because we had such a return years ago, and it is in the library now.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I stand corrected if the hon. gentleman says it is no new thing. Then it is unfortunately an old thing. It is an old inheritance that has come to us from the old-time feuds of that old world 3,000 miles away, which ought to have been buried in the old world and never imported into this. I certainly feel strongly on this subject, and I suppose I speak strongly. I am, as every one knows, not a Roman Catholic, at all events, but I have a good many Roman Catholic friends.

Mr. SPROULE. I have letters asking if you are not a Roman Catholic.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I went to school with many a barefooted Roman Catholic boy, just as I went myself, and these boys that I met at school I have found always the best neighbours in after life. I would urge therefore that this motion is absolutely uncalled for and unnecessary. But if we are to order statistics, to obtain which will necessitate calling on every one in the civil service to make his choice between those two creeds and say to which he adheres, we should, on the same principle, go further and endeavour to ascertain whether or not each particular denomination of the Protestant Church has its share of the offices of this country or whether one, by some inadvertence, has got ahead of an other. It would be a sorry day if we were to call upon any applicant for government office to state whether or not he belonged to the class or sect which happened to be in the majority. We might as well, for exactly the same reason—and with more reason—ask every applicant for office what his nationality was and whether, instead of being Roman Catholic or Protestant, he was orange or green.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. AYLESWORTH.

## ADJOURNMENT—INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business tomorrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A couple of government Bills not of a controversial nature.

Hon. W. S FIELDING (Minister of Finance). There was an understanding, I think, with hon. gentlemen opposite, that we might take what is commonly called a vote on account, of one-quarter the Supply for the coming year. With a view to carrying that out, after one or two non-contentious Bills have been disposed of, we will move for a Committee of Supply taking first in Supply the one-fourth vote.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not know that an arrangement was made as to the amount.

Mr. FIELDING. I mentioned to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) one-fourth, to which he took no exception. I cannot say more than that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) mentioned the matter to me, I told him that we would agree to a vote on account in order that the public business might be carried on. But I had not considered the question of what proportion should be provided, and I would confer with him later.

Mr. FIELDING. I mentioned it. I will not say that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) agreed to the proportion. But I took it that that would be agreed to, and the clerks have prepared the resolutions accordingly.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

---

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 24, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

## HINDUS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the following despatch appeared in the 'Citizen' this morning and which says :

(Special to the 'Citizen.')

Vancouver, March 23.—Five hundred Hindus met yesterday in the Sikh temple, and after

many exciting speeches, protesting against their exclusion and deportation from Canada, and emphasizing the fact that this would be a strong weapon in the hands of those preaching secession in India, sent the followng cable to John Morley, Secretary for India :

We protest against deportation and exclusion from Canada. As British subjects we claim protection throughout the empire. If our interests are overlooked by others, those in India must necessarily resent your government's negligence.

The cablegram is signed by Uday Ram, who is nephew of Dr. Davis Chadd, a Hindu of high caste.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister either now or at a convenient date to give the House a statement as to what is really occurring with reference to the Hindus who come to our country and who are British subjects. The matter is arousing a great deal of interest in other countries as well as in Canada and a plain frank statement of the situation as it really is would be of very great service.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The situation with regard to the Hindus at the present time can be easily explained. The regulations of the Department of the Interior provide that all undesirables, idiots, insane or incapables, for instance, can be and ought to be excluded. But it was found that certain parties were coming in not from the country of their origin but from other countries, and therefore they could not be sent back to the country of their origin. For instance, if a man should come from any part of Europe, from Germany, Russia or any other country, unless he came on a through ticket, the companies that brought him would not take him back from the country from which he sailed. If he had a ticket from Great Britain he could be sent back to Great Britain, but he could not be sent back to the country of his origin. Therefore the Minister of the Interior, in order to have the machinery under his hand to send back to the country of origin any man who did not come up to our regulations physically, mentally or otherwise, passed a regulation whereby no one would be admitted unless he came on a through ticket from the country of his origin. This applies to Hindus, to British subjects and to foreigners of all nationalities. A Hindu, for instance, coming from Hong Kong could not be sent back to Hong Kong if he was physically or mentally unfit, or otherwise would not come up to the regulations because the authorities at Hong Kong would not receive him there. We could send such men to the country of their origin and therefore these regulations were adopted in order to have absolute control of the steamship companies bringing immigrants to Canada so that we could compel them to take them back to the country of origin. The Hindus are in that condition, they are not in any different condition from any one else. The regulations applying to them apply to all other immigrants from whatever country they may come in Asia, or Europe or anywhere else.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does it make any difference how long the immigrant has been in the country from which he comes ? For instance, if a German has resided for three or four years in England before coming to Canada, would you refuse him admission on that account ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This question has not been looked into and I do not think it is likely to arise. If a German were coming from Great Britain after being there some years, I do not know what we should do as the situation has never arisen ; but we are looking to what has actually arisen. Steamship companies, in their anxiety to bring people here, might take them from all over the globe and we should not be able to send the undesirables to the countries of their nationality Therefore, to make sure, we passed regulations whereby no one would be permitted to land unless he came from the country of his origin. The Hindus who have been deported or excluded come under that regulation. The regulation is not directed against the Hindus or any other nationality but it is a regulation that applies to all nationalities, and was deemed essential in order to control the character of the immigrants who were admitted to this country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How long had they been residing at Hong Kong, just a short time or a long time ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that this question has been considered.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the Prime Minister aware that a German landed only a few days ago in Vancouver and was refused admittance because he came from New Zealand ? He was obliged to go to the United States.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought that was carrying a good principle a little too far.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is the meaning of the regulation that the Hindu must come from India ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He could come from Hong Kong provided he comes on a through ticket so that we can compel that company that brings him to take him back to India.

## INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the Postmaster General when I may expect a return for which I asked on March 9 with reference to a post office at North Grove in the county of Grenville.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I shall inquire.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would also like to ask the Minister of the Interior when I may expect a return for which I asked on February 26 in connection with the Kananaski Falls at Banff.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I shall be able to give the information to-morrow.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I would like to ask the Postmaster General for some returns ordered in the early part of the session, some of them I think in December last.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The returns are ready; they have been sent to the Department of the Secretary of State and will be brought here in a day or so.

## CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) yesterday asked a question with regard to the report of the Civil Service Commission. I said that we had received the report but that there were some additional papers to be received. These papers have just come to me and are under consideration. I anticipate that we will be able to bring down the whole report to-morrow.

## IMMIGRATION.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before the orders of the day are called I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the following despatch which appears in the Montreal 'Gazette' to-day:

(Canadian Associated Press.)

London, March 23.—The 'Daily Telegraph' publishes Mr. Bruce Walker's 'remarkable' report on emigration societies verbatim and says that such criticism of the foremost English emigration societies will be received with considerable surprise. The facts do not justify the condemnation or point to the necessity of restriction of emigration.

Mr. Obed Smith, interviewed by the 'Standard,' deprecates the anxiety: 'We do not intend to accept only the best people. We are prepared to accept any but the very worst.' The emigrants should, however, be assured of work.

I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior if Mr. Smith has instructions from the government that the agents of the department in the old country are prepared to accept any but the very worst immigrants.

Mr. OLIVER. I think I shall have to assume that Mr. Smith has been misquoted as certainly such a statement does not represent either the policy or the practice of the government in that connection.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the Minister state in what capacity Mr. J. Obed Smith is in London at the present time?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Smith is in London as assistant superintendent of immigration for Great Britain and the continent, in the place of Mr. J. Bruce Walker who is now in Winnipeg as Commissioner of Immigration in the place of Mr. Smith.

## COMPANIES ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 104), to amend the Companies' Act—Mr. Fielding—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2,

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The chief purpose of this Bill is to provide that companies issuing certificates and desiring to sell them in foreign countries may issue them in the currency of such countries, coming as closely as possible to the equivalent of a given sum in the currency of Canada. The main feature of the Bill is in section 2 which provides:

Subsection 1 of section 69 of the said chapter is hereby amended by adding at the end of paragraph (c) thereof the following words:

Provided that such bonds, debentures or other securities may be for sums not less than twenty pounds sterling, five hundred francs, or four hundred marks, or for sums not less than the nearest equivalent in round figures of other money to one hundred dollars in Canadian currency; and provided further that certificates of debenture stock, transferable on a register only, may be issued for such amounts in Canadian currency, sterling, or other money, as the directors may determine.

There is a tendency in these days to place our securities in foreign markets; and in Berlin they would naturally prefer to have these securities expressed in the currency of Germany and in Paris in the French currency. This is simply to allow the company to issue bonds expressed in the security of the country in which they are sold. I propose also to strike out the last paragraph, namely:

And provided further that certificates of debenture stock, transferable on a register only, may be issued for such amounts in Canadian currency, sterling, or other money, as the directors may determine.

That might lead to some confusion as the status of debenture stock is not clearly defined in the Companies Act. I have asked the parties interested and they are agreed to strike out that part of the clause. Section 2 will therefore be confined entirely to the purpose of allowing the securities to be expressed in foreign currency. I propose to add, however, these words:

And this provision shall take effect from 1st March, 1908.

There are some transactions of importance now pending in the European markets, and it is desired that, should these transactions be completed before this Bill becomes law, the Bill may have a retroactive effect and date from March 1.

On section 1,

1. It is hereby declared that Part I. of the Companies Act, chapter 79 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, applies and was intended to apply to all companies incorporated under the Companies Act, 1902; and there is hereby added at the end of section 2 of the said chapter the following paragraph:

(c) all companies incorporated under the Companies Act, 1902.

Mr. FIELDING. The Companies' Act, in the revised statutes, appears to be open to the interpretation that it may not apply to companies previously incorporated under the similar Act. That was not the intention, and the Department of Justice asked that this clause be inserted to make it clear that the Act applies not only to companies hereafter incorporated but the companies incorporated under the corresponding Act in past years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not purport to correct the revised statutes in respect of all companies previously incorporated but in respect of all companies incorporated under the Companies' Act, 1902. Those incorporated before that were sufficiently provided for.

Mr. FIELDING. I would imagine so. That is the view of the Department of Justice.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would suggest that my hon. friend the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) should, on the first opportunity, suggest to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the old country the advisability of legalizing in that country the system of money as represented by dollars and cents. I do not suggest that Great Britain should wipe out pounds, shillings and pence but that it should legalize dollars and cents, and allow its people to keep their accounts in whatever system they preferred. That might interfere with the profits of the banks and the exchange of money, but surely in this civilized age some effort should be made to unify the coinage and the system of keeping accounts as between America and Europe. If Great Britain would legalize the dollars and cents, without doing away with the pounds, shillings and pence, there would be a struggle between the two systems and the fittest would survive.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid my hon. friend has not taken sufficiently into account the strong conservatism of the English people in matters of that sort. However I shall not fail to bear his suggestion in mind.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. They are not quite so conservative as we think. They are keeping accounts in their navy in the decimal system, and the leadership of the movement for the adoption of that system is in England.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend should not lose sight of his movement for reform in spelling.

On section 2,

Subsection 1 of section 69 of the said chapter is hereby amended by adding at the end of paragraph (c) thereof the following words:

Provided that such bonds, debentures or other securities may be for sums not less than twenty pounds sterling, five hundred francs, or four hundred marks, or for sums not less than the nearest equivalent in round figures of other money to one hundred dollars in Canadian currency; and provided further that certificates of debenture stock, transferable on a register only, may be issued for such amounts in Canadian currency, sterling, or other money, as the directors may determine.

Mr. FIELDING. I move that the words at the end of the section beginning with the words 'and provided' be struck out. And also that the following be added: 'and this provision shall take effect as from the 1st day of March, 1908.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose that the expression 'francs' and 'marks' are sufficiently intelligible expressions in the Canadian statutes. There might be some question hereafter as to their meaning.

Mr. FIELDING. We know that what is intended is the currency of Germany and France. The legal gentlemen who have asked for this amendment must have considered that point.

On section 3,

Section 76 of the said chapter is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:

76. The company may, by by-law, increase to not more than fifteen, or decrease to not less than three, the number of its directors, or may change the company's chief place of business in Canada: provided that no by-law for either of the said purposes shall be valid or acted upon unless it is approved by a vote represented by the shareholders present at a special general meeting duly called for considering the by-law; nor until a copy of such by-law, certified under the seal of the company, has been deposited in the Department of the Secretary of State and published in the 'Canada Gazette.'

Mr. FIELDING. The words 'nor until a copy of such by-law, certified under the seal of the company, has been deposited in the Department of the Secretary of State and has been published in the 'Canada Gazette,' appear to have been omitted in the existing statutes, and we desire to insert them. The effect is that bylaws must be filed with the Secretary of State before they become valid.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In this section 76 the words 'has been deposited in the Department of the Secretary of State and' seem to have been omitted in this revised statute.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the substance of the difference between the two. The intention was to require the by-laws to be filed with the Secretary of State.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is one point which, no doubt, has been considered. If any such by-law has been passed in the interval, apparently it is not required to be deposited in the Department of the Secretary of State.

Mr. FIELDING. That, I suppose, would be the result, and I take it that my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) suggests that this should be made retroactive.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It may be that the point would have no practical application. I do not know about that.

Mr. FIELDING. This is intended to affect the general Act. If it did not affect past cases, it should affect the future.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is here is quite proper, but what I was——

Mr. FIELDING. The Secretary of State, who had the Bill in charge, may possibly not have thought of this point. The parties interested are so anxious to have the Bill enacted at an early date that, unless the objection is a strong one, I would prefer that the Bill be proceeded with.

Bill, as amended, reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It might be well to call the attention of the Secretary of State to the point I have just mentioned. It is required that these by-laws be published in the 'Canada Gazette,' and, by consulting the files of the 'Gazette,' he could ascertain whether there are any such by-laws, and provision might be made perhaps without the passing of an additional statute to have them deposited.

Mr. FIELDING. I will call his attention to it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read third time and passed.

## GOLD AND SILVER MARKING ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 123) to amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act.—Mr. Fisher—and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). This Bill was passed two years ago, and last year its coming into operation was postponed until March 13th instant. In the early part of March representations of the most earnest character were made to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that the Act would create hardships to the trade if amendments were not made. The Minister of Finance had requested the Department of Agriculture, which has charge of the Trade Marks and Designs Act, to take charge of this Act. The requests of those interested in the gold and silver trade were examined and were referred to the Department of Justice to consider the effect of the statute. The officer of the Department of Justice to whom they were referred said that they were so complicated and so numerous that it would be best to repeal the old Act and introduce a new one. This came to us within a day or two of the coming into force of the Act. We felt that we had not time or opportunity to discuss the matter and lay the propositions before the several interests concerned, and so we suggested that it would be better to postpone the coming into operation of the Act until the matter could be gone into thoroughly and the various interests allowed an opportunity to present their views before the new Act should be drawn up. A period of a year was taken to given ample opportunity, but, if the session is at all prolonged, I hope the matter will be taken up, and it is possible that, before the end of the session, the views of the several interests may be harmonized, so that we may introduce another Bill this year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems a rather long delay in the operation of a statute. When was it passed?

Mr. FISHER. In the session of 1906-7. The first Act was arranged to come into force on July 1, 1907. Then, by Act passed in the session of 1907, it was postponed to March 13th instant.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I understood that an arrangement had been made among the manufacturers, the wholesale men and the retailers, and that they had agreed upon a Bill to be passed this session.

Mr. FISHER. That representation was made to us within a few days of the time when the Act was to come into force. But almost at the same time we received protests against the new proposition. We had not time to consider these protests or to give the different interests an opportunity of presenting their views. It would also seem rather unusual, if not extraordinary, that so many changes would be asked for in an Act which had never been in operation, and consequently we could hardly see how it would work. Yet the very interests which asked originally for the passage of this law two years ago, came to us at the last moment before the Act came into operation, asking for considerable and numerous changes in it.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I was told that all parties interested and all sections of the trade were represented at a meeting, and they had agreed upon a measure of which every part had been settled. But rather than have the Bill come into force, I prefer letting it stand over.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Uriah Wilson) has stated the case correctly. But when the operation of this Act was put off until the 13th of March this year, it was for the purpose of giving those interested an opportunity of getting together and drafting some measure that would be acceptable to all. Unfortunately many of those interested were in the old country during the summer and fall, and it was late before they could get together. They had twenty-four meetings in all, and finally drafted a measure that they thought would be acceptable; but as it was rather intricate, they thought it advisable to lay it over for further consideration.

On section 2,

Mr. LENNOX. As a matter of fact the last part of that section is not correct, because the Act has gone into operation on the 13th of this month.

Mr. FISHER. It is true those words are not absolutely accurate, and are unnecessary. But as the Bill had passed the Senate and it was desirable that it should go into force as soon as possible, I thought it hardly worth the while to amend it and send it back to the Senate.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 121) to amend the Supreme Court Act—Mr. Aylesworth—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Any explanation of this?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I explained on the first reading of this Bill when introducing change in the order of hearing appeals, and was made on the suggestion of the chief justice of the court as being desired by the bar of the province of Quebec. Under the present arrangement the sittings almost always conflict with the engagements of legal gentlemen from that province in their own courts of appeal and other tribunals. This new arrangement it is hoped will obviate that difficulty, and by lessening inconvenience to counsel cheapen the cost of litigation to their clients.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. At the present time, I understand, the cases from the different provinces are divided in a somewhat similar manner, although the division is not so elaborate as that now proposed. Is it the intention of this Act to fix the order of hearing just as it is set down here, that is, that part No. 1 shall always be heard before part No. 2, No. 2 before No. 3, No. 3 before No. 4, and No. 4 before No. 5?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. It is the intention, the minister tells me, that each sitting shall be held as laid down here, and not be changeable as the practice is now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have the bars of the provinces been consulted on the subject?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am not aware that the bars of the other provinces have been consulted. The change in the first place is in increasing the number of the divisions of the list from three to five parts. That is plainly an improvement and will be for the convenience of everybody, because it will separate election appeals from all ordinary appeals. This arrangement will also divide into separate lists the appeals which heretofore have been grouped together as coming from the portion of the Dominion west of the province of Quebec, and be a convenience to the bar both of Ontario and of the western provinces, enabling gentlemen from the western provinces to know more accurately when their particular cases will be reached than if they were mingled with the cases from the province of Ontario proper. With regard to the order in which the appeals are to be heard, under the present system there was a special order made for the October sittings, under which the maritime cases were placed last, whereas they were the first at each of the other two sittings of the court. What exactly was the reason for that I have never understood, but it is said that the reason, whatever it was does not now exist, and that it would be more convenient that the same order should obtain for each of these parts at each sitting of the court, that is, the order here provided, by which the election cases are first, the cases from the far west next, then the cases from the maritime provinces, and last of all the cases from Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That arrangement may be perfectly convenient for the bars of the respective provinces; but in Nova Scotia, with which I am most familiar, I think the autumn circuits were arranged some years ago with a view to the time at which appeals were usually heard by the Supreme Court of Canada. If it is not urgently required to pass this Bill at once, it might be worth while to consult with the bars of the different provinces and find whether there is any substantial objection to that arrangement or whether some more convenient arrangement might be made. I am not suggesting that there is any inconvenience.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. As the minister has said, the request for this legislation comes from the chief justice of the court, who states that the change in the October list was made at the request of the maritime bar. Then he goes on to say that the registrar informs him that the reason for the change with respect to the maritime list

no longer applies. It is quite evident from the file that the chief justice has investigated the matter, and he reports to the minister that no inconvenience will be caused, but rather the convenience of all interested would be served by this legislation.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. FIELDING. We have approached very nearly the beginning of a new fiscal year, and it is desirable that some portion of the supplies necessary for the public service for the coming year should be made available as early as possible. In due course the Supply Bill will be passed ; but in the meantime, were no special vote taken, there might be some embarrassment of the public service. I have had a conversation with hon. gentlemen opposite, and an understanding has been reached to pass a portion of the Supply pro forma now. What I propose, therefore, is that the items on which the committee have already passed shall go into a Supply Bill, and that as respects the balance we shall take a vote of one-eighth or twelve and a half per cent. I imagine that this will not cause any discussion of any particular item, because on each of these items there will be ample opportunity for discussion later.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is similar to the understanding we have always had, that the discussion on the various items shall be quite as free as it would be if no portion of them had been voted.

Mr. FIELDING. Exactly. I would suggest that we need not detain the House by going into the details, but that one-eighth of each item shall be reported, and that the clerks shall make the necessary calculations.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it proper, as a matter of procedure, to take one-eighth of the whole estimate without regard to the resolution for each particular department ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. The journals of the House will contain the record that the committee have passed one-eighth, and the clerks will have to make the calculations. I do not know whether the House would desire to wait until the calculations are made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I understand from the Minister of Finance is this. Certain items have already been reported in full, and he proposes to embody these in a Supply Bill ; and as to the remainder, the record will be that the House in Committee of Supply has passed one-eighth of each individual item, and these individual items shall be set out to the extent of one-eighth, just as if we had taken the necessary time to go over them.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, that is exactly correct.

Resolution reported.

House concurred in the resolution.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. I think we may well leave the remaining stages until tomorrow.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Mr. FIELDING. It is desired to take up the supplementary estimates for the current year which is about to expire.

Department of Agriculture—seed branch—further amount required to encourage the production and use of superior seeds of farm crops and for the enforcement of the Seed Control Act, $15,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is due to two things; one is the large edition of the 'Bulletin on Farm Weeds' which has been so much in demand that I have decided to order 10,000 more copies, and the other is the work we have had to do in the office in consequence of the much larger demand by farmers for the testing of seeds owing to their fear that their seeds this year, not only in the west, but in other portions of Canada, may not have the vitality which they would wish them to have and also the testing of the seed purchased in connection with the seed distribution in the Northwest. There has been a demand for the book on farm weeds all over the world, and as the book costs almost a dollar a copy this addition 10,000 copies will absorb most of this vote.

Mr. J. D. REID. How are they distributed?

Mr. FISHER. A copy was sent to every member of the House and Senate. Copies were sent to the Departments of Agriculture of the provinces and to all public libraries. A considerable number have been sent abroad to Departments of Agriculture and educational institutions in other countries. Copies have been sent to all public schools in Canada that have libraries and there has been a small distribution to applicants whose business or position seemed to indicate that they had an interest in that class of information.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the minister not found that the largest proportion of the application for examination or testing of seeds come from the wholesale men and a very small proportion from farmers?

Mr. FISHER. I would not say a small proportion in numbers; a much larger number come from the farmers than from the seedsmen. Still the wholesale men send a great many. The large wholesale seedsmen in Canada have established seed-testing lab-

oratories in their own warehouses, but the smaller ones send in their samples to us.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is any part of this vote for the enforcement of the Seed Act, for the payment of inspectors who visit warehouses, &c.?

Mr. FISHER. No, we have not added to that this year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many convictions have been made as a result of the inspection of seed in the different parts of the country?

Mr. FISHER. I could not give that offhand.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Has the minister considered the advisability of being a little more lenient with regard to what is known as rib grass or plantain in clover seed? The tendency of the Seed Inspection Act has been to create a great scarcity of clover seed. Many farmers have pastured their lands rather than cut them for seed. They fear not being able to find a sale, after the seed is grown owing to the strictness of the measure the hon. gentleman has enforced. Has the department taken into consideration the advisability of allowing rather a larger percentage of what is known as plantain or rib grass in ordinary red clover seed?

Mr. FISHER. I would hesitate a good deal before I would in any way weaken the provision of seed control. Our dealers who wish to buy good seed for the farmers have found that they can live up to the provisions of the Act; and if any dealer does not want to buy good seed for the farmers, I would be disposed to try and make him do so.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. That does not answer the question. Plantain or rib grass is a harmless weed. In Great Britain it is used for sheep pasturage, and I think the minister should make some distinction between that and such noxious seeds as mustard and rag weed. But the sheep are very fond of plantain and it is considered a good fodder plant. After a season such as we have got through, clover seed is almost unattainable. The supply is not at all adequate in the section of country I come from, and the result is that it sells at $12 to $15 a bushel where three or four years ago it sold at $5 to $7 a bushel. The hon. minister will understand that our farmers are not able to seed as much land under these conditions, and until the supply is cheaper he should seriously consider the amending of that part of the law which deals specially with rib grass. I do not refer to the other weeds because the law cannot be too stringent with regard to bad weeds, but with regard to plantain or rib grass the department should be a little more lax.

Mr. FISHER. I quite agree that there is a great difference as regards obnoxiousness among different weeds. I shall look into the matter. Last year was a very dry year and a very short crop of clover, and I appreciate the situation in that respect.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice in the newspapers that a consignment of 300,000 bushels of oats has reached Port Arthur. Were any tests made of these oats? I understand they came from England and Scotland.

Mr. FISHER. All the oats purchased have been tested. We obtained the services of experts and had these oats tested before they were shipped. I was shown some samples out of that consignment, taken after it had arrived, and they were very fine samples of oats. They are slightly different in character from the oats of Ontario and the Northwest. They are grown in a moister climate and are a little plumper. They are almost exactly the character of the oats grown in Prince Edward Island and other parts of the maritime provinces. My seed commissioner said before the Committee on Agriculture that oats of that character were very good to introduce for seed in the Northwest. While the first year's crop might not be quite so large, the infusion of new grain would benefit the crops in succeeding years to a great extent.

Mr. SPROULE. Were they recleaned on arrival?

Mr. FISHER. They were found so clean that that was not necessary. They were thoroughly cleaned in England.

Mr. SPROULE. No danger of noxious weeds in them?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. What grades of oats were they?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot tell the variety.

Mr. SPROULE. Can you give information as to what this will cost the farmers laid down in the Northwest?

Mr. FISHER. I could not off hand.

Mr. J. D. REID. As regards the distribution of this book, I think one should be placed in the hands of the clerk of every municipality. In my section, the school trustees have often asked for these books, and I think that in such cases the department should supply them, so that the farmers might meet together in the evening in the schoolhouse and discuss matters of that kind. I do not think the department should bind itself down to a hard and fast rule of only giving the books to public libraries.

Mr. FISHER. We do not wish to hinder the right people getting the book. We

make the rule as to libraries because many school teachers apply for the book and then look upon it as their own personal property. But our object is to make it the property of the school. Every book sent to a school has pasted in it 'Presented by the Department of Agriculture to such and such a school.' The teachers look upon these books as their own and carry them away with them. I do not know about sending to the secretaries of municipalities. There are about 8,000 municipalities in the Dominion, and if I were sending to all these, I should have to ask for another ten thousand or so.

Mr. SPROULE. Is any provision made for sending it to libraries not connected with a school? In many villages there are independent libraries.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, they are sent to all these.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is in these municipalities that they have the farmers' institute. Everywhere the younger farmers are anxious to discuss matters and secure information.

Mr. FISHER. I think that every farmers' organization has been furnished with a copy.

Mr. J. D. REID. So long as there is a book in the municipality, even in a school, it will do good. It can be borrowed to be used for discussions in the farmers' institute.

Mr. FISHER. That is what we aimed at.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand that the minister sent one to each school, or only to those schools which had libraries?

Mr. FISHER. We asked inspectors all over the country to supply the names of schools who have a library or any means of keeping the book properly. We have not insisted on a regular library, but we wanted to send the books only to places where they could be kept and would be of use. It is distinctly understood that the book is the property of the school and not of the teacher. That is the only point that we have been rather insistent upon. I have had at least a thousand applications from individual teachers saying that they had seen the book and wished a copy for their personal use. Of course, I would give it to all if I could, but the distribution had to be limited.

Mr. SPROULE. I am sure that every school will find it useful and there is hardly any school, I apprehend, but would take proper care of such a work.

Mr. STAPLES. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) that a copy of this book should be laid upon the table of every municipal council is an excellent one, for the municipal council is the body that has in charge the enforcement of the noxious weeds laws everywhere.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. FISHER. That is a very good suggestion and one that I had not thought of. I will see if it can be managed. I may come to the House and ask for means to provide a new edition.

Mr. STAPLES. We do not want to encourage expenditure beyond what is absolutely needed, but I think that the circulation of the book would work out to better advantage if placed with the municipalities than in any other way.

Mr. J. D. REID. Nobody objects to expenditure that will be of real benefit to the farmers.

Mr. BARR. This is a matter of importance to the farmers, and one that I know they will appreciate. I know a number of libraries where this book is kept and is highly valued. I think if the minister came back for money for so useful a purpose as further distribution of this work he would find that the House would raise no objection. The farming community are our most important class, and I do not think that they get more than their just due.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the minister to say that the Department of Agriculture is giving a thorough inspection to all the grain being distributed for seed in western Canada? I hope the hon. gentleman is taking full responsibility. I am sure that the House will be ready to vote any money necessary to have this seed grain thoroughly inspected.

Mr. FISHER. The Department of Agriculture is inspecting this grain for purity and vitality, but not grading it under the inspection law.

Mr. BLAIN. Why not?

Mr. FISHER. Because the Trade and Commerce Department has control of that.

Mr. BLAIN. Are they doing the work?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, all the grain is inspected and graded by the officers of the Trade and Commerce Department under Mr. Horne, who is chief inspector at Winnipeg. That is not the business of the Department of Agriculture, and we do not interfere with the officers whose business it is.

Quarantine—further amount required for salaries and contingencies of organized districts, and public health in other districts, $35,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is in addition to $100,000 which I asked for the current year. However, this year, we have had to make special provision against the introduction of the bubonic plague into our country by the Pacific coast or across the American line. Unfortunately, some cases of the bubonic plague appeared in San Francisco, and, if I remember well, one in Seattle. We had to put on a large number of guards so

as to carry on a more careful inspection. This cost a very considerable amount. Also we made a little miscalculation. We failed to remember that the fiscal year began in April instead of July, and the consequence was that we had, in the first three months of the fiscal year, all the heavy expenditures connected with the Grosse Isle station, which opens the middle of April. Had the fiscal year remained unchanged, this expense would have come out of the appropriation of the year before. The vote of that year lapsed, not being needed. We are asking now practically, for a revote of the amount.

Mr. SPROULE. Is any portion of this money spent in quarantine against the diseases of animals?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Department of Justice—to provide salary of G. Turcotte, private secretary to the Solicitor General, as second-class clerk from October 21, 1907, to March 31, 1908, at $1,300 per annum, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $580.10.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the meaning of 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act'?

Mr. BUREAU. The law requires clerks to pass a certain examination before they are admitted. It is generally conceded that a private secretary is left to the choice of the minister himself, and if the person selected has not passed his examination this provision is put in to relieve him from that necessity.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this for another second-class clerk ?

Mr. BUREAU. When the ex-solicitor general went to the Post Office Department his private secretary went with him. That left a vacancy in the office of the solicitor general, and this man is taking the place.

Exchequer Court of Canada—to provide salary of Romeo Roy as temporary messenger at $500 per annum, from January 16, 1908, to March 31, 1908, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $104.82.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This man has taken the place of the former messenger who was removed to another department. He has not yet passed the Civil Service examination, and is receiving a smaller amount of pay than the former messenger. The former messenger was getting $700, while this man begins at a lower figure.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not necessary for this man to pass the preliminary examination ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. He has to pass the examination, certainly, before his appointmetn is made permanent. But in the meantime he has been taken on with the expectation that he will pass the examination in November next.



Mr. SPROULE. I understood a couple of years ago that we were to abandon this habit of making appointments notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This man was selected by the registrar of the court out of several applicants, because it was almost essential that there should be some one in the department besides the registrar himself who had an acquaintance with the French language, and a man possessing an acquaintance with that language is able to assist the registrar in certain kinds of work. Besides, there is occasionally some typewriting to be done, and this man was able to do that work. For these reasons he was selected, although he has not yet passed the examination, but is, I am told, quite competent to do so. I am sure that in every respect this man is not only a capable messenger but has superior qualifications for that position.

Mr. SPROULE. My objection is this, that some time ago we provided for doing away with a system that was declared to be an improper one, namely, the system of keeping on hand a large number of temporary clerks who had not passed the examination. We were promised that in the future this habit would no longer be indulged in, but now it appears we are going back to the system which we discarded. The Minister of Justice says that this man was capable and eligible particularly because he was able to speak French. But were there no other young Frenchmen available who had passed the examination ? If there were, then the minister must be doing an injustice to them, inasmuch as he did not take one of those men who was eligible as having passed the examination. The other objection is this, that we voted, I understand, a sum of money for a clerk who filled this office before, and that money is still available. Why then do we vote an additional amount here? I do not imagine that this money already voted would apply to any other individual but the clerk who occupied the position which was vacated.

Mr. BUREAU. The difficulty with regard to a private secretary is this : We cannot appoint an officer by order in council unless he has passed the Civil Service examination, and consequently the man who has vacated the place being appointed by order in council, his successor would have to hold the same status in order to draw the salary. The previous official had complied with the requirements of the law and was apointed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. SPROULE. Then will that item lapse ?

Mr. BUREAU. Not necessarily. This is to allow the official who has stepped into

the shoes of one who has left the privilege of drawing a salary by putting him in the same status as the man who has left. In the case of the Solicitor General's office, the private secretary of the former Solicitor General went with him to the Post Office Department, and a balance of the salary was left there which we wish to pay to his successor. The first private secretary was appointed by order in council and was drawing this salary by virtue of his appointment to the Solicitor General's department.

Mr. SPROULE. This is not for a private secretary, but for a temporary messenger.

Mr. BUREAU. But it is the same case exactly. The private secretary of the Solicitor General has not been able to draw any salary until the House consented, as it has just done.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is now drawing the salary that was voted?

Mr. BUREAU. Nobody. The money remains unexpended.

Mr. HAGGART. My objection is this, that you have at your disposal a vote for a messenger, and you are now asking for another vote for another messenger; so that instead of transferring the vote which was formerly taken, you have a double vote. You ought to have struck out the former vote when you got this.

Mr. BUREAU. It was practically stricken out the moment the messenger, who passed the civil service examination, left.

Mr. FIELDING. The money voted for an officer who was qualified under the Civil Service Act could not be applied to this man, who has not a certificate.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the name of the former messenger?

Mr. BUREAU. Labelle.

Mr. LENNOX. Was he qualified?

Mr. BUREAU. I presume he was, because he was a messenger there for a number of years.

Mr. OWEN. I notice that the expenses of this department are increasing very fast. I would like some information about an item in the Auditor General's Report of $150 for a uniform for the registrar of the Supreme Court, and I would like to know what salary is paid to the registrar.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The item to which the hon. gentleman has called attention is one that attracted my notice on the first occasion that I opened the Auditor General's Report. It was news to me, and I made inquiries at once. I ascertained from the Department of the Auditor General that this particular disbursement had been expressly authorized by my predecessor in the department, and that the view on which he acted was that as the officials of this House, or some of them, were supplied with uniforms which they were required by the rules or the usages of the House to wear, at public expense, it was proper that the registrar of the Supreme Court should be put in the same position. That is the whole explanation I have to give. It was something that struck me as being unusual, to say the least of it, and something that I thought called for explanation. The salary of the registrar is $4,000.

Mr. OWEN. I notice another item regarding the registrar: Travelling expenses to Montreal and Blue Sea Lake. I would like to know what called the registrar to Blue Sea lake at the expense of this country.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am afraid I am not able, without inquiry, to give any explanation of the items of travelling expenses of the registrar of the Supreme Court. Of course, it must be very seldom that that official requires to travel, because his duties are at Ottawa.

Mr. OWEN. What I would like to know is whether he was at Blue Sea lake on business for the department. I am told he had a summer resort there, and I would like to know if this government is paying his expenses to and from Blue Sea lake when he sees fit to visit his summer resort.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I will have the explanation when the item comes before the House again.

Mr. OWEN. I would like the minister to give us a short description of that uniform that cost $150.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Perhaps the fullest description might be obtained from the tradesman who furnished it.

Additional amount required for contingencies, including printing and binding Exchequer Court reports, $4,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Why this extra amount?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This is an unusual amount and the explanation is that there were some unusual and comparatively heavy expenditures on the part of the registrar of the court during the year. A sitting of the court was held in Dawson and the judge was so unwell that it necessitated a member of his family accompanying him and an arrangement was made by which his son who is a practising barrister in the city went with the judge in an official capacity. There were also sittings of the court in Charlottetown and Halifax and the registrar tells me that these caused a few hundred dollars more expense than he anticipated when preparing his estimates. Then there was additional expenditure in the cost of shorthand writing which is a disbursement in the first instance and which is paid

for out of this vote, but is not an expense to the country because it is charged back upon the litigants. Provision had also to be made for the binding and printing of a volume of the court reports which it was not anticipated would have fallen within the current year.

Dominion Police—to provide gratuity to retired constable, M. J. Kelly, $483.24.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Kelly was on the force between 7 and 8 years. This winter he was seized with 'locomotor ataxia' and he had to resign. In such circumstances it is customary to pay a gratuity to the retiring officer at the rate of one month's pay for each year's service.

Penitentiaries—additional amount required—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Kingston.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $15,000 | |
| St. Vincent de Paul.. .. .. | 2,000 | |
| Dorchester.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 13,000 | |
| British Columbia.. .. .. .. .. | 10,000 | |
| Alberta.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 10,000 | |
| | | $50,000 |

Mr. BUREAU. This amount is made up as follows: Kingston, increased cost of maintenance of convicts owing to increase in cost of supplies and decrease in farm products $3,500; steel for cell barriers, $5,000; increase in working expenses owing to increased cost of coal, $600; increase in cost of maintenance of building on account of repairs of roofs and alterations of windows of south wing, $2,000; retiring allowance to officers, $2,100; St. Vincent de Paul; increase in working expenses owing to increase in cost of coal, $600; steel for cell barrier doors, &c., $1,400; Dorchester, increased cost of maintenance of convicts owing to increased cost of supplies and decrease in farm products, $1,000; increase in working expenses, $1,400; increase in cost of maintenance of buildings on account of new roof in main building to replace roof 23 years old and blown off in a storm, $1,700; machinery for workshops, $600; steam heating supplies, shafting, cement, glass, iron, lumber, and other material for new shops, $4,500; payment of accounts held over from previous year, $3,000. British Columbia, payment of statutory gratuity to officers on retirement, Niven, $1,033.73; McKee, $1,577.34; White, $1,529.82; Atkins, $1,666.66; Bourke, $279.23; Burr, $1,254.44. The balance was for machinery for new shops which had been erected to replace wooden structures which were the first erected in British Columbia. Alberta: increase in number of guards necessitated by increased number of convicts on account of increase in population, two extra guards at $700 each; increased cost of maintenance of convicts (increase from 24 to 76 the present number) $3,000; increase in working expenses on account of larger number of lights required $650; purchase of machinery, $3,400; materials for new building, $1,700.

Mr. SPROULE. Were these employees superannuated, or dismissed or what?

Mr. BUREAU. They resigned and under the statute they are paid half a month's pay for the first five years and one month's pay for each subsequent year of service.

Mr. SPROULE. Did they voluntarily retire or were they dismissed on account of dereliction of duty?

Mr. BUREAU. In each case the retirement was on account of physical inability on the part of the officer.

Mr. SPROULE. How long did they remain there under physical disability? It would not overtake the whole of them all of a sudden?

Mr. BUREAU. Warden White was ill about seven months before he resigned and died a month after his resignation. Mr. Niven, after examination by a physician, was declared to be unfit for further service and resigned. Mr. McKee resigned on account of age; he was between 64 and 65. Mr. Atkins resigned after an examination by a physician and under his advice. Mr. Bourke retired on account of age; he was 62. Mr. Burr was ill 6 or 7 months before he tendered his resignation.

Mr. SPROULE. Do none of them draw pensions on retirement on account of age?

Mr. BUREAU. No, they are paid the gratuity that is provided by the statute except in the case of Mr. Bourke, who was appointed deputy warden, and received a gratuity for the time he served before appointment. He was deputy warden for 15 years, and draws a superannuation of $450 a year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How was it that you estimated for 24 convicts and now have 76? Was the sudden outbreak of crime due to the government?

Mr. BUREAU. Previous to August 1906, convicts who were sentenced to penitentiary in the Northwest, were sent to Stony Mountain, but since that date they have been sent over to Edmonton, to the Alberta penitentiary.

Mr. BLAIN. At page M—26 of the Auditor General's Report I find an item:

Campbell Brothers, Kingston, mitts, 86 pairs at $1; Persian lamb caps, three at $12; Persian lamb collars, cuffs and trimmings, two sets at $36 each, four sets at $35, a total of $334.

Are these for the convicts?

Mr. BUREAU. They are officers' uniforms. It is customary to pay for them.

Mr. BLAIN. Are they bought on tender?

Mr. BUREAU. They are bought after a circular has been sent to dealers in the particular lines.

Mr. BLAIN. To receive a circular the dealer would have to be on the government's lists ?

Mr. BUREAU. I did not qualify it, I only stated how it was done.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the old story of purchase from the political friends of the government ?

Mr. BARR. Do they require the earmark ?

Mr. BUREAU. Oh they must belong to the faith, of course ; we cannot have heathens as contractors.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose a large supply house in Kingston not belonging to the faith would not receive a circular ?

Mr. BUREAU. There is no reason why they should not receive a circular.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the qualification was that they must belong to the faith, I suppose that is the political faith.

Mr. BUREAU. I made no qualification of the faith.

Mr. BLAIN. I observe here also.

Campbell Milling Company, Toronto Junction, flour 'strong baker's,' 408½ barrels at $3.84, $1,568.64.

Is this the company of which Senator Campbell is president and were these goods supplied after tender ?

Mr. BUREAU. I do not know who are the members of the company, the contract was awarded after tenders were called by public notice in the newspapers. This was given after what my hon. friend from Peel would call public competition.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice Higham & Ramsay, Stonewall, 1,030 bags of flour at $1.80. Was this supplied after public tender?

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed yes, by public advertisement in the newspapers.

Mr. BLAIN. Do the newspapers that get these advertisements have to belong to the faith too?

Mr. BUREAU. Generally we publish them in the newspapers supposed to be the most important.

Mr. BLAIN. I have been unable to find any newspaper accounts for advertising except newspapers that religiously support the government. What I want to know is whether you seek out the newspapers having the largest circulation or only those that belong to the fold?

Mr. BUREAU. It would be very difficult to decide which newspaper has the largest circulation, because they all make contradictory claims. But if we advertise in the Liberal newspapers, those must be the papers that reach the majority of people, since the majority are Liberals.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will bring down a list of the newspapers in which he advertised for the supply of flour.

Mr. BUREAU. Yes, I shall bring down that information.

Mr. BENNETT. On page M—17 I find W. C. Edwards & Co., Ottawa, were paid $803.64 for lumber. Were tenders asked for?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes, tenders were asked for from the largest firms in Ottawa and Kingston.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems extraordinary that the supply did not go to a Kingston firm, as there must be a good many lumber yards in that city. It is really too bad to find senators giving their attention to the Department of Justice. It may be expected that members of the Commons will follow their example and see what profit they can make out of this department too. Is the W. C. Edwards of this company Senator Edwards?

Mr. BUREAU. I could not say, but the initials are the same. We had four tenders altogether—from the Ottawa Lumber Company, the W. C. Edwards Company, the Rathburn Lumber Company and the Frontenac Lumber Company of Kingston, and the lowest tenderer got the contract.

Mr. TAYLOR. On M—16 I find that Campbell Bros., of Kingston, supplied 86 pairs of mitts at $1; Persian lamb caps, three at $12; Persian lamb collars, cuffs and trimmings, two sets at $36, four sets at $35. Were tenders called for?

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that these were bought by specification. We have to give the sizes, and it would not do to call for tenders.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see Caldwell, Boyd & Co., Lanark, were paid for thirty-ounce frieze, 184¼ yards at $1.36; was that supplied by tender?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes, public competition after advertisements in the newspapers.

Mr. TAYLOR. On page M—20, Caldwell, Boyd & Co. were paid $178 for frieze, on page M—23, Boyd, Caldwell & Co. were paid $202 for frieze ; on page M—24, Boyd, Caldwell & Co. were paid $172 for frieze. In this last item the charge was $1.60 per yard and in the others $1.36. On page M—27, Boyd, Caldwell & Co. were paid $490 for blankets. Is Boyd, Caldwell & Co. the same firm as Caldwell, Boyd & Co., and how is it that the one firm got $1.60 a yard and the other $1,36?

Mr. BUREAU. They are the same firm.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why was the price to Boyd, Caldwell & Co. $1.60 and the Caldwell, Boyd & Co. $1.36?

Mr. BUREAU. They must be for different penitentiaries. I am informed by the inspector that we have to pay freight on these goods.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do you pay 24 cents a yard for freight to Manitoba ?

Mr. BUREAU. The inspector informs me that it may be a supply under different contracts. The inspector will inquire into the matter and find out how the discrepancy, if any, arises.

Mr. TAYLOR. And whether this is an incorporated company or a private business concern.

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that it is an incorporated company.

Mr. TAYLOR. A limited liability company ?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the Caldwell whose name figures in this company the hon. member for North Lanark ?

Mr. BUREAU. I do not know. This is the first time I have heard about the company.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, I want to call the attention of the Solicitor General (Mr Bureau) to another item, and I call attention to it because of its contemptibility—if I may use that word. Here, at page M—24 of the Auditor General's Report, I find an item :—

Bole Drug Company, Limited, sundry drug supplies, $142.01.

May I ask if that is the firm with which the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) is connected ?

Mr. BUREAU. I suppose it must be, but I have no information on the subject.

Mr. BENNETT. What does the inspector say ? He knows whether the Caldwell in one case is the member for Lanark or not, and whether the Bole in the other case is the member for Winnipeg or not. We will get through these items all the quicker with a 'yes or no' answer.

Mr. BUREAU. The inspector says that there have been changes made in these companies and that he does not know whether these people are interested in them or not.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the public generally will understand the matter. And this is the depth to which we have got. In a city of the size of Winnipeg, where there must be druggists belonging to the Liberal party, when a petty bill of $142 worth of drugs is to be bought, the department must purchase from the company of the member for the city. As to the Caldwell case, I know nothing about it. I have always understood that the member for North Lanark is associated with the company for selling these things, and the inspector knows it or he does not know it.

Mr. BUREAU. I think the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) is mistaken when he says he is well informed about the Winnipeg transaction. The inspector informs me that the drugs are bought by contract and that tenders are publicly called for and the contract given to the lowest tenderer. Even supposing that the hon. member for Winnipeg should happen to be a member of the company that tenders successfully, I do not see that there is any harm in it under these circumstances.

Mr. BENNETT. It is simply a matter of taste. If the member of parliament thinks that he should be associated with the company that gets a contract for $140—well, as I say, it is a matter of taste.

Mr. BUREAU. The hon. gentleman does not truly represent the facts. This is not a private contract, but is a contract given after a public call for tenders, and awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. BARR. What were these drugs for and how were they purchased before ?

Mr. BUREAU. They are general drugs required for the penitentiary hospital.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau) does not ask for a tender for a contract of $142.

Mr. TAYLOR. In what papers were the tenders advertised ?

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that tenders supplies are called for all the penitentiaries and they are advertised simultaneously all over the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. It strikes me as very odd that the lowest tenderer in these cases is a company in which a senator or member of parliament is interested. The Campbell Milling Company is the lowest tenderer for flour. The W. C. Edwards Company is the lowest tenderer for lumber. No doubt, Senator Edwards is a member of that company. The Bole Drug Company is the lowest tenderer in its line, and we know that the Bole in this case is the member for Winnipeg. Then, we have the Caldwell Company, the head of which is a member of this House, also the lowest tenderer in its line. Does it not strike the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) as being peculiar ? It may be all right ; I am not saying it is not But the people of this country will regard it as peculiar.

Mr. FIELDING. Would they not regard it as more peculiar if the department, having these low tenders, should pass them over and give the contract to a higher tenderer ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not suggest that. But is it not remarkable that in all these cases the lowest tenderer should be a company in which a member of this House or a senator is interested ? It would look as if there was something unfair about it. I do not say that there is anything unfair. But it has a peculiar look about it. The inference which many people will draw is that because these companies have a member or senator in their membership, they have some means of knowing just how low to tender.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) think that the considerations to which he has just called the attention of the committee are rather for the member or senator sending in a tender, or for this House, if this House thinks the law in that respect should be amended ? We have declared upon the face of our legislation that there is no objection to a contract being entered into by a member of this House or a senator with the government of Canada provided that the only interest which that senator or member has is in his capacity as a shareholder in an incorporated company. That is the law of the land, and has been for years, and that being so, every member and every senator knows that the company in which he is a shareholder is in no way precluded from having a contract with the government of the country. As long as the law so stands, it is impossible for any department to do otherwise than to follow the law and accept tenders for the public service from parties who are members of incorporated companies.

Mr. HENDERSON. I believe that the Minister of Justice is correct in law, in fact I have understod in recent years that that is the law. A man may convert his business into a joint stock company in order that he may deal with the government, that no doubt has frequently been done. But what I draw attention to—because it is in the interest of this department and of people tendering—is that there should be some explanation given how it is that in every instance we have brought before us there chances to be in the list of tenderers —I will say chances—there chances to be a firm which has associated with it the name of a senator or a member of parliament. It seems to me that the country will draw the inference that there is something, I might say that is not quite square, in the transaction. That would be the inference if it only occurred in one case, but where it occurs in case ofter case, certainly there is some suspicion.

Mr. FIELDING. Any wrong could only occur through gross misconduct on the part of the official of the department and of the party tendering. Does the hon. gentleman think there is sufficient ground to suggest anything of the sort in this case ? Does he imagine that Senator Edwards, for the sake of a few dollars in that lumber contract, could be a party to a conspiracy of that nature ? Does he think that Senator Archie Campbell—though he may have differed with that gentleman when he was a member of this House—has he so low an opinion of him as to suppose that for the sake of a few paltry dollars he would be a party to a conspiracy of that nature ? He does'nt believe it, his own good sense would tell him at once that these inferences are very unfair and unjust. As long as the law remains what it is, you cannot preclude a company of which a senator or a member of parliament is a shareholder from tendering, and if the tender is sent in in good faith and the contract is taken in a fair way, why should the hon. gentleman rush to the conclusion that there must be something wrong in it ?

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman is quite right, but we want to have it on the table of the House, so that every member may see it, the tenders for these different articles. If we saw for ourselves that these contracts were given to the lowest tenderers there would be nothing to criticise. I ask him to put those tenders on the table of the House so that we can all see them.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not for a moment insinuate that there was any collusion between these men. I am not charging Senator Edwards with any wrong-doing, or charging the member for North Lanark (Mr. Caldwell) or the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) with any wrong-doing. But I remark that in almost every case there is a coincidence, something we cannot explain, though it may be accounted for in some way or other. Now is it not possible that only a few of these men were notified that tenders were wanted, so that they would have an opportunity of tendering ? I drew attention to the fact of this peculiar coincidence, hoping that the Solicitor General might possibly explain the circumstances and remove suspicion from those gentlemen, for whom I have the greatest respect. I threw out the idea hoping he might explain it away, and if any wrong impression is likely to go abroad on account of the peculiar coincidence, I think it is the place of the Solicitor General to give an explanation and remove the unjust suspicion.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am very sorry that these suspicions should be present in the mind of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), of all gentlemen; because I am speaking, I think, not only my own personal sentiments but the sentiments of every member on this side of the House, when I say that there is no member of this House, certainly no member who sits op-

posite, for whom we have a more sincere respect than for that hon. gentleman. I cannot undertake to say anything for the other departments of the public service, but so far as the administration of the penitentiaries is concerned, having now had an experience of two years, I think I can speak with authority. I can assure my hon. friend that so far as I am aware, and in my belief, there has not been, in connection with advertising in the Department of Justice for tenders, or acting upon tenders when they have been received, the slightest attention paid to the political complexion of any man who was tendering for furnishing supplies. Within the last few days tenders have been opened in response to advertisements for general supplies for the current year; the tenders were opened by the inspectors. I have never seen one of them. I do not know how many there were, but I should judge, speaking from memory of the list put before me, that there were three or four hundred, for the different lines of supplies. A list is made out of the names of the tenderers and of the amounts, and going through that list which was presented to me by the inspectors as the result of the tendering, the contract has been awarded in every single instance to the lowest tenderer, and I suppose in number to at least a hundred. Except in one instance where I happened to recognize the name of a firm with which I had some acquaintance, there was not one case where I had, or have, the least idea of the political sympathies of the men who were tendering. Now with regard to the case of the companies in which members of parliament or of the Senate are shareholders, in most instances the name of the company carries with it the identification of the member who is interested. Take the case that has been mentioned here, the Edwards Lumber Company. Lumber is wanted for some penitentiary purpose, and there are not many lumbering firms in a position to supply the quantity and description of lumber that is wanted, they might not have the size on hand that is required; and it would be a poor business operation to advertise extensively in the papers and circulars are sent out. I can only say that I am very sorry if the coincidence that in several instances firms or companies in which members of parliament or senators are shareholders have been the lowest tenderers, should have seemed to give hon. gentlemen a cause of suspicion. Is it in any way an unnatural thing that a large concern like the Edwards Lumber Company should be in a position to offer its wares at a lower price than its competitors?

I think a business man would find exactly the same thing, and if the price is lower and the goods are unexceptionable, it would certainly be contrary to the public interest to refuse an offer because the principal shareholder in the concern is a member of another House. The matter is not put in that way now by my hon. friend, but because he finds the name of this company in the returns as having contracts with the government and because in other lines of goods there are other companies, he says this circumstance is suspicious. Answering for myself, I can only say that since I have been in charge of the Department of Justice there has never been a single instance in which I have been spoken to or written to by any tenderer, whether a political friend or an opponent, and the awarding of the contracts has in every instance proceeded on the principle of accepting the lowest tender.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Justice, with his logical mind, has come to the rescue of the Solicitor General and has advanced a reason, especially in the case of the Edwards Company, and it may be applicable to others, why that firm may have been able to tender at a lower figure than others, that is, on account of the largeness of its business. This is just the point I wanted to bring out. I did not say that the case was suspicious; I said it was curious. I thought it was a peculiar coincidence that these firms in every instance should have been the lowest tenderers. What has been said may tend to remove what might be a suspicion but at any rate some explanation has now been given for what appeared to my mind to be a very peculiar coincidence.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask my hon. friend what the policy of the department is in respect to the opening of these tenders?

Mr. BUREAU. The tenders are always opened by two inspectors, and the extensions are made by them.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to draw my hon. friend's attention to another item—7 dozen of silk handkerchiefs at $12 a dozen. I would like to know whether these are for the prisoners?

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that these are for the Indian chiefs. The penitentiaries, on the order of the Department of the Interior, make clothing for the Indians. These silk handkerchiefs were to conclude an order which had been given by that department, and the price of the handkerchiefs is charged to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BLAIN. On page M—60 I notice another item—$7,784.79 for coal supplied by W. G. Craig & Co., of Kingston. Was this after public tender?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes, by public tender advertised in the newspapers.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend, when bringing down the other information, might bring a list of the newspapers in which this advertisement appeared.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Solicitor General if he will kindly lay on the table the tenders which have been received in connection with the supplying of meats, coal, meal and bran for the cattle on the farm of St. Vincent de Paul pentitentiary.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) In what year?

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) In 1907. I refer to the contract given to Mr. Avila Chartrand for the sum of $2,692.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) All right, I do not object to that.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

## PRIVATE BILLS.

### SHUSWAP AND THOMPSON RIVER BOOM COMPANY.

On the order for

Third reading of Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Mr. GALLIHER moved that the order be discharged and the Bill be referred back to a Committee of the whole.

Mr. COPP. It was understood last night that this Bill should stand for third reading in order that an amendment might be inserted authorizing the government of Canada to take over the works and property of the company at any time it was thought proper.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. LENNOX. I have here an amendment on the lines of the one inserted in the Bill of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Ship Canal Company.

This amendment reads:

His Majesty, his heirs and successors, may at any time assume and take exclusive possession and control of and property in all the rivers, lakes, streams and waters mentioned and dealt with in this Act and of and in all the improvements, undertakings, works, properties, easements, privileges and rights authorized, or vested in or conferred upon the company by this Act or obtained, constructed or acquired by reason thereof, upon giving notice of intention to do so, and thereupon all the said improvements, undertakings, works, properties, easements, privileges, rights and advantages and all things enjoyed by the company in connection therewith shall become, and thenceforward shall be vested in His Majesty, his heirs and successors; and by way of compensation His Majesty shall pay to the company the value of the improvements actually made and of the works and tangible property of the company of which possession is so taken—such values to be fixed by three valuators, or the majority of them, one valuator to be chosen by His Majesty, another by the company and the third by the two so chosen.

Mr. FIELDING. The criticism might be offered that this would authorize the government to do this not simply as between the company and itself, but as between the government and parliament; it authorizes the government without coming to parliament to take over the works. There should be a provision that this power should not be exercised except after authority had been obtained from parliament to do so. This really becomes an appropriation Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. In the case of the ship canal scheme, which is much larger than this one, we gave them that power.

Mr. FIELDING. I remember in the case of the Quebec Bridge Company we took power to take over the bridge as between the government and the company; the company could not resist us; but we put in a proviso that that right should not be exercised by the government until sufficient authority had been obtained from parliament and it appears to me that the same thing should apply here.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think I can overcome the objection in an amendment which I am about to propose as follows:

His Majesty, his heirs and successors may at any time assume the possession of and the property in the company's works and undertakings, and of and in all the rights, privileges and advantages of the company on giving to the company three months' notice of intention to do so, and thereupon all property in the said works and undertakings, rights, privileges and advantages shall become and thenceforward shall be vested in His Majesty his heirs and successors. And the amount to be paid to the company by way of compensation shall be the value of the works and undertakings actually carried out or in course of completion by the company up to the time of the giving of such notice, together with the value of all tangible property of the company of which possession may be so taken, such value to be decided by arbitrators, one of whom shall be appointed by the Minister of Public Works, and one by the company, and if they do not agree on the award, the judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada shall appoint a third arbitrator.

Mr. LENNOX. I have no objection to that, but it is open to the objection raised by the minister.

Mr. GALLIHER. No, it says.

The amount to be paid shall be.

They cannot do it until they get an appropriation from parliament. I have consulted the Minister of Justice and he says that amendment will be satisfactory.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was not present when the amendment was suggested but I would

be glad to be informed of the reasons for it. Personally I am very much opposed to inserting provisions in the case of the incorporation of these minor companies looking towards the acquiring of the property by the Crown. I do not see why it should be done in the case of a company to build booms. If it is done in this case it will be a precedent for other cases and the result will be that the Governor in Council will be authorized without coming to parliament, to take over all companies such as this. I think the clause might well be omitted altogether.

Mr. LENNOX. It could hardly be at this stage of the proceedings as it was agreed yesterday that this should be done. The hon. gentleman will recognize that the government are not bound to take it over and will not do so unless they think it desirable.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amendment vests in the Governor in Council the power to do this without coming to parliament at all, simply on giving one month's notice to the company; then the property of the company is vested in the Crown and parliament will be obliged to appropriate the money if the Governor in Council takes over the property. I would strongly object to the clause being passed in its present form.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood that the Minister of Finance intended to insert a proviso that the Governor in Council could only do this upon obtaining the authority of parliament. I think it advisable that parliament should be consulted but I also think it very necessary that we should have the privilege of taking the company over if it becomes in the interest of the country to do so.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not offer any opinion as to whether this clause should go or not. My point is that if it is desirable to insert a clause it should be so framed as to establish the right of the government to take possession against the wish of the company. As it is worded this amendment makes this unquestionably an appropriation Act because it says the government shall pay. I would suggest that we should add a provision like that in the Quebec Bridge Company's Act:

Nothing in this Act shall authorize the government, without the consent of parliament previously obtained, to exercise the right to take over the whole undertaking. . . .

Thus you establish the right of the government to take it over in the public interest as against the wish of the company, but parliament must first determine that it shall be taken over.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand that the committee decided that the clause should go in and therefore I do not wish to raise any undue objection.

Mr. FIELDING. I would suggest adding to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) the following words :

Nothing in this Act shall authorize the exercise, without the consent of parliament previously obtained, of the right to take over the company's works, undertakings and property, as provided in section 16 of this Act.

Amendment agreed to, Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

## SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Penitentiaries—additional amount required—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Kingston.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $15,000 | |
| St. Vincent de Paul.. .. .. | 2,000 | |
| Dorchester.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 13,000 | |
| British Columbia.. .. .. .. | 10,000 | |
| Alberta.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 10,000 | |
| | | $50,000 |

Mr. BLAIN. We should have some information regarding the binder twine industry. Is the binder twine sold direct to the farmers and how are the prices fixed ? Or is it in the combine ?

Mr. BUREAU. It is sold direct to the farmers and not to anybody else. The prices are based on the cost of labour and the raw material and it enters into competition with the other factories.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Solicitor General why the French copy of the circular which is distributed by the government sent among the farmers in connection with the sale of binder twine manufactured in the Kingston penitentiary, is not issued together with the English copy. Last year, we received the French copy about a month after the other. This year, the English copy has been issued on the fourteenth of March.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) I am informed by the inspector that he cannot say how long elapsed between the publishing of both circulars; but this year the French copy is already in the hands of the printer.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Can the Solicitor General tell me when we may expect the French copy ?

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) It will be distributed within two or three days.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. minister says the binder twine is sold on the basis of cost. Is it the basis of cost for producing it at the penitentiary ?

Mr. BUREAU. The price is based on the cost of raw material plus the cost of labour at the penitentiary.

Mr. J. D. REID. How do these prices compare with the prices at which manufacturers are selling ?

Mr. BUREAU. They are from 1 cent to 2 cents per pound less than the wholesale prices.

Mr. J. D. REID. Sold to the farmer on that basis ?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes, so I am informed.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the minister able to sell the total output each year ?

Mr. BUREAU. No, but what is left over is kept at the penitentiary to be sold next season.

Mr. BLAIN. What was carried over last year ?

Mr. BUREAU. I cannot give the exact figures, but it was in the neighbourhood of 250,000 pounds.

Mr. BLAIN. If the twine is sold for lower prices than are charged by the dealers, I cannot understand why the farmers do not take advantage of the opportunity offered them. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau) use the best means of reaching the farmers ?

Mr. BUREAU. There is a difference between the government and the manufacturers in the terms of sale. Those buying twine from the penitentiary have to pay cash, while the manufacturers grant terms. As to the system of advertising, notice is sent to the members of parliament and also to all the farmers' organizations known.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does the government sell to farmers at the same price at which the manufacturer sells to the retail merchant ?

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that the price charged by the government is less than the price charged by the manufacturer to the wholesale dealer.

Mr. HENDERSON. Two cents less ?

Mr. BUREAU. It varies from 1 cent to 2 cents less.

Mr. J. D. REID. Can the Solicitor General explain, then, why farmers do not take advantage of these prices ? Is he sure they are advised of them ? I have never understood this before. My impression has been, and I am informed by those in the business, that the government are practically in a combine, or have agreed to sell their twine at the same prices that the manufacturers sell at, in fact, they have been selling through some other person. I know that, in cases, they have sold their whole output through another party who charges the same prices as do the manufacturers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I happen to know something about this binder twine business. I notice that the prices advertised by the government are practically the same or a little less than the dealer can buy from the wholesalers elsewhere, taking the quotations f.o.b. Peterborough, Chicago, Welland and other places. No matter what the quantity bought, they get practically the same prices as are quoted by the Kingston penitentiary.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does the government insist on the farmers taking a certain quantity at these prices ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. They can take 500 pounds or whatever they like.

Mr. BUREAU. I would refer to the circular giving the prices. The farmers can buy in any quantity at the following prices :

'Pure manilla' (warranted all pure manilla hemp) 600 feet to pound, 11 cents.
'Manilla' mixed (two-thirds manilla and one-third New Zealand) 600 feet to pound, 10½ cents.
'Premium sisal' (from superior fibre) 500 feet to pound, 8¼ cents.
One-half cent per pound off for ton lots or over.

Mr. J. D. REID. What are the prices charged by other manufacturers ?

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed by the inspector he has not that information. But he has seen the prices as advertised in the 'Binder Twine Journal.'

Mr. J. D. REID. The prices, I understand, are practically the same as charged by other manufacturers, except that the farmers get the advantage of getting it at the same prices as the retailer would pay to the wholesaler.

Mr. BUREAU. The farmer gets it cheaper than the manufacturer sells it to the wholesaler.

Mr. WARD. At what period last year was this 250,000 pounds carried over ?

Mr. BUREAU. That remained in stock at the end of harvest, when the season for buying twine was over.

Mr. BOYCE. What was the total amount manufactured ?

Mr. BUREAU. About 700,000 pounds.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does the government figure any profit ?

Mr. BUREAU. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then, they must figure that they are making so much out of the labour of the convicts. How much a day do they figure for the convicts ?

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that the charge for labour on the work done is 30 cents a day.

Mr. J. D. REID. A great portion of the cost of this twine is in the labour. Those employed by the government are charged at 30 cents a day while other manufacturers have to pay from $1.50 to $5 a day. Yet, practically, the government is not able to sell the twine for less than the manufacturers sell it for.

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that the convicts in the penitentiary never work after dark, and the hon. gentleman will realize that you can get more work out of workmen in an ordinary factory that out of a convict. The only reason I see why this twine is not all taken up is the fact that it has to be sold for cash at Kingston before delivery.

Mr. J. D. REID. In a manufacturing industry such as the hon. gentleman mentions you have to take pay for fuel, light, machinery, buildings, staff, and interest on plant, all of which make up cash cost; the government has none of these things to pay for, yet with all that advantage in its favour the government is not able to produce this twine any less than the ordinary manufacturer, and in that case you are shutting out legitimate labour in this country.

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that the greater part of the cost is the raw material, and that labour and these other items the hon. gentleman has mentioned, form but a small portion of the cost. We take the best means possible to advertise the twine, notices are sent out to all the farmers' clubs all over the country, to all the members of parliament and to all people whom we believe will distribute information amongst the farmers. Why they do not take it, I do not know; the reason may be the difference in the terms of payment.

Mr. J. D. REID. Labour is only 30 per cent of the cost of production. In a penitentiary you pay nothing for fuel, nothing for plant, nothing for interest, nothing for office and staff; yet with all that advantage on the part of the government the farmers of this country are not able to get their twine from the government at any less price than from any other legitimate manufactory. There must be something wrong in the management of that industry in the penitentiary. I would like to see the farmers get all the advantage possible from that binder twine industry. From all I can learn I believe the government have made an arrangement of some kind with the other manufacturers of binder twine that the prices should be the same.

Mr. BUREAU. My hon. friend asked me a few minutes aga if we charged anything for labour, and I answered about 30 cents a day. But that does not include coal, light, &c. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the report of the Minister of Justice on penitentiaries, page 141, he will find mentioned all the different items that go to make up the cost of production.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do you allow anything as interest on the money invested in the business?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes, I am informed that is included in the price of the binder twine before it is put on the market.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is an interesting fact that we consume in Canada upwards of 30,000,000 pounds of binder twine annually, and we imported 15,676,309 pounds during the nine months of last year, which practically means the whole year. I understand that we imported about half the quantity of binder twine consumed in this country. I believe if all the facts were known there is some kind of an arrangement by which the Americans are to have one-half of the Canadian market for binder twine and the Canadian manufacturers are to have the other half. I think the facts elicited a year or two ago showed that to be the case. I have no doubt the same arrangement is in force yet as between the manufacturers and the importers. However, the question is, how does it come that with a consumption of 30,000,000 pounds, the penitentiary twine, which amounts only to about 700,000 pounds, cannot all be sold in one year? There seems to be something wrong. Either the twine is inferior, or the mode of putting it upon the market is not in the interest of the farmer. If the price, the quality and the length of twine per ball are all right, then the twine should all be taken up in two or three weeks by the farmers themselves. But the farmers seem to be backward, they do not send in their orders. What is the difficulty? The Solicitor General has suggested that the terms to the farmers for this twine are cash on delivery, or rather the cash before they get the twine as they must remit the money before the twine is shipped. I do not think the farmers of this country are so poor that they are unable to take advantage of a bargain of this kind, to get the twine at 1 to 2 cents less than the wholesale price, less than the price at which it is sold by the manufacturer to the wholesale dealer, practically, you may say, 3 or 4 cents a pound less than it is sold to the consumer by the ordinary dealer. It is strange that the farmers are not able to take hold of this splendid offer made by the government, of pure manilla twine at 11 cents, manilla mixed at 10½ cents, and premier sisal at 8¼ cents. Has the minister discovered that the twine is not up to the quality, or are there any complaints about the length of the twine in the ball? I think there must be some other explanation. Why is it that the penitentiary authorities are able to sell only about 500,000 pounds out of 30,000,000 pounds. A few townships in the Northwest would consume the whole thing. If this industry cannot be made of any more advantage to the farmers of this country than it appears to be from the statement of the Solicitor General and the statement sent to us, it is of very little use to carry it on. As to the cost of production, the statement was made in a blue-book issued by the Hon. David Mills that the labour cost ¾ cent a pound. The chief component parts of binder twine are manilla

and coal oil. Has the minister any explanation to give as to the price ?

Mr. BUREAU. As my hon. friend knows, most of the twine consumed in the Northwest is imported from the United States. The freight rate on twine from Kingston to the prairies is so high that it puts it at a great disadvantage. As to the quality of the twine, a great many letters of praise have been sent to the penitentiary authorities. Only a few complaints have been made, and these by people who bought more twine than they could use and wanted the authorities to take it back. As my hon. friend knows, the large manufacturers have their travellers on the road who never cease to run down the twine made in the penitentiary, trying to make people believe that because it is made by convicts it is of inferior quality; but there is nobody to boast of the quality of the binder twine manufacturend at Kingston. A very small proportion of the twine is consumed in the eastern provinces compared with what is consumed out west.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think it is very small. The province of Ontario consumes an enormous quantity. When you consider that 30,000,000 pounds is consumed in the country, it is evident that a very large proportion of that is consumed in the eastern provinces. So far as Ontario is concerned, the question of freight is neither here nor there, because the distance from Kingston to any part of Ontario is not very great.

Mr. BUREAU. The western farmer is close to the United States market and as there is no duty on binder twine he can get it from the United States delivered at Winnipeg or anywhere else in the west at less cost.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I think I can give you some information as to why even United States twine is sold in Kingston. The manufacturers go to a storekeeper and say: We have plenty of this twine on hand; we do not know where to store it, so we will ship it to you in the winter time and you do not have to pay for it until the following fall. A machine agent will do the same thing. He is continually going around the country trying to sell machinery to the farmers, and every time he goes to a farmer he says: Don't you want to get some twine for next summer? You do not have to pay for it until next fall. In the same way, by means of the same offer, the storekeeper forces the twine on the farmer. It is delivered in the winter time, and is not paid for until the following fall, and that is the reason why so much more twine is sold by the other manufacturers than by the penitentiary.

Mr. LAKE. There is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman has said, but I would like to suggest that in order to sell the twine cheaply enough to the farmers in the Northwest you should have some points of distribution there. At present you send a circular to a farmer telling him that his order has to be accompanied by the cash, and owing to the distance he has to send his order a long time in advance of the time when he wants the twine. If he is not going to pay a high price for bringing the twine from Kingston in small quantities, he has to hunt up a number of his neighbours to join with him in ordering in large quantity, a trouble which he is not likely to go to, especially as he has to put up the cash. If there were centres of distribution in the Northwest, where the orders could be received and from which the twine could be sent, the farmers could send in their orders at just about the time they needed the twine and would be prepared to pay cash for it. Then the twine could be sent to the Northwest in large quantities, and it would be of real benefit to the consumers.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has stated that the twine is sold direct to the farmers. I want to call his attention to one or two items in the Auditor General's Report, at page M—34: W. J. Keen buys $4,819 worth, J. M. Morin buys $2,142 worth, E. H. Muir, buys $2,953 worth, R. Shephard buys $2,640 worth, R. W. Wallace buys $2,725 worth. What class of farmers are these ?

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed that these gentlemen are all secretaries of various branches of the Alberta Farmers' Association.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I can say that the gentleman named R. Shephard mentioned by my hon. friend is the secretary of the Strathcona branch of the Alberta Farmers' Association and he ordered the quantity mentioned there for supplying the farmers of that section.

Mr. BLAIN. What about W. J. Keen ?

Mr. BUREAU. I do not know, but I am informed that all these gentlemen are secretaries of the various branches of the Alberta Farmers' Association.

Mr. BLAIN. What about T. L. Hobbs ?

Mr. BUREAU I am told that Mr. Hobbs purchased some rope, not binder twine.

Mr. BLAIN. It is described as binder twine in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. BUREAU. There must be an error there if my information is correct.

Mr. ALCORN. I have in my hand one of the circulars referred to and I call the minister's attention to the fact that it is nowhere stated in this circular that sales are made to farmers only. It does contain a schedule of prices said to be for farmers only, but that implies there are other schedules applicable to other people, and it

would seem from the statement made by the hon. member for Peel that sales are made to others than farmers.

Mr. BUREAU. There are no prices for others than farmers, and the gentlemen mentioned are, I am told, officials of the various branches of the Alberta Farmer's Association. There is no binder twine offered to any except farmers.

Mr. ALCORN. What steps do the government take to ascertain they are selling to farmers only?

Mr. BUREAU. We have to rely on the signatures of these gentlemen and the decription they give as secretaries of these associations. It would be very difficult for us to have any other guide than that.

Mr. AVERY. I notice that sales were made to the Independent Cordage Company to the extent of $5,384.68; is that a farmers' company ?

Mr. BUREAU. If my hon. friend will look at the heading he will find that these are rope sales and not sales of binder twine.

Mr. BLAIN. We are anxious to know about Mr. Hobbs, because he figured in the binder twine industry a few years ago. This was a very large sale to Mr. Hobbs, and it requires some explanation.

Mr. BUREAU. We did not expect so much discussion on the supplementary estimates to-night, but if my hon. friend is agreeable I will bring the information down on the main estimates.

Mr. STAPLES. Can the minister tell us what it costs to place this binder twine in the Winnipeg market in carloads ? I would like to have that information so that I can advise my constituents as to whether it would be to their advantage to purchase this twine. I suppose this industry is going to make a profit for the country, or at all events not to make a loss, and we should know the details with regard to it. I would also like to know whether the quality of this twine has been satisfactory. I had a little experience with it a few years ago which was not quite a success, but probably it is is better now than it was then.

Mr. BUREAU. I will correspond with the railway companies and ascertain what their freight rates are on this twine if the hon. gentleman will state to what points he would have it delivered. I am informed by the inspector that there have been a few complaints about this binder twine some of which came from the west, but the letters expressing commendation are more numerous than the complaints.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the rope sold to the Independent Cordage Company sold after tender?

Mr. BUREAU. A circular was sent to every man in the trade and the person offering the highest price for the rope got it.

Mr. BENNETT. Both sides of politics?

Mr. BUREAU. To every one in the trade; I do not know whether they are Tories or Grits.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was purchased during the year 377,000 pounds of manilla and 55,000 pounds of New Zealand, and I would like to know what it cost. The Auditor General's Report formerly gave the cost, but I do not see it published this year and neither can I find it in the report of the Department of Justice.

Mr. BUREAU. At page 141 of the report of the Minister of Justice it shows there was purchased 55,123 pounds for $4,350.21 and 377,000 pounds at $38,388.88. At page M—18 of the Auditor General's Reunder the heading of Kingston penitentiary, the details of the cost are given.

Mr. BLAIN. At what price was this rope sold to the Independent Cordage Company and what are the different kinds of rope that are manufactured in the penitentiary?

Mr. BUREAU. I am informed they do not pretend to manufacture rope, but there are certain qualities of hemp which are unfit for the manufacture of binder twine and it is turned into rope. There is no definite quantity manufactured every year.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the price per pound?

Mr. BUREAU. At page M—33, Auditor General's Report, under the head rope shipments, the details are given: Pure manilla, 11 cents, 12 cents, 12½ cents and so on.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Can the Hon. Solicitor General tell us what the sale of binder twine manufacteured at Kingston amounted to ?

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) As I already stated, I am informed by the inspector that out of last year's total output of 700,000 pounds, about 250,000 pounds still remain on hand. As to the price of sale, it will be found in the circular issued by the department.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) The Auditor General's report states well enough the expenditure incurred during the fiscal year of 1907, but it does not indicate the receipts therefrom.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) If my hon. friend wants to turn up page M—33, of the Auditor General's report, he will find there a statement of the various amounts of money received, the number of pounds of twine and cable sold, and the different prices paid for each of these respectively.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Could not the department alter the terms of sale of

that product? According to the circular sent out by the department, farmers are requested to send in the amount of their purchase either by money order or check. As a rule that circular is sent out in March or April of each year. But, that is the very time of the year when farmers have less available money. If, instead, the warden of the penitentiary be instructed to note down all orders from farmers, orders for deliver, say in May or in June, then the farmers could more easily meet the payment of these goods. It could also, for instance, be paid on delivery as is customary in the trade.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) As was observed a little while ago by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Wright), the manufacturers leave it optional for the farmers to pay the amount if they purchase in the fall only. But, it can easily be noticed that the government cannot follow such a course, not having any one like the manufacturers appointed to collect the accounts. In regard to that, the government is not in the same position as private individuals. On the other hand, there is that truism—I know not whence it came—that the state cannot be as faithfully paid as private parties.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) The year prior to the elections might be taken advantage of.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) It might be adding allurement upon temptation. I admit that some good may be found in my hon. friend's suggestion, and the department will take it into consideration.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Should the government hesitate to give effect to my suggestion through fear of losing money, it might insist upon payment at the time when the twine is being made use of, either in June or July, when the order has been given and is being delivered. It might be delivered C.O.D.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) There is this drawback, that should the purchaser refuse his order, this order would remain unsold, owing to the late season, not allowing a sale to other purchasers.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I always took it that the intention was especially to assist the farmer, and that was primarily the object of establishing this industry at Kingston. As it is, it appears that certain clubs and associations of would-be farmers control the production and re-sell it later at a profit of 2, 3 and even 4 cents per pound. So soon as you make it available to the farmer to purchase directly on terms offered to him by the dealers, that is by granting him reasonable time, he will not fail to profit by the opportunity.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) My hon. friend must understand that the government could not, like the individual dealer. be kept posted on the financial condition of every farmer that would place an order with them. Moreover, if the government were to start granting time to farmers, it might meet with serious difficulties in collecting bills. My hon. friend also suggested the C.O.D. system. Besides the objection which I already stated, there is also this one which is to be guarded against. Should the purchaser refuse his goods, the government would stand to lose the cost of transportation both ways, which would not be quite profitable.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) There would still be the agreement which is binding on the farmer, and the government stands to lose nothing.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) The government would hardly revert to lawsuits for securing payment. The dealers have got this advantage that their agents are perpetually on the road and looking to these matters. If the government were to employ travellers, of course this would still increase the price of sale.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) If the government were really anxious to help the farmer, they could easily adopt another system. Everybody knows that the farmer much prefers buying on time and settle up whenever he has the cash. It is the system in use by all dealers and manufacturers of implements, who sell at an advanced cost of 50 per cent, but at long terms of 24 or 30 months, and farmers prefer this system than the cash system.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to draw my hon. friend's attention to the way this binder twine business is being run. My hon. friend has said that they sold the output of the Kingston penitentiary, 37,450 pounds of pure manilla rope at 8½ cents, $3,181.22. Looking over the Auditor General's Report I find on page P—119 a purchase of 103 pounds at 15 cents and another item of 24,466 pounds at a fraction less than 15 cents. Would it not be better for the government to sell rope to themselves rather than to the people throughout the country? On the one hand the hon. minister is selling his rope at 8½ cents and his colleague is buying it at 15 cents.

Mr. BUREAU. It may not be the same kind of rope.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, manilla rope of the same size. It would be better for the one department to sell the rope to the other.

Mr. TAYLOR. There would be no chance then for a rake-off.

Mr. BENNETT. Was that at Sorel?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Oh, everybody steals there.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The rope is made at the penitentiary out of the refuse or culling of the material used for twine. A certain amount of the manilla, which is not fit for twine, is manufactured into rope. The manilla which is made into rope at the penitentiary is worth only 5 cents or 6 cents a pound, whereas the manilla fit for good rope is worth 10 cents to 15 cents. Manilla is graded practically as wheat. Some grades are sold as low as 5½ cents a pound.

Mr. J. D. REID. Where ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. In New York and Liverpool. Other grades sell at 10 cents to 12 cents a pound. That which is made in the penitentiary is made possibly from pure manilla but manilla that is only worth 4 cents a pound.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman then must give the lie to the officer who is in charge at Kingston. For if the hon. gentleman will turn to the report, page N—32, he will find that the government had on hand the first of July, 1906, 518,365 pounds of pure manilla. They manufactured during the year 95,000 pounds into twine, they shipped 341,000 pounds, and made rope out of 22,000 pounds of that pure manilla. They used nothing else but pure manilla, yet my hon. friend says they made the rope out of the refuse.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is made into rope may be pure manilla but it is none the less the culling of the material made into twine.

Mr. BLAIN. I was very much interested in the explanation of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford), but would be much more interested if the minister would tell us whether this was the best or an inferior manilla. My hon. friend must be aware that there is no rope manufacturing establishment in Canada which buys the highest grade of manilla to put into rope. The highest grade is sold for the purpose of making binder twine.

Mr. BUREAU. The only manilla we buy is the best quality to manufacture twine, but when they open the bales and put it in use some of it has to be culled because it is not fit.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do you get a rebate ?

Mr. BUREAU. That has never been considered. It may be a good suggestion.

Mr. J. D. REID. Any business man would get a rebate for an inferior article.

Mr. BUREAU. There may be something in the suggestion. I am informed that the culling is put into rope. That which has been culled out would not be worth the price of high-grade, pure manilla.

Mr. TAYLOR. You do not purchase any.

Mr. OWEN. At page M—32 of the Auditor General's Report, it is shown that 377,095 pounds of manilla hemp was purchased during the year. But no price is given. We cannot judge whether what was purchased was first or fourth class.

Mr. BUREAU. If my friend (Mr. Owen) will turn back to page M—18, at the bottom of the page, he will find the total prices paid for raw manilla.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will the minister explain how he pays 10⅞ cents for manilla and sells it at 8½ cents ?

Mr. BUREAU. If part is used for first class and the cullings for inferior grades, of course, the same price cannot be got for the lower grades.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understood the minister to say that he was selling twine at 8½ cents to 9 cents, and he reads there that he is paying 10⅞ cents for manilla.

Mr. BUREAU. I have not read anything yet. I said that manilla was bought at 9⅞ cents and the twine was sold at something a fraction over 11 cents to the farmer.

Mr. HENDERSON. Perhaps, it is not necessary to detain the committee longer on this question. I think the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) will be able to afford more information when the main estimates are under discussion. I was afraid the hon. gentleman was going to give a very erroneous answer to the question as to how the minister could pay 10⅞ cents for the raw material and sell it at 11 cents. I suppose the explanation is this : In a pound of binder twine, there is not a pound of manilla. Only 80 per cent of the weight of the twine is manilla, the remainder being coarse oil or grease, at about 5 cents per pound. The manila would cost 8 cents and the oil 1 cent. Then, add 75 cents per 100 pounds for manufacture and you get 9¾ cents. And the hon. gentleman sells that to the farmer at 11 cents. Yet, he tells us that he is selling this manilla at cost price. It seems to me he is making a very large profit.

Mr. BUREAU. There is the coal and other expenses.

Mr. HENDERSON. Hon. David Mills is on record as having stated that the cost of manufacturing binder twine in Kingston penitentiary was about ¾ cents per lb., and I think that included all expenses. What I contend is that the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) is not giving the farmers a square deal. Instead of selling at cost price, he is making a profit of 1¼ cents per pound on an article which costs less than 10 cents, which would be a very large profit on an ordinary commercial transaction. I do not wish to criticise unduly the twine made at Kingston, but there must certainly be a reason why that twine is not taken by the farmers more readily than it is. The fact is that the twine at Kingston is made by prisoners who are turned on to a job that

they know nothing about and so cannot turn out the nice, even article that a spinner would who has been spinning twine for ten or fifteen years. It is not reasonable to expect it. It is a question for the government to consider whether this institution should be kept alive or not—whether it really pays or not. I do not think the farmers, or the public either, are getting any real benefit out of it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) to say that the government sold this twine strictly for cash. But, if he will turn to page M—35 of the Auditor General's Report, he will find, in the statement of revenue, the following :

| | |
|---|---|
| Outstanding from 1905-6.. .. .. | $10,855 78 |
| Shipments in 1906-7.. .. .. .. .. | 39,574 64 |

Who owes these outstanding accounts of $10,855.78 ?

Mr. BUREAU. I have not that information at hand. I will have it looked up, and will give it to the committee on another occasion.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is something wrong about this business. I live alongside Kingston, and am well acquainted with the farmers of Pittsburg. I see them buying twine in the stores in Gananoque and Kingston. You do not find the farmers of that part of the country in the list of the purchasers of this Kingston binder twine.

Mr. BUREAU. You find the secretaries of many farmers' clubs.

Mr. TAYLOR. We know that, as a matter of fact, you can go to any machine agent or hardware dealer and buy at the prices given in the circulars that the government is sending out—perhaps better prices. And the farmers say they get a more satisfactory article. There is no question about it—the government are keeping up these prices to oblige their friends who are manufacturing in the country, part and parcel of the combine, and the farmers are paying nearly double prices for every pound of twine. For, as has been stated here, sisal can be bought in New York at 5½ cents per pound.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not fit for twine.

Mr. TAYLOR. If you buy it in New York it will cost 6 cents or 7 cents when it is put into the twine, because the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) says there is only 75 per cent or 80 per cent of manilla in a pound of twine, the rest is cheap material.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to press upon my hon. friend's attention the fact I mentioned a few moments ago. He contended that the output of rope at Kingston penitentiary last year was $7,407 worth, the largest part of which, $5,384 worth, was sold to the Independent Cordage Company at 8½ cents and 10 cents per pound, pure manilla. Now, why could not the hon. gentleman sell this rope to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the same price as he sold it to the Independent Cordage Company, particularly when the Marine and Fisheries Department are buying the same kind of rope and paying 15 cents a pound for it?

Mr. BUREAU. Very likely the Marine and Fisheries Department are buying rope, but are they buying the kind of rope that we make in the penitentiary? The rope that we manufacture in the penitentiary is made from the cullings, from an inferior quality of manilla that is not fit for binder twine. Perhaps the Marine and Fisheries Department would not accept that kind of rope. We would like to sell them the rope, but they might not have any use for it.

Mr. BLAIN. Some persons must be using it, because the Independent Cordage Company, who are manufacturers and sellers of rope, are selling it in this country. It is fair to assume that the same kind of manilla the penitentiary is using for making rope is used by the Independent Cordage Company to make the same kind of rope.

Mr. BUREAU. My hon. friend will admit that if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) wants to buy a rope to take a cow down to market he will buy a different kind of rope from that he would use on a ship. Of course the Department of Justice would be glad to sell their rope, but I do not know as it is our business to go round all the departments and ask them if they will buy it. We are not in the rope business, we are manufacturers of twine, and the rope is only an incident of the manufacture of twine, so as not to waste the cullings.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There are just as many grades in twine as there are in wheat. You can have 5 cent manilla pure and you can have 20 cent manilla pure, and in both cases it is all manilla. The wholesale price of the International Harvester Company for 650 foot twine, the same as quoted here to-day, is 13 cents, not to the farmer, but to the retailer or jobber in the west. That twine will cost the jobber or retailer at Winnipeg $13.75 per hundred, whereas the price for the Kingston penitentiary is $11.75, a difference to the farmer of about 2 cents.

Mr. BLAIN. Why is it that when the government are offering pure manilla twine at 11 cents per pound the farmers do not buy it ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think this is just another instance of government ownership, it does not work out as it ought to. Some years ago the Kingston penitentiary sent a lot of twine to the west, and we are feeling the effects of it to-day. It was the most miserable stuff that ever came into the west, not because of the quality of the material

in it, but owing to the way it was spun. I do not think this industry at Kingston is a success myself, to be honest about it. The great thing in connection with the manufacture of twine, and what makes the value in twine, is not so much the quality of the material that comes out more in the spinning than in anything else. I think it is almost impossible to get evenly spun twine from an institution such as this at Kingston.

Mr. BLAIN. May I suggest that a few years ago they were applauding themselves because they had invested in the very best modern machinery to be found, so that they could supply the best quality of twine.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have no doubt that the machines are all right; but unless the twine spinners are experts, who have been trained to the work from childhood, the twine will be uneven. The twine of the Plymouth Manufacturing Company is possibly the best twine sold in the whole western country, and the reason of that is that the spinners employed at the factory are people who have been trained to the work from childhood. I have seen farmers throw into the fence corners twine that was thick and thin, and then drive to town and buy another kind. The unfavourable impression created years ago in regard to the Kingston twine has never been got over in the western country, and the want of confidence then created in it has been a detriment to it ever since. It may be that it is now much better than it used to be; but as our friend from Renfrew said, there is a great difference in the way twine is placed on the market. I know agents in the western country who have all their twine orders booked for next year, with the understanding that they will deliver the twine when it is wanted, and that the farmers may return what they do not use at the end of the season, which is a great inducement to them. Then, the fact that the farmers do not have to put up the cash until they sell their grain is another inducement. In the case of the Kingston twine, they have to advance the money when they buy, and they have to keep all they buy, whether they use it or not. The conditions surrounding the sale of binder twine to-day have had the effect of seriously shortening the sale of the Kingston twine.

Mr. BLAIN. I just want to say a word in respect to the quality of the twine manufactured in the Kingston penitentiary. The farmers of my own county have had some experience of it, and I do not at all agree with my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford). I have not many good words to say of the government, but I wish to say that the twine manufactured in the Kingston penitentiary is in my opinion number one, the equal of the twine sold in any part of Canada. We have some very good farmers in the county of Peel, who are using hundreds of pounds of twine every year, and of the large quantity of twine that has gone into that county in the last few years I have not heard of one complaint from any farmer. My own opinion is that the Kingston twine is the equal of any other on the market.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the Solicitor General have a statement prepared for the next meeting of the committee showing on the one side the amount paid for labour and materials and on the other side the amount of the sales, so that we can see the amount of profit or loss on last year's business ?

Mr. LEONARD (Laval). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the item under discussion is adopted by the committee, I wish to inquire of the government what measures they propose to adopt with respect to the officers of St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary who take an active part in politics in the county of Laval ? Oscar Beauchamp, especially, the warden of the penitentiary, is at present the chief Liberal organizer in the parish of St. Vincent de Paul. Since his appointment to that position he has been in the habit of organizing our opponents' committees. He has used the horses, carriages, and even the officials of the institution in arranging contradictory meetings in their interest. He has headed gangs of noisy rowdies. Officials under his orders have been mixed up in a rather bloody fight, and several of them were arrested for assault.

Since many years, the leader of the government and his colleagues have been in the habit of declaring it to be their fixed intention to prevent government officials from taking part in elections. When complaints are made to them under this head, they never fail to reply : Make a direct charge and the government will attend to it. Well, I will make a direct charge to-day. I now declare from my seat in this House, that Oscar Beauchamp, warden of St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, is a violent and fanatical partisan of the present government. He has fostered and is constantly fostering political passions in the parish of St. Vincent de Paul. In 1900, he attended the nomination meeting at St. Rose, being accompanied by the guards of the penitentiary in penitentiary vehicles, and they took an active part in the tumult which ensued. In 1902, he attended the parish committees. He himself brought liquor or caused it to be brought there, and the penitentiary officials became intoxicated and broke the peace.

In 1904, the same officials, headed by the same Oscar Beauchamp, were guilty of the same reprehensible conduct.

Since then, at the time of the revision of the voters' lists in September, 1907, a St. Vincent de Paul lawyer, son-in-law to one of the guards, had been instructed by my political friends to contest certain lists before the courts. Some time before the hearing, Oscar Beauchamp summoned to his office the guard whose son-in-law was to con-

duct the case, and informed him that unless the petition was withdrawn he would lose his position.

The official, who was, quite naturally, reluctant to lose the salary upon which he lived endeavoured to induce his son-in-law to give up the case. The latter, however, refused to do so, and reminded his father-in-law that he was under no obligations to him.

Thereupon Oscar Beauchamp again called him in the office and requested him to resign, stating that if he refused he would be dismissed within two days. The officer was therefore obliged to choose between resigning or being dismissed and losing his indemnity. He preferred to secure his indemnity by tendering his resignation, which was accepted on the spot.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) Would my hon. friend mind giving me the name of the official in question ?

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I have the name among my papers, but they are not at present before me. I think it is a Mr. Rochon, but I am not certain. The lawyer is Mr. Larivée, practising in Montreal and residing at St. Vincent de Paul.

At the time of the municipal elections, January 8, 1908, Oscar Beauchamp——

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's, Montreal). (Translation.) The government has nothing to do with municipal elections, as the hon. gentleman should know. Let him confine himself to federal matters.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) The hon. the Solicitor General has no need of help from the brilliant member for St. Mary's (Mr. Martin). He can defend himself without his assistance.

We are discussing an item having special reference to the salaries of the warden of St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary and of the officers of that institution, and I have a right to criticise their conduct.

At the municipal elections of 1908, Oscar Beauchamp organized the campaign ; he gave the matter his special attention and requested all the officials of the penitentiary one after the other to go and cast their votes. Those who refused to vote for his candidates were threatened with dismissal. His son and one of his friends stood at the door of the polling booth, and as they came up, the penitentiary officials were given the names of the candidates supported by the warden.

It appears to me that if the hon. the Minister of Justice, the Solicitor General and their colleagues really desire to enforce the policy which they have since several years proclaimed, this is a case deserving of their best attention.

The warden of the penitentiary is an active political partisan constantly taking part in elections in the interest of government candidates and preventing his employees from voting as they desire. I call upon the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice to stand by their principles and to say whether, in the face of all these facts, Oscar Beauchamp is to continue in the employ of the department.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) I desire to say to my hon. friend that this is the first time I hear of any complaints concerning the conduct of the warden of St. Vincent de Paul. Some time ago a question appeared on the Order paper as to whether the government was aware that certain officers of this penitentiary were taking part in municipal elections. The Minister of Justice replied, I believe, that he knew nothing about it. For my part, I do not know what took place.

The hon. member has made certain charges against Mr. Beauchamp. As he has done so from his seat, I have no doubt that he believes them to be true. It strikes me, however, that the facts complained of took place as far back as 1900 and 1904, and that they are said to have been going on from day to day since that period. How is it that the hon. member did not complain of them sooner, either to the Department of Justice or before this House ?

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) There is an end to all patience.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) I give my hon. friend full credit for the patience he has displayed, and I think he might have continued in patience a little longer, as the crimes charged against Mr. Beauchamp may not be as serious as he has stated.

The reports of the Department of Justice show that Mr. Beauchamp is an officer who performs his duty to the letter, and the inspectors place entire confidence in him. His administration of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary has always given entire satisfaction. He has treated the convicts with justice and I may add that since his appointment things have greatly improved at the penitentiary. My hon. friend will admit that we cannot be held responsible for matters which have not been brought to our knowledge, especially when the facts alleged are not of public notoriety and when they are based upon the ipse dixit of interested persons. Under present circumstances they may have been exaggerated.

If the officers of St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary have taken an active part in elections, they must have done so very secretly, as no complaint has reached the department on the subject.

At all events, if my hon. friend makes a serious charge against the warden, it will be the duty of the Department of Justice to take notice of it.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I accuse him of having taken an active part in politics in the past and of still doing so every

day, of being the most violent partisan organizer to be found in the county of Laval.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) That accusation seems rather vague.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I accuse him of using the carriages and horses of the penitentiary for electoral purposes, of giving leave of absence to the officials for the same purposes, of attending political meetings and interrupting Conservative speakers.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) All these charges are rather serious, but they date back several years, as my hon. friend has not been re-elected since 1904. I desire to insist upon it that this is the first time that such charges are made before the House, and that the Minister of Justice declares that they have never been brought to his attention. I have just inquired of the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) as to whether he had any knowledge of such complaints when he was Solicitor General. His reply was the same as that of the Minister of Justice.

My hon. friend desires me to make a declaration of policy, but I do not clearly see what declaration he would wish me to make.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I do not wish these things to be repeated at the next election.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) My hon. friend cannot prevent a man, because he is the warden of a penitentiary, from having sympathies and opinions, from believing that things are better managed by one government than by another. The man is free as to his convictions.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Has such a man any right to use government horses and carriages and the prestige of his position to prevent his opponents from speaking at contradictory meetings ?

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) I do not know that it is wrong for the warden to have a horse at his disposal.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Not one horse but ten horses, government horses, and twenty-five officials following him to each meeting.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) The charges being made, I will request my hon. friend to be precise as to time and circumstance ; we know nothing of the alleged facts and for my part I hear of them to-day for the first time. As I have several times stated, Mr. Beauchamp, as warden, is a model officer who is always spoken of in the highest terms.

Mr. MONK. The Solicitor General having been asked for a declaration of the policy of the government under the circumstances mentioned by my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Leonard), he should at least have gone to the trouble of stating what that policy is. I have heard it stated time and again in this House, both by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Finance, that the policy of the government is that civil servants may have their opinions and may vote but they are forbidden to take an active and partisan part in elections. To-night, the member for a constituency in which is situated this important penal establishment, points out a most disgraceful state of affairs in connection with an official of that penitentiary, and he asks for a declaration of the policy of the government, and the Solicitor General representing the Department of Justice gives no answer. My hon. friend (Mr. Leonard) is lectured for not making an accusation in due form before this date, but he was no doubt afraid of provoking an inquiry such as was had when this government came into power, into comparatively unimportant complaints regarding the administration of that penitentiary, and which inquiry cost the country $25,000. A lawyer in Montreal who sat on that committee was paid I think $12,000, others connected with it were paid on a proportionate scale, and the inquiry ended in the dismissal of Mr. Ouimet, then warden of the penitentiary. How can it be that the Solicitor General has not heard of the facts stated by my hon. friend from Laval to-night. I think the Solicitor General was in the county of Laval during the elections of 1902, and if he had his eyes open he must have seen that this warden of the penitentiary was here, there, and everywhere, that the employees of the penitentiary, the horses belonging to the penitentiary, the whole staff of the penitentiary were in commission to try and defeat my hon. friend (Mr. Leonard). Everybody knew it; it was a matter of public notoriety. There is not a man who follows public events within the city of Montreal or within 50 miles of St. Vincent de Paul who does not know that this man Beauchamp is continually in the breach at election time. He meddles in federal elections, he meddles in provincial elections, he takes an active and disgraceful part in municipal elections. And yet the Solicitor General says this man is a model warden of the penitentiary. It is difficult to believe that it is possible for a man to be continuously on the road for political and partisan purposes, and at the same time be a fit and proper person to conduct a penitentiary. I cannot say as to how he fulfils his duty within the penitentiary, but it is inconceivable that a man who has such an idea of his duty as the head of the leading penal establishment, can discharge his duties properly within the walls of the penitentiary and so multiply himself outside of the penitentiary for purposes which are calculated to shed disgrace and shame upon the whole adminis-

tration of justice. What does the Solicitor General want? Does he want the member for Laval (Mr. Léonard) to put his seat in jeopardy—as we are often invited to do when we point out such things as this to the government—does he want the hon. gentleman to lay formal charges? Why it is a matter of public notoriety. I have seen this man Beauchamp at work and I have seen him put his men to work and I say it is the duty of the government, if it requires to be absolutely certain of the facts which are notorious to obtain these facts and to obtain them without the expenditure of $25,000 from the public funds as was the case in the last inquiry. What is the inspector of penitentiaries good for if he cannot go into that county, or into a single parish of that county, or if he cannot go into my own county which adjoins it and not find out that these rumours are true. There is nothing more important in this or in any other country than that justice should be properly administered. I say that a penitentiary warden who carries on in that way ought to be dismissed. He is not fit to fulfil the duties of his position. We are voting these supplies to-night in a temporary way, but I think we should take our stand and under these circumstances, refuse supplies to this department until justice is done. A man of that description would not be tolerated in the public service of England for five minutes. The rule in England is that public servants may entertain such opinions as they wish on public matters and they may vote, but it is a strict regulation that no man shall take such part as this man takes in elections. I venture to say that an official in any state of the American Union in charge of a great penitentiary such as this is, and who would do what this man does, would not be tolerated in his position for five minutes. This man goes about openly, he boasts of what he does, and yet he is retained in office. Under the circumstances we are perfectly justified in raising an objection to this vote. If the Solicitor General goes to Montreal, without leaving the city of Montreal at all he will find that the allegations made here are absolutely true, and that being the case this man Beauchamp ought to be dismissed from the service.

Mr. BUREAU. It is surprising to me that the hon. member should read me such a lecture and demand that the Solicitor General should go down and within twenty-four hours dismiss a man for offences which he says have been going on for six years, when the hon. member and his colleague from Laval who represents the very riding in which this man lives, have not yet brought the matter officially or unofficially to the notice of the department.

Mr. MONK. I have spoken of this and the attention of the government has been repeatedly brought to it in this House which is the proper forum in which to speak of it.

Mr. BUREAU. It has been asked if the department has any knowledge of these things and the answer is on 'Hansard.' My hon. friend charges that in 1902 I was with Mr. Beauchamp in the Laval election and witnessed the things of which complaint is made. I took part in the Laval election but I did not meet Mr. Beauchamp and did not know him until I was appointed Solicitor General. He may have been there for all I know but I did not see him and do not know that he was.

Mr. LEONARD. Where did you spend the time?

Mr. BUREAU. In St. Rose, where you polled the largest vote, if that is any comfort to you. I think it is unfair for the hon. member to say that he is going to hold up the estimates and that he wants us to at once, within forty-eight hours, dismiss Mr. Beauchamp on a statement made here to-night by himself and the member for Laval (Mr. Leonard). My hon. friend justifies the member for Laval by saying that they do not want to have an investigation, to have public money expended to find out whether this man did right or did wrong. It costs nothing to write a letter to the department or to the Minister of Justice or to make complaint to the inspector of penitentiaries. Why has that not been done? I have asked the inspector if he has had complaints against the warden of St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary and he says: No. I have asked him if he went there and mixed with the people and he replies that he did. If this man has been committing such outrageous crimes the people would speak of it. I have been in St. Vincent, in the penitentiary and the village and have had occasion to talk with the people, but I have heard nothing of it. The hon. member will admit that it is unfair to say to-night: Dismiss this man or we will hold up the estimates. He must give a chance for an investigation of the matter. He says we have received complaints but that does not mean that we must say: The man is guilty. Let us take some of the rope that has created such a fuss to-night and hang him. Surely an opportunity should be given him to prove that he is not guilty.

Mr. LEONARD. If he is guilty?

Mr. BUREAU. We will find out first. It is a principle of British law to hold a man not guilty until he is found guilty. My hon. friend may make a statement from his seat and of course I accept what he says, but he will agree that it is unfair to say that we must go to this man and dismiss him. If we did that the hon. member for Laval would be the first to condemn our method of administering justice. My hon. friend stated that I said Mr. Beauchamp was a model

warden of a penitentiary. I have to judge him as I find him and the reports of the inspectors upon his work are the best. We have to take these reports and to take Mr. Beauchamp as being as my hon. friend has said, a model warden of a penitentiary, until the contrary is proven.

Mr. MONK. I do not wish to raise the question of the manner in which civil servants have been dismissed since 1896. That is not my object. Throughout my own county every civil servant was dismissed. Most of them were employed on the Lachine canal. Some were dismissed without being given an opportunity to learn what they were accused of. Where the government had some reason for instituting an inquiry, some lawyer, some heeler, some political hanger-on was charged with the inquiry and conducted it ex parte in most cases; at any rate I was never notified of any of these inquiries and the inquiries ended with the dismissal of men who possibly had been twenty years in the civil service and so were unfit for anything else. I remember particularly a case that created quite a sensation in Montreal, that of the bridge master at Cote St. Paul, a man infirm, with twelve children, who had been placed there by Laflamme, Minister of Justice in the Mackenzie administration. He was told at midnight that he had to clear out the next morning to make place for a relative of the then member for Hochelaga. I do not wish to waken up these cases as it would lead to too long a discussion, but the Solicitor General surely remembers that in these early days when a member would ask why such a man was dismissed the stereotyped answer of the government was that he was dismissed on the complaint of the sitting member for the constituency. I have heard that answer given here time and time again, and therefore I do not see why this man if he is guilty of these offences should not be treated as others have been treated by this government. I do not think it is necessary after the allusions and complaints that have been made here from year to year since the election of 1902, that a member should sit down and make a regular complaint in writing supported by affidavit like some proceeding in a court, against such an important branch of the administration of justice; it is sufficient I think to ascertain whether what I am stating here to-night is true or not. Is it notorious in the district of Montreal that this man takes an offensive and partisan part in every election ? If that is the case how can it be that the inspector of penitentiaries goes down to the very place where these forbidden acts are committed and is not able to ascertain whether there is any truth in them or not? The matter has been ventilated in the press of the district of Montreal and it is known to every man there who follows elections that this warden violates the essential principle of the public service. Under these circumstances I do not ask my friend to go down to-night and dismiss him, but I say his duty is to ascertain whether that is true and if it is true this man should be removed from office because he meddles in a shameful and brazen manner in elections when he should not. If it is true, he should be removed from office.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, before this item is voted, I ask for a plain declaration from the government. I want to know from the Department of Justice, if the warden is guilty of the facts which I charge against him, if the department, I repeat, will dismiss him.

Mr. BUREAU. My hon. friend cannot ask for such a declaration before an inquiry being made by the government. We will decide according to the results of the inquiry.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I want to know, if Mr. Beauchamp is guilty of the facts I accuse him, if the Minister of Justice will punish him.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) I have only to say that if the employee is guilty, the department will have to look into the degree of culpability before taking any action.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I have accused Beauchamp of using the rigs of the penitentiary; of having granted a fortnight's holiday to more than half of the employees of the penitentiary so that they could attend the public meetings. More than that, of having used his position to threaten a public employee of dismissal if his son-in-law would not consent to withdraw a political prosecution in which he was acting as lawyer. I have accused him of having taken part in municipal elections which were practically political elections. I want the government to make a declaration.

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) My hon. friend plays his part very seriously. He accuses the warden. I answer to him that we will inquire. My hon. friend is a lawyer and he is too respectful of the dignity of his profession to ask me to render a judgment upon simple hypothesis.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) The First Minister and the Minister of Finance have declared many times here that their policy was to punish those employees who would take an active part in elections. Why is the Solicitor General so much afraid to make a declaration?

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) I do not want to declare Mr. Beauchamp guilty before having heard him.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) But if he is found guilty, will the government encourage him by keeping him in his position?

Mr. BUREAU. (Translation.) The department will certainly not encourage him; but we won't give any judgment before having heard him.

Mr. MONK. It would be a great mistake to think that the complaints of the conduct of this man are confined to members of the Conservative party. When the warden of a penitentiary mixes up in municipal elections, he naturally very often comes up against his own friends. I do not remember having attending a single meeting in Laval without seeing this warden turning up with his own men, and I have heard Liberals as well as Conservatives exclaim: There is Beauchamp with his men; it is a public scandal. If this man has any sense of the dignity and importance of his position, he would on no account meddle in elections. But when he takes part in politics, municipal, provincial and federal, he creates a public scandal, and when the facts are brought to the knowledge of the government, they should take immediate action.

Mr. BLAIN. Here is a charge made on the floor of the House by two hon. members that a certain highly paid official, the warden of one of the penitentiaries, is an active partisan. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has noticed him in public meetings taking an active part in politics. Considering the fact that the policy of this government, announced by several members of the cabinet from time to time, is to allow no officials to take part in politics other than to vote, it is time the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should pronounce himself upon this particular case. He should say whether he proposes that the policy he laid down shall be carried out or whether he is going to let his Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) set it aside.

Mr. FIELDING. I have nothing to add to the statement I made on previous occasions as to what I regard as the proper attitude on the part of Dominion officials. As to this particular case I have no knowledge other than that which comes from the discussion to-night, and I do not feel free to express any opinion.

Mr. BLAIN. Surely the hon. gentleman must accept the statement of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that he has seen this man from time to time taking active part in elections. If that statement be true, it is the duty of the government to take immediate action. Does the minister propose to do that?

Mr. FIELDING. I propose to leave the matter in the hands of the Department of Justice.

Mr. BLAIN. Are you going to leave it over until next year?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not feel disposed to make any statement regarding a matter of which I have no knowledge other than that which comes up to-night. I propose to leave it to be dealt with by the Department of Justice.

Mr. BUREAU. I told my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Leonard) in French that I had not heard about this before to-night. I told my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that I did not know Beauchamp in 1902 or until I was appointed Solicitor General. I shall make inquiries, but it would not be fair to require an immediate dismissal without giving the man a hearing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A great many men have been dismissed without being heard. I do not propose that that should be done in this case. But when we have resolutions concurred in unanimously by this House and adopted by the government as their policy, and when we find that policy violated by the head of this penitentiary, action should be taken and taken directly. Otherwise the will of this House is set at nought and the alleged policy of the government becomes no better than a farce.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital—Railways—Intercolonial Railway—to increase accommodation at Halifax, $220,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. minister (Mr. Graham) please explain this?

Mr. GRAHAM. These improvements are under contract. Last year we had a vote of $300,000. But we made better progress with the work than we had anticipated, so that $220,000 is due to the various contractors.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount expended by the government for terminals at Halifax?

Mr. GRAHAM. The amount spent from the beginning is $3,753,188.01.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it not more than that?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the amount given me by the department.

Mr. HAGGART. What amount will be required to finish this work?

Mr. GRAHAM. The total estimated cost of the work is $1,019,380. The amount spent is $520,000, leaving practically $500,000 yet to be spent.

Mr. HAGGART. What do the improvements consist of?

Mr. GRAHAM. They are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Additional facilities west side Water street.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. ..$ | 173,225 |
| 36 stall engine house.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 175,000 |
| Freight car repair shop.. .. .. .. .. | 75,000 |
| Store house, sand and oil house.. .. | 35,000 |
| Steel concrete chimney and foundation | 4,500 |
| 14 coal pockets and foundation.. .. | 2,500 |
| 100,000-gallon tank.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 5,000 |
| Water supply.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 7,000 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Cinder pits | $ 10,000 |
| Grading in new yard | 51,000 |
| Ballast | 15,000 |
| Tracks | 20,000 |
| Rails in engine house | 3,655 |
| Double tracking, Richmond | 55,000 |
| Heating and piping in new building | 2,000 |
| Sewer in new yard | 10,000 |
| Turnouts | 2,000 |
| Tracks, Richmond yard | 25,000 |
| Locomotive crane | 8,500 |
| Building for power inspectors | 2,000 |
| Wharf and dredging | 328,000 |
| Total | 1,019,280 |

Mr. HAGGART. Does not the minister think that a road completed as long as the Intercolonial, with terminals at Halifax, should have such expenditures as this charged to ordinary expenditure instead of to capital ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are following as closely as possible the English system under which increases of accommodation are charged to capital account.

Mr. BERGERON. Was it in connection with these works that land was purchased for the government by Mr. Preston ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not quite conversant with that. Land was bought concerning which there has been some discussion.

Mr. BERGERON. I am sure that the deputy minister knows whether the land in this case was that in connection with which Mr. Pearson was engaged.

Mr. GRAHAM. Part of it on the same land.

Rolling stock, $80,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for the purchase of 50 steel coal cars. We are badly handicapped for rolling stock for the transportation of coal, and we bought 50 cars for which we had not a vote.

Mr. HAGGART. How did the minister get the cars without paying for them ? Or has he got them yet ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The government's credit is good. The cars are promised for immediate delivery, and we expect them in a few days.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are all cars purchased for this railway charged to capital account, or are any charged to revenue ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We buy cars, repair cars and hope to make cars ourselves. But these are steel cars and practically a new thing for us.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister is evading the question. I asked if the government ever charged to revenue account any new cars purchased ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I said they did, and that they made new cars themselves and expect to make more.

Mr. J. D. REID. Were any cars purchased within the last year charged to revenue account ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so.

Mr. J. D. REID. From what company were they purchased ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Some from Rhodes, Curry & Company.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are they manufacturers of cars ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, large manufacturers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under what circumstances are cars charged to revenue account ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are endeavouring to purchase some of these cars to replace those broken down or worn out, charging them to revenue as far as possible. We are trying to adjust that, as I explained a few weeks ago, by putting aside a certain amount $25,000, at the first of every month. The additional rolling stock, we charged to capital, but cars to replace others are charged to revenue.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And this is an absolute addition ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes—this is a thing we never had.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a plausible way to put it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not mean exactly——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought not. Perhaps the minister will explain just what he did mean ?

Mr. GRAHAM. These cars are absolute additions to the rolling stock and are not to replace others.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the minister state what number of cars and engines he has charged to capital account last year ? Has he charged any to revenue ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is, for the fiscal year just closing ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have charged some cars as well as engines to revenue. I will get a statement of them.

Mr. HAGGART. I have the printed return for nine months, and I think that shows only one locomotive charged to revenue.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is for last year, but the hon. gentleman asked me concerning this year.

Mr. HAGGART. That is what is shown by the report for nine months of last year. I find that, at the ordinary rate of depreciation, a long life for a locomotive is four-

teen or fifteen years, and, for a car, twenty years. Then you ought to charge to revenue account each year 5 per cent of your rolling stock, and perhaps 8 per cent or 10 per cent of the locomotives.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the principle, and I think we are getting nearer to it than the department ever did before. As I said previously, we are charging to revenue every month $25,000, or $300,000 per year, and we expect to get an equilibrium established so as to be able to charge everything to revenue that should be charged.

Mr. HAGGART. You don't intend to defend the past, then?

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, if you go very far back, no.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) referred to a certain phenomenon last year, namely, one engine that was charged to revenue. Was there any such phenomenon this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think my hon. friend will find nearly a quarter of a million dollars this year placed to revenue, between locomotives and cars.

Mr. HAGGART. What percentage is that of the total value of the locomotives and cars?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot answer that; I am not sure that any railway makes its calculations on that basis.

Mr. HAGGART. Every railroad allows a certain time for the life of rolling stock; twenty years is a long time. If you keep that rolling stock in repair and replace it, it would mean 5 per cent addition every year to the rolling stock and perhaps 7½ or 10 per cent on the locomotives. We don't find anything of that kind in the hon. gentleman's report.

Mr. STANFIELD. The four motor cars, does the minister charge them to capital or to revenue?

Mr. GRAHAM. To capital account.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister is not charging all the engines and cars that he has purchased during the present year to revenue account? The next time we take up these estimates will he bring a statement showing how many engines and cars during the year just ending were charged to revenue and how many to capital?

Mr. BENNETT. Where are these four motor cars being used and what did they cost a piece?

Mr. GRAHAM. They cost approximately $17,000 each. They are self contained, car and motor. The car carries its own propelling power, which is steam.

Mr. BENNETT. Are they a success?

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. GRAHAM. They are an experiment and we hope they will be successful.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is the minister not aware that these motor cars are an absolute failure for handling freight?

Mr. GRAHAM. They are not for hauling freight; they are for handling passengers for the suburban service, where it does not pay to run trains. We think they will be more economical.

Mr. HAGGART. Let me draw the minister's attention to the amount that he has charged to revenue account for the year ending 31st March, 1907: 1 passenger car, 9 box cars, 11 platform cars, 2 coal cars, and an oil tank.

Mr. STANFIELD. I would call the attention of the minister to a shortage in engines. In Nova Scotia the Lord's Day Alliance want to prosecute the department, and because they cannot sue the government they are getting after the employees. In my own town of Truro an engine that came in on No. 26 train on Saturday night went out the next morning to Springhill and came back, and went out that same evening on No. 9. Now, the people who are employed in the engine shops do not have time to look after the engines properly. The accident at Belmont is supposed to have been caused by lack of inspection. That was before the time of the present minister and before the time of the present deputy minister.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have a new engine house at Truro and are in better shape in that respect than before. We are short of motive power, and we are trying to remedy that as fast as we can. I am afraid we shall have to charge a good deal of that to capital. Another thing that aggravates the situation is the loss of shops by fire at Moncton, which renders it difficult to keep our engines in repair.

Mr. BENNETT. Reading on page 10 of the report of the Department of Railways and Canals, we find that for the year ending 31st March, 1907, there have been, as stated by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), the following equipment added, and that alone is chargeable to revenue, namely: 1 first-class car, 9 box cars, 11 platform cars, 2 coal cars and 1 oil tank. Now, is the House to understand that for the year mentioned no equipment in the way of cars has been charged up to revenue, and that every other item has gone to capital account?

Mr. GRAHAM. I can hardly answer that directly. The hon. gentleman has named 23 cars; there must be some locomotive power in addition to that.

Mr. BENNETT. Take first the passenger car, what would be about the value of that?

Mr. GRAHAM. About $20,000.

Mr. BENNETT. And the nine box cars ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Perhaps $1,150 each ; that would be about $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. The eleven platform cars ?

Mr. GRAHAM. About $650 each.

Mr. BENNETT. And the two coal cars ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Probably $2,500 for both.

Mr. BENNETT. These figure up to about $40,000. We often hear of the amount of money charged to the revenue account of the Intercolonial Railway. I have seen it stated repeatedly in the public press that were it not that hundreds of thousands of dollars are taken out of the revenue to add to the stock of the railway, there would be a handsome surplus. The minister's figures prove that for the year ending the 31st March, 1907, there has been taken from the revenue account only about $40,000 for cars, and nothing for locomotives. Does the minister say that that statement, taken from his report, is right or wrong ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The report is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Then it can go out to the public that the magnificent sum of $40,000 was taken out of receipts to go towards rolling stock, and that a very large amount that was disbursed was charged to capital account. It is just as well that the country should understand where we stand ; and that is an official statement of the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is hardly putting that fairly. He wants the country to understand that we are expending on the maintenance of the road only some $40,000. As a matter of fact, we have been spending since last April $25,000 a month in renewals and betterments.

Mr. BENNETT. Let us confine ourselves to the rolling stock, or rather to cars, because there are no locomotives.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not agree to that until I have looked over the report myself. It must be borne in mind that, in addition to new rolling stock, a great deal of money is spent on repairing and bettering the rolling stock we have, and this is absolutely new, which under the practice of some roads is charged to capital account.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the minister if a special vote was taken for the four motor cars, which were obtained at a total cost of $68,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. A special vote was taken last year, I think.

Mr. BLAIN. It seems to be rather a large expenditure without the department having fully looked into the matter. Would it not have been better for the department to have constructed one motor car and given it a test before ordering the others ? I understand that these cars are now put out of use altogether, and the minister has almost said to the committee that he looks on them as a failure. May I ask him what he expects from them in the coming year ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We expect them to take care of suburban traffic at places like Halifax, St. John and Moncton, whose citizens live outside of the cities in the summer, and for which it would not pay us to run a regular train. One of these cars was constructed in the old country, and they are a success there. I have been on one of them, and I think they are well fitted to do the work for which they were obtained.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the trouble with them ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is partly the expense of manning and operating them, which costs much less in the old country than in this country. I believe myself that they will be successful eventually. There is no doubt of their practicability.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the minister not found that they will not climb the difficult grades?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think there is any difficulty about that. They will climb any grade we have on the Intercolonial, and a great deal more.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are they in service now ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The one at St. John is, and the others will be in a short time.

Mr. BLAIN. Where were they manufactured, and what is the name of the firm ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The model car was manufactured in Austria, the others by ourselves in Moncton. The car part was made by Rhodes, Curry & Co., and the engine part at Moncton by our own people.

Mr. J. D. REID. From the statement made by the minister in his report, that only these few cars have been rebuilt or charged to revenue account is a surprise to me after the statement made by the late minister at the last session when, if I understood him aright, he stated that they had changed the system and had adopted the system in use on the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway, which would be carried out from that time forward. Yet here is a statement read from the minister's own report to the effect that only a few thousand dollars for cars are charged in the revenue account. The minister has been showing the people of this country in by-elections during the past year what great results have been achieved on the Intercolonial under the new system that has been adopted ; and to-night, when met face to face, he has to admit that it is the same old system that has been going on for the

last ten years, and we have no reason to believe that any other system will be adopted during the next year. To my mind there is something wrong, and we should not be misled in that way. At Halifax the government paid $187,366 to one person for land. Was that land valued and who were the valuators ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That was a very valuable wharfage property belonging to the Cunard Company and everybody to whom I talked in the city of Halifax said it was an exceptionally good bargain. We had it valued, but I do not remember the names just now.

Mr. J. D. REID. We are entitled to know who valued that land.

Mr. GRAHAM. Perhaps unwisely, I did not look upon it as necessary to have all this detailed information on the supplementary estimates to-night but I will be glad to give it on the main estimates.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is this $220,000 to go to?

Mr. HAGGART. It seems extraordinary that there should be $220,000 earned by somebody in Halifax; it seems queer that on a vote of $300,000 they should have earned $520,000. Who is so well off in Halifax that he can afford to be out of $220,000?

Mr. GRAHAM. This work is divided amongst eight or ten contractors. The contracts were let to the lowest tender in each case but owing to favourable conditions the contractors were able to do more than the work we thought they would be able to preform this year and this is to pay for it. The contracts are not exceeded in any case.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the nature of the work done and who are the contractors ?

Mr. GRAHAM. W. Kitchen, grading the west side; M. E. Keefe, engine house; Rhodes, Curry & Co., freight car repair shops, etc.; Wallberg, store and oilhouse; Dube, coal pockets; Wallberg, cinder pits; Wallberg, heating and lighting.

Mr. J. D. REID. When were these contracts let ? Were they let during the current fiscal year or last year ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Each one of those men has performed more work than was expected but none have exceeded the contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. Cannot the minister state whether these contracts have been let since March 31, 1907 ?

Mr. GRAHAM. They must have been let in 1907, but I cannot say just now definitely as to that.

Mr. J. D. REID. At page W—18 of the Auditor General's Report I find Intercolonial Railway capital Halifax increased accommodation. Is this $220,000 to be paid out under that head and to be added to the amount we have charged in the Auditor General's Report last year ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not see anything of Wallberg, Dube, Rhodes-Curry, in the Auditor General's Report of last year. Were these contracts let since ?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will see that those whom he has mentioned had contracts last year but these are new contracts made at the beginning of the current year.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have only mentioned Kitchen.

Mr. GRAHAM. You mentioned Keefe.

Mr. J. D. REID. No, I mentioned W. Kitchen. There is another contract, the estate of Beasley Brothers, a contract for removing and dredging out pier 9, $7,096. The minister has not mentioned that. I do not see Wallberg down under increased accommodation at Halifax. He is down under 18 or 19 contracts on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. Being the lowest tenderer.

Mr. J. D. REID. Not in all cases.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. No, he is not. I can assure the minister that I have seen in the Public Accounts Committee cases where he is not.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Oh, no, you have not, that is a dream.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have, it is not a dream.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not understand my hon. friend. If this were a contract made this year, in 1907, he would not find it in the Auditor General's Report, would he ?

Mr. J. D. REID. This report is up to March, 1907.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am explaining that they are new contracts.

Mr. J. D. REID. Have they all been let since March, 1907 ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so. The real meaning of it is that these men as contractors have consumed the estimate that the department took last year and have performed work on the same contracts to the extent of $220,000 more.

Mr. BENNETT. Did they receive any payment on account of these works before March 31, 1907, and if so where are they in the Auditor General's Report ?

Mr. GRAHAM. If they received them they would I suppose appear in the report.

Mr. HAGGART. How does the minister enter into contracts of $1,700,000 on a vote of $300,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend knows as an ex-minister that it is customary to enter into a contract for a large amount and only take in the estimate what we expect to spend during that year. My hon. friend would be the first to object if we took more than that amount.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the statement should be made when you take the vote what the total expenditure is estimated at and what amount is to be taken for that year.

Mr. GRAHAM. The explanation would be fully made in the committee before the vote would be given.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister will find these explanations are not as full as he thinks they are.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not unusual to enter into a contract for a larger sum than is voted but the contract usually contains a provision that it is subject to a vote from time to time. I do not know as to this particular contract but this is the practice.

Mr. J. D. REID. Can the minister give us particulars as to date, amount, &c., of this contract with Wallberg ?

Mr. GRAHAM. One contract is for a store and oil house, cinder pits, another is heating and lighting. He was the lowest tenderer in every case.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister should be able to give the dates and full particulars of each contract.

Mr. GRAHAM. These same matters will probably come up in the main estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. In the Auditor General's Report at page W—367 I see a letter from the Auditor General dated February 7, 1907, commencing :

Sir,—With this please find vouchers amounting of $4,115.41 in favour of R. T. MacIlreith, for legal services charged to Intercolonial Railway, increased accommodation at Halifax.

Would the minister give us an explanation of this item ?

Mr. GRAHAM. This was of course all taxed by the Law Department. In expropriations of this kind there is always a great deal of legal expense.

Mr. BOYCE. When we ask for information concerning this item of $4,000 paid a legal gentleman, we are told that the item is all right because it must have been taxed.

Mr. GRAHAM. I said it was taxed.

Mr. BOYCE. Then the hon. minister ought to be able to tell us something about it. I am curious to know what services could have been rendered for this $4,000, and what was the bill put in originally which was reduced by the Department of Justice ?

Mr. GRAHAM. As a legal man, my hon. friend is not fair in saying that I have given no information. I gave as much as he would get in a lawyer's bill. As a matter of fact there were some twenty or thirty properties which had to be expropriated and the transfers of titles completed and the other necessary legal proceedings taken, and I think the charge was as reasonable as one you could expect from a legal practitioner.

Mr. BLAIN. The point is what are the services which were charged for ?

Mr. GRAHAM. What more information can I give? As a matter of fact this has been already investigated before the Public Accounts committee.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend will see by the letter of the Auditor General, page W—367, that he wanted the vouchers in order to put them before the Public Accounts Committee, and they were for services rendered down to June 30, 1906.

St. Rosalie—improvements, $20,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is where the Intercolonial Railway connects with the Grand Trunk Railway. The estimated expense was $138,900.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the amount paid last year ?

Mr. GRAHAM. $56,000 was voted for this current year but the contractor got on faster with the work than was anticipated and has earned $76,000.

The improvements consists of :—

| | |
|---|---|
| Water supply.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $ 7,000 |
| Engine house.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 20,000 |
| Buildings for stores and offices.. .. | 3,500 |
| Sewers and drains.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,000 |
| Cinder pit.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 3,000 |
| Turntable.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 5,400 |
| Grading, masonry, tracks and ballast.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 71,000 |
| Land (18:19 acres) and legal expenses.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 25,000 |
| Coaling pockets.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 3,000 |
| Total.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 138,900 |

Mr. HAGGART. What is the estimate of the total cost of the work ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contractor is J. P. Morin. Tenders were called for by poster and newspaper advertisement. There were two tenderers, Morin being the lowest. The estimated cost of the work is $138,900.

To increase accommodation at Pictou, $12,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is to pay the final estimatae for the sea wall, filling, engine-house, pump and water service. E. A. Wallberg is the contractor, being the lowest out of seven tenderers. The amount of his contract is $62,520.

Mr. HAGGART. How was water pumped there before ? We want some idea why this should be charged to capital account.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am told that whatever service they had there before was very amateur.

Mr. STANFIELD. The city water in Pictou is bad for the boilers.

Mr. BOYCE. Who is the engineer who certifies the completion of work ?

Mr. GRAHAM. W. D. McKenzie.

Mr. BOYCE. Who is this man A. C. Selig who has done some certifying on Mr. Wallbergs' contracts?

Mr. GRAHAM. He is assistant engineer.

Mr. BOYCE. I would draw the attention of the minister to a matter referred to by the Auditor General on this Wallberg contract. I may say that the Wallberg contract is open to very grave suspicion, as shown by the evidence before the Public Accounts Committee. At pages W—369 and 370, there are letters which show that Mr. Selig has been in the habit of certifying for Mr. Wallberg before the work is completed. I desire to put on record a letter of the Auditor General of January 25, as follows :

Sir,—Let me acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 22, in answer to my telegram of same date, concerning an outstanding cheque for $3,540 in favour of E. A. Wallberg, for final estimate on tanks at Truro and Rivière du Loup.

The final estimate in question, dated June 30, was received at this office July 7; and it was approved and returned to Moncton July 9. The cheque for $3,540 is still outstanding, and my telegram of January 22 asked for an explanation.

Your answer is: 'This cheque is retained in the custody of the treasurer of the railway, and has not been issued to Wallberg; because although all the work for these tanks has been completed, yet the testing of them, which has to be done by the railway, has not yet been done. The railway had to put in the water pipes connecting with the tanks, and these have not been put in; so that the testing could not be carried out.'

The local engineer should not have certified that the work was completed until he knew that it was satisfactory. In similar cass, a deduction is usually made, to cover any expense which may arise from possible unsatisfactory work, and the balance is paid as a further progress estimate.

It is a curious fact that the same complaint is made with regard to the same engineer's certificate in relation to a contract of Mr. Wallberg, at Stellarton. I give a quotation from a letter of January 26, 1907, from the Auditor General to the general manager of government railways :

This means, I suppose, that the work was not completed until shortly before December 24, 1906, the date when the cheque was released. If this supposition is erroneous, please send the correct date.

If completion was not had until December 1906, the certificate on the voucher of June 30 is not correct, which reads: 'I certify that the work described in the within account, amounting to $2,441, has been performed. (Sgd.) A. C. Selig, assistant engineer.'

If Mr. Selig has certified to the performance of work which had not been done, he should give a full explanation of his reason for doing so.

No explanation is given by Mr. Selig. There are other cases in which the same sort of certificate has been given and cheque issued before the work was actually performed. I would ask an explanation as to how the public interest is safeguarded.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) will see that he is mistaken. The cheque was not issued——

Mr. BOYCE. It was issued, but held.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was held by the treasurer of the railway.

Mr. BOYCE. But Mr. Selig certified that the work was completed before it was completed, and upon this the cheque was issued by the Auditor General, and then held. But the reason for it being held was the exception taken by the Auditor General.

Mr. GRAHAM. While the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) may be correct as to the fault of certifying before the work was done, yet the inference that there was any chance of Wallberg being paid until the work was fully tested is not justified.

Mr. BOYCE. Had it not been for the Auditor General, he would have been paid.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, the Auditor Genral did not retain the cheque, and had nothing to do with retaining it. As a matter of fact the work was practically completed so far as the assistant engineer could certify to it, but the department had not tested the work and the cheque was held until the work was tested.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the minister quarrel with the principle laid down by the Auditor General in this letter ?

The local engineer should not have certified that the work was completed until he knew it was satisfactory.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is not going to put me in that place. I told him that possibly there was something to complain of in the action of the assistant engineer—that it would have been better for him to wait until the test had been made. But I was explaining what was done. There was no chance of loss on the part of the department, for the cheque was not given until the test was made.

Mr. J. D. REID. There have been many cases in which these cheques are issued, and the Auditor General's duty is not to issue the cheque until he gets——

Mr. GRAHAM. He does not issue the cheque. These cheques are issued from Moncton.

Mr. J. D. REID. They are on the Auditor General.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, they are on the Bank of Montreal.

Mr. J. D. REID. Must not the Auditor General transfer the amount to the department?

Mr. GRAHAM. He transfers a credit amount. I approve of his suggestion that the assistant engineer should not have certified until the test was made.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital—Railways—miscellaneous—to pay Canadian Pacific Railway compensation for right of way, $600.

Mr. BENNETT. At what place ?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is an old story. When the British Columbia section was being handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, a similar portion of land was included for which no clear title could be given. That was in 1885 I think. Recently the title was perfected and the Canadian Pacific Railway paid the owner the price $600. This is to refund that amount.

Post Office—to provide for the appointment of Messrs. Robert Durston, letter carrier, and R. W. Hynds, porter in the Toronto office, to the senior third class, at $800 a year each, from the 1st April, 1907, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service or Post Office Acts, $1,600.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Durston is an expert in organizing the free letter delivery system in cities. He came from the old country some years ago and is a very able man. Unfortunately he came into the service late, and for that reason we wish to give him this increase. We are extending the system of free delivery to cities with a population of 10,000 and a revenue of $20,000. Mr. Hynds is 51 years of age, he is an able accountant, and by reason of his special ability he has been promoted.

To complete payments for mail service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1908, $52,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is to establish new post offices and to open new postal routes in the western provinces. There has been for two or three years past a demand for the extension of the postal service in new districts of the western country, and there has also been a demand for free rural letter delivery. The revenues at the disposal of the department have not been large enough to meet all these demands. But we are extending the mail service constantly. Where we formerly gave a tri-weekly service or a semi-weekly service, we are to-day practically giving a daily service.

Miscellaneous—further amount required, $48,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This vote is asked for in consequence of the general increase in all branches of the postal service. An additional amount will be required for printing, stationery, and various items of miscellaneous expenditure, such as letter carriers' uniforms, wages of labourers, telephones and telegraphs.

Charges of management—additional amount required for printing and engraving Dominion notes, $35,000.

Mr. FIELDING. An additional sum is required owing to the fact of an enlarging circulation and the desire to have a cleaner currency. It is an item which must increase every year with the increase in the volume of currency.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board contingencies—further amount required, $1 500.

Mr. FIELDING. This is to purchase a couple of adding machines costing about $1,200, and the balance is for odds and ends in the department.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What business to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. We will resume the Budget debate.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. Wednesday.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 25, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

### PRIVILEGE—GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

Mr. D. W. BOLE (Winnipeg). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I find in the parliamentary report in the Montreal 'Gazette' of this morning the following:

During discussion of the $50,000 additional for penitentiaries. Messrs. Blain and Bennett proved by the Auditor General's Report that supplies for penal institutions had been purchased from Senator Campbell's flour mill at Toronto, the D. W. Bole Drug Company of Winnipeg, and Senator Edwards' Lumber Company, Mr. Bennett said that the Justice Department had generally been held to be above board. However, senators and members seemed to be permitted to browse in these green and fertile fields.

Further on is this paragraph:

Mr. Henderson thought it curious that the lowest tenderer chanced to be a firm which had associated with it a senator or member of parliament. There was grave ground for suspicion.

On the editorial page of the same paper I find the following:

It was shown in the House of Commons that the government bought penitentiary supplies from corporations in which Senators Archie Campbell and Edwards and Mr. Bole, M.P., were interested. The government evidently knows supporters when they are to be seen and also understands how to encourage them.

As I was not present in the House yesterday, I was not aware what all this pertained to until I read 'Hansard' this morning. I have to state that this is the first knowledge I had that my company did business to the extent of $142 or any other amount with this government. I wish to state that I have never, either before I became a member of parliament or since, asked this government or any other government for any patronage. Further than that, no member of my company since its organization has to my knowledge solicited business from this government or from any other government. If any business has been done with this government, it has been in the usual course of business, and it must have been solicited by some officer of the government or it would not have been done.

## QUESTIONS.

### NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. What is the estimated length of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, (a) from Winnipeg to Quebec, (b) from Quebec to Moncton, according to present information?
2. What is the estimated average cost per mile?
3. On what are these estimates based?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I was informed in my department this morning that a return has been asked for covering the same matter as the question and that it is being prepared.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I adopted that course, not knowing which would be the most convenient and the most expeditious.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are working on the return, and it will be brought down as soon as possible. If the hon. gentleman wants an answer to the question, I will get it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not necessary if the return will be brought down at an early date.

Mr. GRAHAM. It will be.

Mr. BOLE.

### STONEY LAKE DOCK.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. Has the government constructed a dock on island number 19 'a' Stoney lake, Ontario?
2. If so, who is the owner of the island above referred to, and was the part of the island on which the dock is built purchased by the government? If so, what was paid for same?
3. Have any docks been constructed in said lake on the island by the government since 1896?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I cannot find from the officers of my department that any work has been done by the Public Works Department on that island. Whether or not any has been done by the Department of Railways and Canals I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT. It will be in one department or the other. For reference, the island is owned by Mr. James R. Stratton, formerly a member of the Ross administration in Ontario.

### SERVICE OF D. B. DOWLING.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

Was D. B. Dowling, of the Geological Survey Department, when absent from the service of the department from May 1 to October 1, 1907, in the service and pay of the German Development Company?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The department does not know if Mr. Dowling was employed and paid by the German Development Company while absent without pay from the department.

### TORONTO ISLAND SUBWAY.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens) asked:

1. Has a deputation waited on the Minister of Public Works, respecting the construction of a tunnel between the city of Toronto and Toronto island, as reported in a special despatch to the 'Globe' newspaper on the 15th instant? If so, has the minister promised a survey?
2. What is the object of the proposed tunnel, and what is the estimated length?
3. How many permanent residents live on Toronto island?
4. Did honourable Senator Jaffray and Mr. M. J. Haney, president of the Reform Association, Toronto, from a part of the deputation?
5. Does the government propose to survey or build the tunnel at Toronto before taking any steps to build the tunnel under the straits of Northumberland?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. A deputation consisting of representatives of the board of control and harbour commissioners of Toronto, also of other citizens of that city, recently waited upon me,

respecting the co-operation by the Department of Public Works with the city of Toronto in constructing a subway under the new west channel which the government propose making for the accommodation and safety of shipping. I have promised to have an examination and report made with a view of ascertaining the necessity for the work and the cost without in any way committing either the government or the department to its construction.

2. The object of the proposed subway, as stated to me by the deputation, is to afford a means for carriages, street cars and foot passengers to pass and repass between Toronto Island and the city. Its estimated length is 400 feet, besides the approaches.

3. I am unable to answer this question at present.

4. Senator Jaffray and Mr. W. J. Haney formed a part of the deputation.

5. The government has not considered the question of building such subway. I am unable to see what connection the making or not making of a survey, or the building or not building of the subway at Toronto has with the construction of a tunnel under the Strait of Northumberland.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the minister if the proposed sending of an engineer there will cause any expense to the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not imagine so. We have a resident engineer at Toronto, and he will not be paid anything extra for his services in connection with the matter.

## STONEY LAKE DAMAGE CLAIMS.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. Were any claims made by the owners of island in Stoney lake, Ontario, for damage done by flooding in the past three years?

2. If so, what claims, if any, were allowed and what are the names of the persons and amounts given to same for damages or otherwise?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes, a number of claims were sent into the department.

2. Mr. W. R. Aylesworth, of Belleville, Ont., who was appointed commissioner to investigate the above claims, recommended the settlement of the following, viz.:

| | |
|---|---|
| Honourable James R. Stratton et ux, whose claim was paid by authority of an order in council, dated 10th June, 1907, amount of which was.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $ 500 |
| Richard B. Jeffrey, settlement recommended in September, 1907. | 25 |
| Township of Verulam, settlement recommended in October, 1907.. | 2,000 |
| James Tighe, settlement recommended in October, 1907.. .. .. | 225 |

This list of claims will, in all probability, be added to when the commissioner makes his final report.

## QUEBEC BRIDGE FINANCES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. How much money have the people of Canada contributed by way of (a) subsidy, (b) loan, (c) bond guarantee, (d) any other mode of advance or contribution, to the cost of the Quebec bridge?

2. What has been the cost of the Quebec bridge to date?

3. What is the estimated cost of completing the said bridge?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. (a) By chapter 7. Acts of 1899, the government appropriated $1,000,000 as subsidy for the Quebec bridge. Of this, $374,353 was paid. The remainder of the subsidy was released and cancelled by the schedule agreement to chapter 54 of the Acts of 1903.

(b) Under the provisions of chapter 35, Acts of 1907, the government have avanced $2,000,000 to the Quebec Bridge Company, and, in connection with such loan, have received guaranteed bonds to the amount of £478,700, being portion of securities referred to in subsection (c) of this answer.

(c) Chapter 54, Acts of 1903, authorized the government to guarantee the Bridge Company's bonds to the amount of $6,678,-200. The bonds were guaranteed accordingly and delivered to a trust company to be applied to the purposes of the bridge undertaking. These bonds have not been issued to the public. They were used by the Bridge Company has collateral in the raising of loans from the banks to the amount, including interest to the 30th of June, 1907, of $5,561,507.23. The advance by the government of $2,000,000 above mentioned has been applied in reduction of this indebtedness.

(d) The Bridge Company advises that the cost of the bridge, including Chaudière bridge and the railway approaches, to March 1, 1908, was $6,899,033.03, to which is to be added interest from June 30, 1907, on the advances for which the bonds of the company were pledged.

2. The cost above mentioned includes for customs duty, harbour dues and fees, $510,-288.73.

3. No estimate has yet been made of the cost of reconstruction.

## OTONABEE POWER COMPANY, PETERBOROUGH.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to a question which I asked on the 23rd. I was not here when it was answered, but if the minister will refer to it, he will find it was not answered when asked. The question and answer were:

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

What amount of horse-power was paid for by the Otonabee Power Company, of Peterborough, in last fiscal year?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The lease to the Otonabee Power Company, of Peterborough, was for the right to use all the surplus water, estimated at the time at 625 horse-power.

The minister will see that the question asked is what they paid for it, and I wish he would have it looked up again.

Mr. GRAHAM. I see the difference.

## ALLEGED IMMIGRATION FRAUDS, HALIFAX.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the Minister of the Interior whether he has any further information to submit to the House in respect to the alleged frauds upon the Immigration Department at Halifax?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I am able to afford some information, but not at length. The information I have is that the letters signed W. Dodds were written by Dr. Hugh L. Dickey.

## CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it the intention of the government to lay the report of the Civil Service Commission on the table today?

Mr. FIELDING. I hope to lay the report on the table before six o'clock, but if the papers are not ready then I shall submit it the first thing to-morrow.

## INQUIRY FOR REPORT.

Mr. BENNETT. I would ask one of the ministers to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that the report of Mr. Victor Gaudet, appointed to inquire into certain affairs at the Sorel shipyard, has not yet been placed on the table.

## WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding, that the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). The gentleman who last took part in this debate, the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Thompson), occupied but a very short time, and yet in that time he made an announcement that seemed to be of special importance to himself and to afford a great deal of comfort to our friends upon the other side of the House. They are as welcome to that comfort and enjoyment as they are entitled to it and as entitled to it as they are welcome. For my part, I congratulate the hon. member of the Yukon on his taking at this late date a step that perhaps it would have been better for him to have taken at an earlier date.



Most of us are somewhat prejudiced in our political leanings. We are biased by our early political upbringing. I find that the hon. member for the Yukon has not been an exception in this respect, that he is a Conservative and a member of an old Conservative family. Referring to the 'Parliamentary Guide,' published at the beginning of this parliament, I find in the short biographical sketch of the hon. member—a sketch founded, I have no doubt, like all the others in that book, upon statements made by the member himself—that the hon. member was at that time a Conservative, and did not claim to be anything else. But it was stated in that sketch that the hon. gentleman chose to run in the last campaign, not as a Conservative, but as an independent. That is to say, he chose to ride for the time being under colours not his own for purposes best known to himself—and it may be to the electors in his own constituency. In his short address of probably ten or twelve minutes upon Friday last the hon. member criticised what he was pleased to call the extravagance of this government, and to find fault with their administration of affairs in the west, particularly as to the public lands and as to the granting of certain fishing leases in some of the smaller lakes in the remote and isolated parts of the west. It is passing strange that the hon. gentleman sat in this House for four years without, by his voice or vote, raising any objection to any of the expenditures that he now describes as extravagant, and that he offered no objection to any of the transactions with which he now finds fault. If there has been extravagance, if there has been mal-administration, it was not only his right, but his duty, during the time that he sat in the House, when these transactions were being negotiated, to have raised an objection.

I say I congratulate the hon. member for having taken at this date a step that perhaps he ought to have taken long ago. He must have found it very uncomfortable to have to resort to the things he had to resort to, and to take the course he had to take in order to preserve his role as an independent member of the House. I have said he did not protest either by voice or vote against any action of the government. Neither did he very strongly support the policy of our friends of the opposition. The fact is that in many instances the hon. gentleman absented himself from the vote, either paired with some member of the Liberal party or without a pair, and it was only upon very rare occasions that he voted at all. I am very sure that, during the remainder of the time he may sit as a member of this House, whether a longer or a shorter period, he will find it much more comfortable for himself, and he will respect himself more, and perhaps be more worthy the respect of others, if he appear in his own true colours rather than in col-

ours assumed for the time being, for whatever reason. We on this side have not suffered loss, for we cannot lose that which we never had. I will say this for the hon. gentleman, who is not present, and who, I believe, has returned to his home, that, during the time he has sat as a member of this House, he has always conducted himself as a gentleman, and has received, and not only received but merited, the good will and good feeling of every member of the House on both sides. I am sure that the announcement he chose to make on Friday last will not lessen the respect in which we hold him, nor will the kindly feeling which we on our side of the House extend to him be affected.

Immediately preceding the hon. member for Yukon, we had a speech of some length and some interest from the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith). It seemed to be the particular desire of that hon. gentleman to reach for the scalp of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). In the first place, he scored the Minister of Agriculture on the ground that the hon. minister had not made sufficient endeavours to have removed the embargo imposed upon our cattle by the government of Great Britain. I do not think that the Minister of Agriculture can be successfully criticised on that line. I do not think he has missed any opportunity or that he had lacked in industry in his endeavour to have that embargo removed, Sir, although the Minister of Agriculture has a very great deal of influence in the affairs of this country, we cannot expect and do not believe that he controls the parliament of Great Britain or that he can force the authorities of Great Britain to remove the embargo. But, very soon after the criticism to which I have referred, the hon. member for Wentworth, endeavouring to belittle the Minister of Agriculture, said that the only thing that hon. gentleman had succeeded in doing was one of no consequence, the removal of the quarantine regulations that had practically barred from the United States market the store cattle of Canada that, since the removal of these quarantine regulations, we have been enabled to send to the United States. If it would be a good thing to remove the British embargo upon our cattle, it was a good thing that the minister succeeded, as he did, in removing the quarantine regulations that prevented our farmers and stock raisers from sending their stock into the markets of the United States; for the cattle that we are prevented from sending to Great Britain by the embargo are our store cattle and the same class of animals that we are now enabled to send to the United States because of the removal of these quarantine regulations to which I have referred.

The hon. member for Wentworth then asked the question: Has this government during the past ten years opened up any new markets? That is an important question; let us consider it fairly. The hon. member for Wentworth will admit that, as the figures will prove, our exports have wonderfully and marvellously increased under Liberal administration. Then, one or other of two things must be true—either we have succeeded in finding new markets, or we have greatly increased our exports to the existing markets and our dealings with our old customers. I ask the hon. member for Wentworth, as a business man, as a successful business man, whether he would not prefer, in his own business, to increase his sales to his old customers, whose names he has on his books, with whose methods of trade he is conversant, and upon whom he has learned that he may rely, rather than increase trade by finding new customers with whom he is not acquainted? Speaking of the British preference, the hon. gentleman (Mr. E. D. Smith) asked: Are we benefited by the preference? He did not answer that question. And I leave it for the people of this country to answer for themselves. The hon. gentleman asked also: Is it any great advantage to our people that we can get goods at one-third less duty? I point out that hon. members on the other side of the House are inconsistent. They accuse this government of adding immensely to the taxation—as they choose to speak of it—wrung from the people by our customs duties, and yet, when, by means of the British preference, a large proportion of the goods imported into this country come in under duties reduced by one-third, they ask: Is that removal of taxation any particular benefit to the people? But the hon. gentleman asks a third question: Are the manufacturers satisfied with the British preference? It seems strange to me that so many members on the Conservative side of this House do not seem to be able to see beyond the manufacturers. I do not look lightly upon the manufacturers; I am ready to admit that, under Liberal administration, the manufacturers of Canada have done a great deal for themselves, and, in doing a great deal for themselves, have done a great deal for the country. Canadian manufacturers for the past ten or twelve years have done much for the development of our resources, the advertising of our country and the adding to our national wealth. At the same time, they have been making themselves rich as they never did in any preceding period of equal length or under any other government. But, I ask the hon. member for Wentworth, are there no other people in this country to consider than the manufacturers, no other people whom we may consult as to the benefits that have accrued under the British preference and the throwing off of one-third the customs duties? Are there not workmen in the factories and workshops making their living by their daily labour? Are there not farmers tilling our soil? Are there not men

working for these farmers ? Are there not the professional classes and the men employed upon salary in the various undertakings throughout Canada ? And are not the interests of these people to be considered as well as the interest of the manufacturer? And may we not ask ourselves the question, have these people been benefited by the British preference and the removal of one-third of these duties ?

The hon. member for Wentworth then sought to draw a contrast between this country and other nations of the world to prove that we have not made a greater percentage of increase in the value of our trade in recent years than other nations have done. And with what nations did he make comparison ? With Germany ?—with Great Britain ?—with the United States ? No, Sir, it would not have suited his purpose to have made comparison with these nations. He compared the progress of Canada with the progress made by Japan, Argentine and Mexico. Mr. Speaker, we contend that Canada was fairly fast asleep under the Conservative administration ; that there was not much life in Canada during the eighteen years when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power ; but we will hardly go so far as to compare the somnolent condition in which we were during these eighteen years with the long sleep of centuries which enwrapped the people of Japan, Argentine and Mexico. The hon. member for Wentworth himself said that Japan, a few years ago, was regarded as a half civilized nation, and was looked upon with scorn. Yet it is with such nations that he makes comparisons in setting forth the condition of Canada to-day.

The hon. member for Wentworth says that we have boasted that we have spent $100,000 for Atlantic steamer cold storage. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not here, for I would like to know what he endeavoured to make us understand when he spoke of an expenditure of $100,000 for Atlantic steamer cold storage. Did he mean yearly expenditure, or a total expenditure of $100,000 during the eleven years this government has been in power? He not being here to answer the question, and I not knowing what he meant by his figures and words, I desire to turn up the records and see what has been the amount expended by this government for cold storage in the years during which they have been in office. First, I will quote the figures for cold storage from the year this government came into power, aye, and give the figures for the year preceding up to the time that we ceased to assist and bonus Atlantic steamers for cold storage. Let me say here that we have not paid any bonuses for cold storage on Atlantic steamers since the year 1901, and we have not paid any bonuses for cooled air storage upon the Atlantic steamers since 1903, which was the last year when we had any expenditure for anything of this kind.

Expenditure for cold storage from year to year since its inception to the time it was withdrawn from the ocean service:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1895-1896 | $ 16,741 00 |
| 1896-1897 | 29,518 09 |
| 1897-1898 | 27,087 83 |
| 1898-1899 | 45,695 61 |
| 1899-1900 | 24,538 77 |
| 1900-1901 | 27,002 76 |
| 1901-1902 | 30,028 92 |
| 1902-1903 | 39,708 31 |
| 1903-1904 | 30,940 85 |
| | 254,521 14 |

Now the hon. member spoke of ventilation chambers upon Atlantic steamers by means of fans, and said that this ventilation was usually of as much effect as the cold storage and that could be had without any expense to this government. Let me say that that is not an original idea with the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith), but it originated with the hon. the Minister of Agriculture in 1901, as may be seen from the report of that minister for the year 1902. I have shown to the House that the total expenditure for cold storage by this government was something about $250,000. Let us see some of the benefits that have accrued to the country, and especially to the farmers by that expenditure, and again it will be necessary for me to quote some figures. For that purpose I invite your attention to the exports in the articles of eggs, butter, cheese, bacon, ham and pork.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that all these articles were exported in cold storage ?

Mr. MILLER. That is my understanding and my information. We will start with 1895, the year before the Conservative government started in with the ice cold storage by their expenditure of $16,000, and we will continue to the date the expenditure ended on the new system in 1903 :

| Year. | Eggs. | Butter. | Cheese. | Bacon, Ham and Pork. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $ | $ | $ | $ |
| 1895.... | 807,990 | 697,476 | 14,253,002 | 3,839,145 |
| 1896.... | 807,086 | 1,952,089 | 13,966,571 | 4,446,884 |
| 1897.... | 978,479 | 2,089,173 | 14,676,239 | 5,871,988 |
| 1898.... | 1,255,304 | 2,046,686 | 17,572,763 | 8,092,930 |
| 1899.... | 1,267,063 | 3,700,873 | 16,776,765 | 10,473,211 |
| 1900 ... | 1,457,902 | 5,122,156 | 19,856,324 | 12,803,034 |
| 1901.... | 1,691,640 | 3,295,663 | 20,696,951 | 11,829,820 |
| 1902.... | 1,733,242 | 5,660,541 | 19,686,291 | 12,457,863 |
| 1903.... | 1,436,130 | 6,954,618 | 24,712,943 | 16,029,269 |

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Were all these exported in cold storage ?

Mr. MILLER. That is my understanding, and I think the hon. gentleman will find upon investigation that the whole or nearly the whole of these exports were by cold storage.

Mr. OWEN. Why does the hon. gentleman stop at the year 1903 ? Why not give us 1904, 1905 and 1906 ?

Mr. MILLER. Because that is the last year when this government paid any bonus for either cold storage or cold air storage on the Atlantic steamers. Let me point out also that the total of agricultural exports from this country being the produce of Canada, for the decade from 1887 to 1896 under the Conservative administration was $451,938,000, whereas the total exports of Canadian farm produce under the Liberal administration was $953,980,000, or more than double. But hon. gentlemen, especially those who are agriculturists, will realize that our cold storage system did not apply to a large part of our Canadian farm products. The three exports that were chiefly benefited by our cold storage system were the items of butter, cheese, bacon and ham. Under the Liberal administration these three items, assisted by cold storage, made up 63 per cent of the total exports of farm products, and had it not been for the wonderful increase in our exports of wheat, then these three items, assisted by cold storage, would have formed 75 per cent of our total exports of farm produce, while under our Conservative friends in the next preceding ten years the exports of these three particular items amounted to only 48 per cent of the total of our Canadian agricultural exports. But now, in order to make comparisons or draw contrasts, let us look at the figures as they stood in the United States for the very same period and let it be remembered that during this time the people of the United States were clinging to the old style, out-of-date system of ice storage which was introduced into this country in the last year of the Conservative administration. In order not to take up too much of the time of the House I will confine myself to the figures with reference to cheese and butter and we find that in the United States the exports of cheese and butter, during the same length of time, when our exports were so largely increasing, were just as largely diminishing and decreasing. The exports of cheese from the United States were, during exactly the same period of time as follows : In 1895 there was exported of cheese from the United States, $5,497,539 worth and, without quoting the figures year by year, by 1903 their exports of cheese had fallen from above five and a half million dollars to $2,250,229, and their exports of butter had fallen off from $2,937,203, in 1896, and $4,493,364, in 1897, to $1,604,327, in 1903. That is, I think, sufficient evidence of the efficiency of the cold storage system inaugurated by our Minister of Agriculture and the splendid benefits that have accrued to the farmers of Canada under that same system.

The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) paid especial attention to the item of butter and he said :

> Butter does not require a very efficient cold storage system ; it may be kept at any temperature below freezing point.

Then, the hon. gentleman went on to say that surely it would not be a very difficult thing for us to maintain a cold storage system by which we could keep the temperature below the freezing point ; and further that one would naturally expect our exports of butter to have increased rather than to have decreased. The hon. gentleman quoted the figures of 1905, of 1906 and of 1907 to show that we were exporting less butter to-day than we were a few years ago, and he endeavoured to blame it upon the lack of efficiency of the cold storage system. I would like to answer what the hon. gentleman said in 1908 by the words of the same hon. gentleman which he uttered in this House in a debate in March, 1907. In 1908 the hon. gentleman says that butter does not require a very efficient cold storage system, that it may be kept at any temperature below freezing point. What he said in this House on the 21st day of March, 1907, can be found upon 'Hansard' revised edition, page 5129, as follows :

> I am bound to say that now most of the steamers carrying butter in cold storage are carrying it at a temperature below freezing point. The minister has said in his report at one time that it should be carried at 10, and at another time at 20. I am not going to cavil about the exact temperature. If the butter is carried below freezing point, I dare say, it is not so very bad after all.

So, we have the hon. member for Wentworth effectually answering in 1907 the criticism that the same hon. member has given to us in 1908 and what he says ought to be done is exactly what he says has been done. The hon. member next devoted his attention to the Fruit Marks Act and he said :

> I think it is a good Act.

So far that is an endorsement of the Fruit Marks Act, but to have allowed it to remain there would have been to give credit to the Minister of Agriculture that the hon. member for Wentworth did not want to give him, and he said that while the Fruit Marks Act is a good Act it was practically framed by the fruit growers of Canada. I do not know whether that be true or untrue, but suppose it to be true, what does it show ? It shows that we have in Canada to-day a Minister of Agriculture who is a man big enough to be willing to accept good suggestions from wherever they

may come. Who ought to be better able than the fruit growers of Canada to suggest to the minister what would be good legislation for the betterment of their condition and the possible improvement of the business in which they are engaged, or who were in a position to offer better and wiser suggestions, than these same fruit growers? I say to the cattle breeders of Canada, I say to the members of the Sheep Breeders' Association, the Swine Breeders' Association, to the men who are interested in the breeding of horses and cattle, and to the members of the various Farmers' Associations, that upon the testimony of the hon. member for Wentworth we have as Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa a man who is willing to listen to their suggestions as to legislation that would be a benefit to them and is willing to put their suggestions, in the shape of legislation, upon the statute-books of Canada. No higher praise could be bestowed upon the Minister of Agriculture than has unconsciously been bestowed upon him by the hon. member for Wentworth. The hon. gentleman has said that two years ago there was a convention of Canadian fruit growers in Ottawa, and that the gentlemen who attended that convention had their fares paid and he thought their time paid by the Minister of Agriculture. The hon. member has given the fruit growers of Canada credit for having less enterprise than they really have. The Minister of Agriculture paid to a certain limited number of delegates five cents a mile, one way, the shortest route, from their homes to Ottawa to attend the convention and paid them $2 a day for their expenses for a time not exceeding three days. But the hon. member for Wentworth again says that at that convention of fruit growers a resolution was passed that was condemnatory of the Minister of Agriculture, and that because of that resolution condemning him there has not since been a further convention of fruit growers in this country. The hon gentleman was mistaken. There was no such resolution passed at that convention. There was no resolution passed at that convention that was condemnatory of the Minister of Agriculture. The hon. member for Wentworth said that it was a resolution suggesting that the fruit growing department of the work of this government be placed under a separate head subservient to the Minister of Agriculture. I will admit that the particular delegates at that convention, whose duty it was to frame resolutions, did frame a resolution having that in view, but that resolution was not submitted to the meeting for the simple reason that the Minister of Agriculture said that he would like to discuss the question before having it submitted; and, the time of the convention being taken up with other things apparently greater of importance, it was not submitted at all. If it was not submitted it could not have been passed.

Mr. MILLER.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the Minister of Agriculture passed by the resolution and said that it would be taken up later and if the convention closed without it being taken up was it not the fault of the Minister of Agriculture that it was not brought forward?

Mr. MILLER. Not entirely, because if anybody afterwards had brought that matter to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture who was in the chair there is not the slightest doubt that it would have been submitted, but it is not fair to say that the resolution was passed when the fact is it was not submitted at all. But, this is not a case of the hon. member for Wentworth saying what he knew was incorrect. I do not think that he did it intentionally, but I think he was mistaken. I think that what he had in his mind was a resolution moved by the Rev. Father Burke, of Prince Edward Island, and seconded by Mr. Martin Burwell, of British Columbia, in which the convention resolved to give to the Minister of Agriculture a very hearty vote of thanks and it is said that that resolution was carried with very great enthusiasm by the convention.

That resolution conveyed to the Minister of Agriculture the thanks of the members of the convention for bringing them together as he had done and for his personal interest in the matters that were of vital importance to them, and for the many pieces of useful legislation they had had at his hands. The member for Wentworth has said that the Fruit Marks Act is a good Act, but that it has not been well administered, and he has said that the penalties under that Act have been too light to accomplish any useful purpose. This again is not an idea that has originated with the member for Wentworth, because it was stated in the newspaper press some time ago upon the authority of the Minister of Agriculture himself that the fines had been shown to be too light, and that it was the intention of the department to increase the amount of the fines. I would like to point out as an evidence that the officials who have had the administration of that Act have been duly vigilant, that the number of fines under the Act has been increasing from year to year. And it has not been altogether the fault of the department that the fines imposed have been lighter than they ought to be to have been effectual, because the Act does not say that the fine shall be 25 cents, but it says that the fine shall be from 25 cents to $1, and it has been the fault of the magistrates to a large extent that in almost every case the minimum fine has been imposed. The member for Wentworth said: Administer your Act more efficiently and if necessary spend a little more money. I have noticed that as the opposition members have advocated first one thing and then another, in almost every single instance of

suggested expenditure they have been willing to say and do say: Spend a little more money; and while they do not condemn the expenditure of money in any single instance they are ever ready to condemn the same expenditure in the aggregate and call it extravagance. I have here—I am sorry the member for Wentworth is not present to examine them—a number of thermographic records of the temperature of several steamers which crossed the Atlantic during this summer carrying fruits and meats, and dairy, and orchard products. I think, if the member for Wentworth were here, and I think every other gentleman in this House who examines these records will say that the temperature was so satisfactory that there is no room for surprise that the products carried by these steamers reached the European markets in very good condition indeed. The member for Wentworth quoted and we cannot find any fault with him for quoting, the report of Mr. Jackson, the agent of the Department of Trade and Commerce, stationed at Leeds, England. Mr. Jackson, referring to the apples sent from Canada to Great Britain during the past year, stated that the apples had not arrived in the best of condition, and that they had not been subjected to the best possible classification. It was perfectly fair for the member for Wentworth to quote the opinion of one of the officers of this government. But Mr. Jackson being the general agent of the Trade and Commerce Department in Leeds he was not giving his whole attention, or by any means his particular attention to the fruit exports of Canada, but to Canadian trade in general and he is not an expert in so far as Canadian fruit exports are concerned. The member for Wentworth said that American apples now outrank our Canadian apples in the British markets. If that statement be true, if our Canadian apples are outranked in the markets of Britain it is perhaps necessary to make the statement, but if that statement be not correct, it was a very unwise thing to have made it because it is calculated to do very great injury to our Canadian fruit export trade. Notwithstanding the letter and the report of Mr. Jackson, I claim it is not a fact that American apples outranked Canadian apples in the British market even during the past year. And in order to prove my contention I refer to the reports issued by Woodall & Co., of Liverpool, England, who are among the largest handlers of apples in the British market. Their reports are weekly reports and they cover the whole period from about the middle of October until I think the middle of December. I quote from their report of the 19th of October, 1907 :

The condition of Canadian fruits has also been quite satisfactory and fancy varieties such as Alexanders, &c., have sold from 18 shillings to 25 shillings.

When the prices as quoted by Woodall & Co., of Liverpool, are as follows :

New York Greenings, 13 shillings to 15 shillings per barrel; Boston and Maine Greenings, 12 and 6 to 14 shillings; Canadian Greenings, 15 shillings to 17 shillings and 6 pence; New York Kings, 18 shillings to 21 shillings and 6 pence; Boston and Maine Kings, 18 shillings to 21 shillings and 6 pence; Canadian Kings, 21 shillings to 27 and 6 pence.

I am quoting for first-class in every case. Their report for October 26 says :

The bulk of receipts have been from Canada the condition and quality of which continue satisfactory.

Then the price quotations are as follows:

New York Greenings, 13 shillings and 6 pence to 15 shillings and 9 pence; Boston and Maine Greenings, 14 shillings to 15 shillings; Canadian Greenings, 15 shillings to 18 shillings and 3 pence; New York Kings, 18 shillings to 21 shillings; Boston and Maine Kings, 18 shillings to 21 and 6; Canadian Kings, 20 shillings to 26 shillings per barrel.

In their report for November 2, 1907, they say :

With the exception of 7,000 barrels of Nova Scotian the bulk of arrivals were from Canada.

They always distinguish between apples from Nova Scotia and apples from other parts of the Dominion :

With the exception of 7,000 barrels of Nova Scotian the bulk of arrivals were from Canada which continue to land in very good condition.

The prices are quoted as follows :

New York Baldwins, 16 shillings to 18 shillings and 3 pence; Boston and Maine Baldwins, 15 shillings to 19 shillings; Canadian Baldwins, 16 shillings and 6 pence to 19 shillings and 3 pence; Boston and Maine Kings, 17 shillings and 3 pence to 20 shillings; Canadian Kings, 18 and 6 to 24 and 6.

And so on all the way through the reports of Woodall & Co. show the price for Canadian apples to be very largely in excess of the price of apples imported from the United States. I quote from another authority, namely, the 'Market Growers' Gazette,' published in London, England, which in its issue of February 5, 1908, says:

Canadian fruit realizes from 10 shillings to 24 shillings per barrel according to variety and condition and United States fruit from 9 shillings and 6 pence to 14 shillings and 6 pence.

This again shows the Canadian fruit quoted at a very large advance over that from the United States. Again, in the report as quoted from Cardiff, Wales, I find :

Canadian Baldwins, 18 to 20 shillings; Greenings from 17 to 20 shillings; Kings, from 22 shillings to 28 shillings; Spies, from 16 shillings to 19 shillings. Americans about 3 shillings per barrel less on the average.

This shows very clearly indeed that our Canadian apples all through the last season

have brought in the British market from 2 shillings to 3 shillings per barrel more than the same variety of fruit arriving from United States points. I quote again from the last report of the Dairy Commissioner, page 103, and this is a statement made by W. & L. Gilmour, of Glasgow :

We quite admit that there is still room for further improvement in the make of Canadian butter but this is a matter we are willing to leave in the hands of your different dairies as the suggested improvements and instructions given by your dairy experts if acted upon are bound to have a good effect. In our opinion they are one and all in the right direction and without intention to flatter in any sense we may honestly say that no government has done and is still doing more towards perfecting the development of the very highest and admittedly best system in the production and distribution of dairy produce than has the government of Canada.

I would like to quote from a speech made in the House by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) on the 21st of March, 1907. That hon. member made, as he usually does, a very excellent speech, in which speaking on the subject of cold storage, he said :

Although this matter was taken up in the time of the Conservatives by the Hon. Dr. Montague, there is no doubt at all that the system has been greatly improved; I think we must admit that.

The hon. member further pointed out that if we are to send our fruit in good condition to the markets of Great Britain, we must depend on something more than the establishment of a system of cold storage. He said, and well said, that the farmer pays great attention to the time at which he reaps his grain crop; he goes and looks at his wheat field, and says to himself, that wheat has approached the time when it ought to be cut, and to-morrow we must reap it. But, said the hon. member, he does not exercise the same care and wisdom in the reaping of his fruit crop; he often allows the fruit to remain on the trees until it is over-ripe and the germs of decay are in it, and no system of cold storage would take that fruit, shipped in an over-ripe and over-heated condition, to the markets of Great Britain in any proper condition. I was talking on the street yesterday to Mr. McNeill, who is in charge of the fruit branch of the Department of Agriculture; and, referring to the remarks of Mr. Smith, of Wentworth, in which that hon. gentleman said that it had been impossible to ship pears or peaches in any proper condition by our cold storage system to the markets of Great Britain, Mr. McNeill said that the fact that pears and peaches were not shipped in large quantities to Europe during the past season was not because of any lack of efficiency in our cold storage system, but because there were not enough pears and peaches grown in Canada during the last season to satisfy the demands of the home market. He said that last summer he had inquiries from South Africa for large quantities of pears and had made himself very busy in attempting to meet that demand; but with all his efforts he was only successful in obtaining two carloads, which were shipped to South Africa in vessels having the cold storage equipment provided under instructions from the Department of Agriculture; and those two carloads of pears reached the South African market in a first-class condition, after crossing the equator and making the long ocean voyage. Mr. McNeill stated that so great was the scarcity of that kind of fruit in Canada last year, that while he had managed with strenuous efforts to get these two carloads, at the same time the Canadian canners had imported from outside markets five carloads of pears for their canning business. The fruit growers of this country, and the people of this country generally, must realize that if we are to preserve our reputation for good fruit in the markets of the world, the responsibility must not rest entirely on the shoulders of the Minister of Agriculture, but the fruit growers must take care to produce the best fruit their orchards are capable of producing. If the man who owns the orchard will persist in slovenly methods of cultivating and caring for his orchard, he will have poor fruit which no system of cold storage or inspection will make into good fruit. If the hon. member for Wentworth would use his influence with the present provincial government at Toronto, to see that a better system of spraying were carried out in the orchards of Ontario, he would do more good than he does by his cynical criticisms in this House of the methods of the present Department of Agriculture at Ottawa. The spraying of fruit trees is a matter of very great importance. This is nowhere more fully realized than it is in some of the United States, particularly some of those near or on the Pacific coast ; I refer to the states of Oregon, Washington and Idaho. In the state of Idaho especially, a great deal of attention is paid to this matter. There is a state board of Agriculture composed of six men, and the state is divided into ten inspectorial districts, over each of which there is a district inspector, whose duty it is to report annually or semi-annually to the state board. In each county there is a sub-inspector. Every orchard owner in the state is obliged to spray properly the fruit trees of his orchard, I think six times in the year. If he does not do so, his orchard is quarantined, and is properly sprayed at the expense of the state, the cost of this spraying being charged against his lands in the same manner as taxes that are in default. Every man in the state of Idaho who places wormy fruit on the market is subject to a fine of from $25 to $300, or to imprisonment. Wormy fruit, wherever found, may be confiscated and burnt. As a result of the at-

tention paid to spraying, the fruit of the state of Idaho is of the very highest quality and brings very high prices. If, then, the government of Ontario will pay the attention they ought to pay to the matter of spraying, the Minister of Agriculture and his officials at Ottawa will find a great deal better class of fruit to classify and ship, and the orchard owners will obtain vastly better prices for the fruits they grow.

I would like to devote a little attention to the speech delivered in the same debate by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). That hon. gentleman said that this government was always careful to do three things: in the first place, to depreciate the condition of affairs as they existed in 1896; in the second place, to keep in the background the important truth that in the years preceding 1896 there was a general and world-wide depression, and that in the years immediately following 1896 there was a period of equally world-wide prosperity and advancement; and, in the third place, to make it appear that whatever degree of prosperity and success this country has had under a Liberal administration, has been due to that administration. Well, Sir, I do not know that it requires the representations of Liberals to make the people of this country know what was the condition of affairs in 1896. The people of this country have memories, and are well able to remember the state of affairs as they existed then. It is unnecessary to paint those conditions in any more gloomy colours than they were painted by our Conservative friends who were then in power; but if it were possible for us to forget the sad and depressed state of our trade in 1896, a state to which no one wishes ever to return, the figures and records prove to us most clearly what were the conditions in 1896.

I wish to give to the House a comparison of some increases during the two decades 1887-1897 and 1897-1907, the first under a Conservative government and the second under a Liberal government.

| | Increase, 1887 to 1897. | Increase, 1897 to 1907. |
|---|---|---|
| Total trade.. .. .. .. .. | 54,760,815 | 360,796,090 |
| Total imports.. .. .. .. | 6,326,373 | 240,574,669 |
| Total exports.. .. .. .. | 48,434,442 | 120,221,421 |
| Total trade with Great Britain.. .. .. .. .. .. | 15,479,359 | 109,810,153 |
| Railway traffic tonnage.. | 8,943,996 | 38,565,802 |
| Bank discounts .. .. .. | 57,603,156 | 413,010,214 |
| Bank deposits.. .. .. .. | 93,087,205 | 388,318,201 |
| Deposits in Post Office Savings Banks .. .. .. | 8,102,700 | 12,558,696 |

But, Sir, if the picture that the Liberals paint of conditions as they were in 1896 is darker than the facts warrant, then surely the picture drawn by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as to the conditions that existed in 1896 when the Liberals came into power is very very much too bright. It is a bright picture indeed that he draws of the conditions as they were at the moment when this government assumed the control of the affairs of Canada. The hon. member said that during the eighteen years of Conservative rule previous to 1896 Canada had been strengthened as well as chastened. I will admit that men are oftentimes strengthened by the privations they have to endure and the strenuous efforts they have to make, and if making strenuous efforts for a living during eighteen years, if many privations consequent upon hard times, had made us stronger, then we were stronger in 1896. The hon. gentleman says we were strengthened. He says further that we were chastened, and although there may be some doubt as to the degree in which we were strengthened or the process of strengthening, there cannot be the slightest doubt as to the truth of his assertion that we were chastened during the eighteen years of the Conservative reign at Ottawa. We were chastened and it is probable that the people of Canada deserved to be chastened for continuing in power so long as they did the Conservative government that assumed office in 1878. We were not only strengthened and chastened, but we were humiliated. We were humiliated for that upon every side of us, in 1896 there was strife—strife in the country, strife in the cabinet. There was everywhere in 1896 such a degree of corruption that we, the people of Canada, had no confidence in ourselves, we had no confidence in our country, in the people who were administering the affairs of the country, in the future of our country; and while we had no confidence in ourselves or our country, the people of other lands, of the outside world, had no greater degree of confidence in us than we had in ourselves, and consequently neither we ourselves nor strangers from other lands were willing to make any permanent investments or establish permanent industries in Canada.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says that in 1896 everything was bright and lovely and there was not a single cloud upon the horizon excepting one little cloud, no larger than a man's hand, and that would have quickly been dispelled, the good sense of the people would have adjusted it if left to themselves—that one little cloud was the Manitoba School question. Sir, that was more than a little cloud upon the sky over us in 1896. The Manitoba school question had put three-fifths of our people on one side of a line and two-fifths on the other, it had created a feeling of enmity between the people of this country that boded no good for our country. It had split and divided a cabinet and it had nearly split the Dominion, and it is true that a country divided against itself is not likely to stand. I have here a volume of the 'Monetary Times' and in the issue of June 26, 1896, just after Sir Wilfrid's victory at the polls, I find in an editorial this reference to the Manitoba School question:

All that Mr. Laurier is committed to do, so far as the public is aware, is to appoint a commission of inquiry into the Manitoba school question and to do justice upon the facts disclosed.

Sir, that was all that any one required to do, to ascertain the facts and to do justice. Sir Wilfrid Laurier coming into power ascertained the facts and did justice to the people of Manitoba; that cloud upon the horizon immediately disappeared, and where there had been confusion and strife, we had peace and unity, and the people of Canada, joined hand in hand, working together for the prosperity of this great Dominion.

At a later date, not long ago, a similar cloud appeared upon our sky, and we had to deal with another very similar question. When that second cloud arose, we found our friends of the opposition willing for the sake of political capital to again create strife, quarrelling and division among the people of Canada. Sir, the right hon. gentleman who in 1896 ascertained the facts and did justice did not, upon that subsequent occasion, reason with himself and say: What move can I make to secure the largest degree of political capital out of this question? But again he said, standing out courageous and brave and wise and temperate: What are the facts and what will be justice? And having ascertained the facts, again he did justice, again there was peace everywhere from east and west and many even of our Liberal friends who were disturbed and hesitating during the time of that trouble now say that while the action of the right hon. the Prime Minister was not perhaps in acordance with the political exigencies of the time, while his sole endeavour was to stand firm amid all that sudden gust of popular passion and to endeavour to do the right thing, to do what was just and right and not what appeared most likely to win immediate political capital, he stands today, by reason of his action, stronger in the country than he was before that question was raised by our friends on the other side of the House.

The hon. member for North Toronto has said that, while there had been a deep, dark, world-wide depression up to 1896, at that time, the great sun of prosperity rose over every land in the world and that from that day to this we have had an unprecedented world-wide prosperity. Is the hon. member prepared to go as far as this—is he willing to say that, as a consequence of the change of government that took place in Canada in 1896 we have had, ever since, world-wide and unprecedented prosperity? I do not think he will admit that, nor do I think it would be a well founded argument. But I say that it would be not more unreasonable to argue that the world-wide prosperity we have had was due to the advent of the Liberal party to power in Ottawa as to say that the marvellous degree of prosperity, development and progress that we have had in Canada in recent years has not been largely due to the administration of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The hon. member for North Toronto says that the Northwest, in 1896, had passed the stage of experiment and stood as a great producing agricultural country. As was well pointed out by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) these lands of the great Northwest were as fertile before 1896 as they have been since, they were just as wide in extent and had as great possibilities as they have to-day. In 1896, our country had owned these lands for more than a quarter of a century, and, for many years, a railroad had been running through these lands. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) further says that, in 1896, the stream of immigration from the United States and other countries had begun to flow towards that country. Up to 1896, that stream had not been very rapid; it had not begun at all to overflow its banks. The total immigration into the Northwest—that is, into Manitoba and the territory now included in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and also the thinly populated country to the north—in the calendar year 1897 was 10,977. In the year 1907, ten years later, that immigration had increased to 106,457. In 1896, when this government came into power, land in the Northwest had no value. Some of our Conservative friends throughout the country, who had received land in the Northwest for nothing, or for small prices because of services that they had rendered to their party, found the ownership of those lands of no advantage to them; they could not sell them; they were worth nothing. But when Sir Wilfrid Laurier came into power in 1896, and gave into the hands of Hon. Clifford Sifton the administration of the Department of the Interior, there began the boldest, the cleverest, the most systematic and most successful plan of immigration, the best conducted, and, in its results, the greatest immigration campaign ever carried on in any country since the beginning of time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLER. Some hon. gentlemen laugh. I have seen the same statements made in magazine articles written by public men of repute in the United States. These men say that never in any country was so well-planned, well-executed and successful an immigratnon campaign carried on as that carried on by Hon. Clifford Sifton when he was Minister of the Interior. Under Hon. Clifford Sifton and under Hon. Mr. Oliver, who succeeded him in that department, and who has carried on the policy with the same vigour, the same success, while making changes required by changing circumstances, the policy of that department has been exceedingly creditable to this government and exceedingly profit-

able to this country. Under this policy the people came into that Northwest country. They brought money into that country and spent it. They grew wheat and other grains upon those fertile lands, thus creating immense amounts of wealth. Upon the ranges and ranches and large farms, they raised great herds of horses and cattle and immense flocks of sheep that meant millions of dollars to that western country. Through these industries, they have produced freight and money has been spent to provide the railroads necessary to handle that freight and carry it to market. More than that, the cultivation of these lands in the Northwest, the settlement upon them of the people of the world, has given to the people of the east, merchants, manufacturers and business men, eleven years of the most successful trade they ever had. Throughout Ontario, manufacturers have had to add to their factories and to increase their output because of the excellent market afforded them in that Northwest country.

The hon. member for North Toronto said that Sir Wilfrid Laurier made pledges in Toronto in 1896 which had not been carried out. I will not admit that the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier made any pledges in Toronto which were broken in the ordinary acceptation of that term. But I am willing to admit that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then Mr. Laurier, in 1896, did say that, if his party came into power, they would reduce the expenditure. And I am willing to admit, further, that the expenditure has not been reduced. As an illustration, to show what I mean, when I say that this does not involve what is usually called a broken pledge, let me remind the House that the hon. member for North Toronto stated that he could not conclude his speech on the evening of Tuesday, but would like to continue it another day, and would occupy three-quarters of an hour. But, as a matter of fact, the hon. gentleman spoke for two hours and a half. I do not say that that was a broken pledge or promise. In the meantime, the hon. gentleman had acquired material that he thought ought to be dealt with, and dealing with it under different circumstances required a longer time than he had anticipated. When Mr. Laurier was chosen to be the leader of the Liberal party years before that party came into power, he was a big man and a clever man. But it is the part of big men to grow bigger, and of great men to be greater. And, constantly, we find great men, as new duties and responsibilities are placed upon them, grow greater and stronger In 1896, Mr. Laurier was made First Minister of this Dominion and was successful in bringing about him such men as Mr. Fielding from Nova Scotia, Mr. Paterson, Sir Richard Cartwright and others from Ontario, Mr. Borden from Nova Scotia, Mr. Sifton from Manitoba and other leading men whose names do not at the moment occur to me. The presence of these strong men about him, added to his strength and gave him confidence in what he could accomplish, with their help, for the good of the country. I believe that Mr. Laurier could have administered the affairs of this country as they had been administered and still have reduced the expenditure. He felt that, with such men as he had about him, the country could do business on different principles and undertake a work of development that had never before been undertaken.

You see the two distinct types of men everywhere. Take two young men brought up in the same community, men, perhaps, of equal ability and with equal advantages. One says: I am going into life to acquire a fortune, and I will acquire it by keeping down my expenses. I will not spend one copper that I can avoid spending, I will make and firmly hold every copper that I can make. The chances are that that young man, if he is not troubled with ill health or something of that kind, at the end of his life will have a reasonable amount of money. But in the meantime he will have become warped and withered himself, and have been a source of no good to himself or any body else. The other man says: I will not do business on that principle; I am going to be very enterprising. and while I shall endeavour to succeed, and while it is my purpose to make as much money as my friend, I will endeavour to benefit others while I do it. I am not going to be so miserly and so penurious in keeping down my expenses, but I will spend money when it is prudent to do so, and I will spend a dollar so that it will bring me more than one hundred cents in return. Now I claim that the rate of success that has attended the administration of the Laurier government has been due to themselves, that they were an aggregation of business men, of business enterprise, of business ability, of business integrity, and that in business ability they far exceeded the men who had preceded them.

As an instance to prove my argument, I would point to the Post Office Department. The total expenditure for the Post Office Department in the year 1897 was $4,897,783.06. I will give you the figures for 1907 for nine months, but have added to those figures one-third in order to make them appear as for twelve months, and in that twelve months you have the expenditure of that department increased to $7,270,383.79, a tremendous increase indeed. Now that is a part of the extravagant expenditure for which this government is blamed. There has been admittedly a very large increase of expenditure in that department, but with what result? We find that the revenue of that department in 1897 was $4,311,243.14. Whereas the revenue in that other period of equal time was

$8,713,457.57. So that while the Conservative government kept down the expenditure of that department to under $5-000,000, they did that with a deficit, with a balance on the wrong side of the account at the end of the year of $586,539; whereas the Liberal government, with more enterprise, with more ability, and with greater business talent, expended fifty per cent more money and showed, in place of a deficit, a surplus of nearly a million and a half dollars, or to be exact, $1,443,067.78. Now the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) used the old argument that there had been no change of policy whatever but only a change in the methods of administration. The argument is not a new one it is an old one with our Conservative friends. The hon. member for North Toronto puts it in this language:

They do not attempt the new work with new tools as they had promised. They found a workshop already built, with tools in place and fires burning bright. They entered that workshop, they used those tools, they employed the same system as their predecessors; and to-day, eleven or twelve years after they came into power, they are still at the old stand doing their work—not over efficiently—in the old way, so far as principles and policies are concerned, with some deviations which I propose to take up a little later.

The hon. member uses the old argument that there has been no departure from the old principles, no adoption of any new policy—'we are working in the old workshop with the old tools.' Sir, I beg to point out to the members of this House and to the people of this country that there is absolutely nothing left of the old workshop and of the old tools except the bellows, and in these days the bellows appear to be working overtime. Is there no difference between the policy of the Liberals and the Conservatives to-day? Hon. members sitting around and behind the member for North Toronto do not agree with him. One of the differences is this, that while the tendency of the Liberal administration is to reduce the tariff, the tendency of our friends of the opposition is to increase the duties and raise the tariff. I need only quote from the hon. member from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), from the member from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and from the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) to prove what I say. The member for Brantford, speaking upon the budget debate on the 30th of November, 1906, and referring to the reduction in duty upon agricultural implements that was brought into effect by this government during the last session, a reduction to the extent of two and a half per cent, used these words:

I doubt whether it will give him——

That is the farmer.

—an advantage of more than $2.50 on a mower or a reaper, and for that you jeopardise an important Canadian industry. It is a retrograde step. This country has gone too far in the direction of adequate protection to home industries to take such a retrograde step towards free trade.

Mr. MILLER.

There is a statement by the member for Brantford that this government is going towards free trade. Again, the same member, in the same speech, said:

I look upon a twenty per cent tariff——

That is the tariff that had existed upon agricultural implements.

—as a very moderate tariff. I think that should have been increased on the bulk of agricultural implements and not diminished.

Again he says in the same speech:

I may say that I think most of the reductions are not well advised, in a general way I think that any reductions that have been made would have been better not made, and that in some instances there should have been an increase where the reduction has been made.

And to show which way the sympathies of that hon. gentleman lie, I quote further from his speech when he said:

Then why should we jeopardize the $500,000,000 of capital embarked in these manufacturing industries in order to give a very slight advantage to the agriculturist?

Now it may be the opinion of the member for Brantford, it may be the opinion of other members upon the opposition side of this House, that all the attention of the House ought to be given to the promotion of the interests of the manufacturer. But I do claim that this government have acted wisely in going in a contrary direction, and in decreasing the duties upon agricultural implements rather than increasing them. I want to refer to a little incident that occurred in this House during the last session when the House was in committee and when the votes were not being recorded. After the budget speech had beeen delivered, and after the changes had been announced that were to take place in the tariff, and at a time when there was a very small attendance in the House, some of our Conservative friends proposed a reduction in the duty upon agricultural implements to the extent of ten per cent. That resolution, if I remember correctly, was opposed and voted against by the leader of the opposition and by the member for North Toronto; it was supported by some of the Conservative members representing rural constituencies; and if I mistake not that resolution will be used by them in the coming campaign, whenever that campaign may take place, for the purpose of making political capital. But I want to point out that the very members who proposed in committee at a late date in the last session, a reduction of ten per cent in the duty on

agricultural implements, were the very same men that cheered and applauded the hon. member for Brantford when he said that the duty upon agricultural implements ought to have been increased instead of being made less. When our Conservative friends endeavour to make capital out of this ruse of theirs in asking for a reduction of duties, I believe our farmer friends will ask whether there is not a little hypocrisy in that attempt that our Conservative friends were found making. The hon. member for North Toronto showed a great deal of sympathy with the people of this country out of whom this wicked Liberal government had wrung a very large amount of money in the duties under the customs tariff. I do not often quote to this House the figures of the hon. member for North Toronto. I do not always think I can rely upon the figures that come from that gentleman, but, as in this case, his own figures are to the advantage of my argument, I do not hesitate to give them to the House. The hon. member said, in speaking of the rate of taxation to-day and the rate of taxation in former years :

I have added the bounties and the customs duties together and the result shows that in 1897 the average duty (including bounty) was 30·15 per cent; in 1906, 28·22 per cent; in 1907, about 27·04 per cent.

Showing by the figures of the hon. gentleman himself that the rate of taxation, including with the duties, also the bounties, had fallen under Liberal administration to the amount of 10 per cent and I say that a reduction under Liberal rule of 10 per cent of the rate of taxation is a very material decrease that I am sure the people of this country will appreciate at its full value. The hon. member for North Toronto called attention to one of the planks of the Liberal platform as laid down at their Ottawa convention of 1903, and I do think that the hon. gentleman might have been expected to have avoided this of all planks in that platform. The paragraph to which I am referring in the platform of the Liberal party as adopted by that convention is as follows :

We cannot but view with alarm the large increase in the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878 and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

I would have expected that the hon. member for North Toronto would have avoided any mention of the public debt. What are the facts ? What are the figures ? In 1878, when the Liberal administration went out of power and when our Conservative friends assumed the duties of office, the public debt of Canada was $140,362,096. But when they went out of power in 1896 the public debt had increased to $258,497,432, an increase in the public debt in the eighteen years of their administration of $118,135,363, an average yearly increase of about $6,500,000 or to speak more correctly, or more exactly, an annual average increase in the public debt of $6,563,075 ; while we find that the total increase of the public debt of Canada in the first 10¾ years of Liberal rule was $5,174,427 or considerably more than $1,000,000 less for the whole 10¾ years than the annual average increase of the public debt under the administration of our Conservative friends. And, to quote again the words of the hon. member for North Toronto, he said that the interest upon the public debt of Canada in 1896 was $10,502,429 and that in 1906, after 10 years of Liberal administration, the interest on our public debt was only $10,814,697.

As to the matter of economy, to which this particular plank in the platform of the Liberal party refers, I claim that there has been in the Liberal administration thorough business economy. I do not say that there has been penuriousness, that there has been a niggardly administration, that no mistakes have been made by the Liberal administration, but I do say that there has been a businesslike economy characterizing their whole administration. By economy I mean that it is economy to spend a dollar that is wisely and well spent and that will bring to the people of this country more than one hundred cents worth of value. The hon. member for North Toronto introduced a doctrine with which I cannot agree. It was that when building a great work like the Grand Trunk Pacific or other such permanent work that will exist and be to the benefit of the people of the country for a hundred years we ought not to tax the people to pay for the carrying out of that undertaking but that we ought to borrow the money and allow those who come after us to wrestle with the debt. The hon. gentleman has oftentimes, used and very wisely used, this illustration ; he has said that the government ought to pursue the same policy as a wise and prudent business man would adopt in carrying on the administration of his own affairs. I say that the farmer would not be a wise farmer, who, in making permanent improvements upon his farm either with respect to drainage, fencing, or clearing, would say to himself : Now, my sons who will come after me and who will inherit this farm, will benefit by the improvements that I am making ; therefore, I will not endeavour to pay for these improvements but I will put a mortgage on the farm and let my sons wrestle with the mortgage. That is not good business and it is not such a system that this or any other government ought to follow or practise.

There will, in the more or less near or distant future, be other large undertakings that

the government of Canada will have to busy themselves about. There will be the building of other railways, of other transcontinental railways and of other railways running north and south as well as east and west, there will be, possibly the building of the Georgian bay canal, there will be, I have no doubt, the building of the Prince Edward Island tunnel, there will be the establishment of the All Red Line, and, Sir, there will always be in the development of a great and growing country like Canada large projects which will require our money as well as our attention and it is good business for us to provide for these works as nearly as possible as we go along. It is perhaps hardly necessary to devote attention to the statement made by our friends of the opposition that the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made the flat assertion that the Grand Trunk Pacific would be built from the Atlantic to the Pacific for $13,000,000. I notice that the chief whip of the Conservative party is here and as the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has been fond of making that statement I would like to ask him what he understood to be the statement of the Prime Minister. I would like to ask the hon. member for Leeds whether he understood that the right hon. First Minister contended that the whole road from the Atlantic to the Pacific would be built for that amount of money.

Mr. TAYLOR. Read his speech and you will come to no other conclusion.

Mr. MILLER. That is the information I want. Then, I understand that the hon. member for Leeds understood the First Minister to say that the whole line from the Atlantic to the Pacific would be built for $13,000,000, and that after reading the whole speech we could come to no other conclusion.

Mr. TAYLOR. That was all it was to cost the country.

Mr. MILLER. Now does the hon. member endeavour to deduce some other meaning than the one he endeavoured to convey to us the other night ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Read the speech and we will have it in 'Hansard' again.

Mr. MILLER. Read the whole of the speech ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Read it all.

Mr. MILLER. The whole speech ? Thank you, no, but I will read from the speech which was delivered in this House on the 30th of July, 1903, and which will be found at page 7690 of 'Hansard' :

> Now, Sir, what is the liability incurred by the government for the construction of this road from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean? Assuming that the road across the mountains is 600 miles long, the cost of construction will be $18,000,000.

Mr. MILLER.

Then, how can it be contended by the member for Leeds that if the mountain section of the road, 600 miles, was to cost $18,000,000, that the whole line was to cost only $13,000,000. Quoting again from 'Hansard,' page 7691, the Prime Minister said :

> When completed the company will lease the road and will pay to us a rental at the rate of 3 per cent per annum upon the cost of construction whatever that may be.

Now, Sir, was there any attempt made to deceive the people of this country as to what would be the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Let me quote from the campaign literature that was circulated by the Liberals in the campaign of 1904 throughout the length and breadth of Canada, and there I find these figures taken from a speech delivered by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) on the 26th day of May, 1904, as may be found on 'Hansard,' page 3626. The figures given by the Minister of Finance for the building of the road from Moncton to Winnipeg were as follows :

> This would make the cost as follows:
> 400 miles Moncton to Quebec.. .. ..$12,500,000
> 1,475 miles from Quebec to Winnipeg 51,625,000
> On this basis the cost of the eastern division would be:
> Interest during construction capitalized.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. ..$ 7,031,975
> Capital account, actual outlay.. .. 64,125,000
> making the total charge to capital account for the building of the section from Moncton to Winnipeg.. 71,156,975

As I have said, these figures are taken from the campaign literature circulated by the Liberal party throughout the length and breadth of Canada during the year 1904. And the Minister of Finance in giving the figures was careful to say that his estimate was based on the figures of Mr. Schreiber, government engineer, and that in order to be upon the safe side he had added 25 per cent to the figures furnished him by Mr. Schreiber. In his speech the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) made another charge as to the Grand Trunk Pacific. He said :

> More than that Sir, he (the Prime Minister) kept back from the people and parliament of this country the offer that the Grand Trunk Pacific made for the building of the road west of the lakes, an offer which carried out the idea that they were willing to build it, and hand over the traffic on this side to the Intercolonial Railway and take nothing but a simple subsidy for the western part from the lakes on to the Pacific coast.

As I understand it, this is a charge made by the hon. member (Mr. Foster) that the Prime Minister endeavoured to deceive the people of this country and to withhold from them knowledge which they should have had. Sir, there was no attempt made to deceive the people, for during the whole of the campaign of 1904 that proposition of the Grand Trunk Pacific was discussed upon

every political platform and upon every hustings throughout Canada. It was argued then by the government of Canada that it was a desirable thing that there should be what was termed an enlargement of the spout; that there should be some means of carrying the products of the west and particularly the grain eastward from the lakes to the Atlantic ocean by a railroad of easy grades capable of carrying a large number of well laden cars at the least possible expense, in addition to and if necessary in opposition to the facilities provided via the lakes; and to carry the grain of the west out of the country after navigation upon the lakes had closed. The argument was a good one, and is justified by the facts as the facts are presented to us to-day. I noticed in the daily 'Globe' of the 17th of the present month a statement as to a condition that well warrants the argument that was put forth by the government at that date. The article is a very short one and is as follows:

Blockade of grain. Situation at Fort William causes bitter complaint. Canadian Pacific Railway will not supply cars for shipments yet charges storage on grain delayed though its own act. Eastern and western divisions holding cars:

Fort William, March 16.—The inability of the Canadian Pacific Railway to supply cars is causing here a big tie-up of export grain and the attention of the railway commissioners will be called to the situation. At the present time upwards of 1,700 cars are needed to handle the grain for which orders have been given to the company. A considerable portion of this may be cancelled and sent by way of the lake route when navigation opens. From two weeks to 30 days is the period of delay and the delays have been made doubly obnoxious to the grain men by the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway continues to charge storage until the grain is loaded. Heretofore storage charges ceased when the grain was ordered out by local agents.

The contention therefore is borne out that a rival route was required and is required to-day, and when the member for North Toronto goes among the grain growers of the west his opposition to the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific from the lakes eastward to the Atlantic coast will not be a welcome argument to the people of that western country.

The hon. member (Mr. Foster) said also, that the Liberals of these days are not as fond of making comparisons with the United States and of drawing contrasts between the state of affairs in Canada and in the United States, as they were some years ago. He pointed out that the per capita debt of the United States is to-day $11.46, while the public debt in Canada to-day is $45 per head. His figures are not quite right because the Finance Minister has set forth that our per capita debt to-day is $42.84 and not $45. Let me point out that while the hon. member (Mr. Foster) objects to a per capita debt in Canada to-day of $42.84; that our per capita debt in 1897 when he himself was Minister of Finance was not $42.84 but $50.87. Surely we would expect that in the United States whch has a territory not so great as ours, which is a much older country and much further developed and which has twelve persons for every one person there is in Canada; surely we would expect that their per capita debt should be less than ours. At any rate, the comparison is not a fair one because in the United States, with a constitution very different from ours, the people are subject in every state of the Union, I think, to a very large state debt, which is not the case in this Dominion. In the province of Ontario where many of us reside there has never been a provincial debt under the administration of the Liberal party. Referring to an article in the 'Daily Globe' the other day, I noticed from the heading of the article, I did not read the article itself, that now after three or four years of Conservative administration in Ontario we have a provincial debt, a thing which did not exist under the regime of the Liberal party in that province. I find from the figures that the per capita debt in the state of New York, aside from the federal debt, but including the debt of the cities and towns, is almost equal if not quite equal per capita to the whole federal debt of the Dominion of Canada. But, Sir, let me point to the per capita debt of Great Britain and see how we compare with that country with which we are fond at times of making comparisons. In 1906 the population of Great Britain was 43,659,121, and its national debt, reduced to dollars at $4.87 to the pound, was $3,842,382,210, or $87.82 per capita. In any comparison between Canada and the United States, we do not, I think, suffer. In the Toronto papers of the 17th of this month appeared an account of a visit to the United States and this country of Sir Edgar Vincent, who is described as having been a former financial adviser of the Khedive of Egypt and a man of affairs in England. Sir Edgar Vincent is represented as having said:

I was especially impressed by the financial soundness of Canadian enterprise and the thorough, sure way in which that country is developing. I know of no greater tribute to the confidence in Canadian methods than the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway has been able to borrow $10,000,000 at a shade less than four per cent. The government itself pays a little more than three per cent, and by way of comparison we have the New York Central paying a little more than five per cent.

The hon. member for North Toronto said that the Minister of Finance had added to his surplus to the extent of three millions and a quarter dollars by reducing the interest on the Post Office Savings Bank deposits of labourers, farmers, school children, widows

and working girls. If the hon. member will take the trouble to make inquiries, he will find that a large part of the deposits in the government savings bank to-day are not the deposits of the people he described, but the deposits of men who are comparatively well off. If the Minister of Finance had increased the rate of interest, instead of reducing it from 3½ to 3 per cent, what would have been the effect? Simply this, that the government would not have benefited, because it can usually borrow money in Great Britain at as low a rate as it is paying to these depositors, but there would have been locked up in the government savings banks a large amount of capital which, since the reduction in the rate of interest, has been put in circulation. Men who had large amounts deposited in the savings banks have withdrawn their money and have lent it at a comparatively low rate of interest to farmers to aid them in improving their farms and to mechanics in the cities, towns and villages, to aid them in building homes for themselves, and in doing so have not only directly benefited themselves as well the borrowers, but have helped to keep down the rates of interest charged by the loan companies and other financial institutions of this country.

The hon. member for North Toronto again made reference to the North Atlantic Trading Company. He asked, was ever a more reckless bargain—$370,000 of the people's money paid out? Now, why was that a reckless bargain? What fault can be found with any one in making the bargain? The hon. member for North Toronto did not argue, as he used to do, that there was any dishonesty in connection with the bargain, or that no benefit had accrued from it to the people of Canada. He could not do so. No man can continue honestly to argue that that was not a good contract for the people of Canada. The fact remains that during the period that that contract ran, we did not receive into Canada any other immigrants for whom we did not pay more than we paid for the immigrants who came to us as a result of the work of the North Atlantic Trading Company. But the hon. member for North Toronto says, to whom has the money been paid? That is the vexed question, with regard to which he endeavours to fasten this contract on the minds of the people of this country as a scandal—as something to the detriment of the present administration. Sir, why does not the hon. member for North Toronto, and why do not other hon. members, when discussing the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company, upon various platforms in the country or in this House, and saying that the premier knows, but the parliament does not know, who composed that company, be honest and tell the whole truth? It is an old saying that a truth half suppressed is the worst form of falsehood. If these hon. members will tell the whole story, I shall not be afraid of the effect that will be produced on the minds of the people of Canada. Why does not the hon. member for North Toronto say that the Prime Minister offered on two occasions in this House to tell the hon. leader of the opposition who are the men composing the North Atlantic Trading Company, and that the hon. leader of the opposition preferred to have his grievance rather than to have the information. If the people of this country know, as the hon. member knows, that that information was offered and was refused, there will be but little of a scandalous character attached to the dealings of that company.

The hon. member for North Toronto criticised also the contract between the government and the Ross Rifle Company, and not only the contract, but the Ross rifle itself. He said that the government had entered into a contract to get made in Canada a rifle which is not made in Canada and has not been from the beginning. He said that this government had given to Sir Charles Ross a perpetual lease of 19½ acres of land, and that if this government desired to get rid of that factory they would have to put up of the hard earnings of the people of this country a million dollars. It is not denied that the contract was made and that the lease was given, but I cannot understand why the hon. member for North Toronto says that if it becomes necessary to get rid of that factory we shall have to pay to the Ross Rifle Company $1,000,000 of the hard earnings of the people. He has not proved, in the first place, that it will be necessary to get rid of that factory. What is the history of this whole transaction? We have had it thoroughly investigated before the Public Accounts Committee, where Colonel Fiset, the deputy Minister of Militia, told us on oath that long before any such contract was discussed between the Minister of Militia and Sir Charles Ross, the minister had endeavoured to get British manufacturers to manufacture rifles in Canada, but they had refused to do so; that in the year 1900, long before the contract was entered into, rifles could not be purchased in Great Britain for the use of our Canadian militia, the Lee-Enfield people having absolutely refused to make them. Was it not time for a Canadian Minister of Militia, awake to his responsibilities, to endeavour to have rifles for the use of our militia made within our own Dominion? If they could not be purchased in Great Britain, it became absolutely necessary for us to have them made in this country, and it is obvious under any circumstances that instead of having in troublous, warlike times to bring our rifles overseas it would be of great advantage to us to have them manufactured on our own ground. Under these circumstances the Minister of Militia entered into negotiations with Sir Charles Ross. In the first place, he appointed a committee to investigate the Ross rifle, the

committee being composed of General Otter, one of the ablest and most patriotic military men in this country; Colonel Gaudet, Colonel Hughes, the Conservative member for Victoria and Haliburton in this House, and Colonel Gibson, of the city of Hamilton. This committee composed of these able and experienced men, tested the rifle at many times and in many ways and pronounced it to be a good gun. Having the pronouncement of that committee, the Minister of Militia went further with his bargaining and entered into a contract.

As to the efficiency of the Ross rifle, I was talking the other day to the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) who is himself a militia man of considerable experience, who takes an interest in militia matters and is accustomed to handling rifles; he assured me that he has found the Ross rifle to be equal to any other rifle he had ever tried and in many respects superior. A gentleman living in my own riding, a Mr. Rummage, wrote me quite unsolicited last week and incidentally mentioned the Ross rifle. He said he had been a member of the Canadian militia since either 1881 or 1891, I forget which, and he had been accounted a good shot, and he is to-day considered a good shot; he said:

I have used and have shot from the Ross rifle. I consider it to be the best rifle I have ever used and I have been able to make with it the best record I have succeeded in making with any gun.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLER. We have the testimony of the member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) whatever may be his faults and whatever some of us may have to say about him, no one will deny that he is a patriot; he was brave enough at the time of the South African war to go to South Africa with the boys and take his part in the troubles there. In this House and before the committee Colonel Hughes has stated that the Ross rifle is a good gun, equal to the Lee-Enfield in every respect and in many respects superior.

I find that in the Austrian army to-day 1,200,000 men are equipped with the Mannlicker rifle which is the counterpart of the Ross rifle and made after Sir Charles Ross' patterns and designs.

I noticed in the Toronto 'Globe' of March 20, the following short but significant item, headed 'Ross rifle for Norwegian army.'

London, March 19.—The Norwegian army is to be re-armed. King Haakon, it is believed, favours the Canadian Ross rifle.

So we have the Austrian army equipped with it and the Norwegian army about to be equipped with it.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. If the hon. gentleman had read the Montreal 'Star' of the day following the appearance of that item in the 'Herald,' he would have seen that the commander in chief of the Norwegian army, General Jansen, laughed at the idea and said he knew nothing of the Canadian rifle at all. That was in reply to a cable sent from the 'Star' office to the commander in chief of the Norwegian army.

Mr. MILLER. Then the fact will appear to be that a general in the Norwegian army laughs at the rifle while the King of Norway proposes to adopt it.

It has been said that the Ross rifle is not and has not been made in Canada. There appears to be a disposition to convey the idea that the Ross rifle factory is a very insignificant factory and yet we have the sworn evidence of Colonel Wurtele that the factory is to-day employing from 300 to 500 men, that there are a large number of machines, that parts are imported but imported as raw material and are milled, machined and put together in the factory. We have also the sworn testimony of Brigadier General Cotton that there is no rifle factory in the world that does not begin its manufacture with steel billets, that they always get their steel billets as the Ross factory does, they do not manufacture the billets but buy them from other manufacturers no doubt as a matter of economy. We have also his sworn evidence that the wood for rifle stocks is not grown either in Canada or in the United States and therefore has to be imported, and that the wood in the rifle stocks of the United States army rifles is grown either in Italy or in Spain. We have the sworn testimony of Major Pym that in the government rifle factory at Enfield, England, in which he was at one time employed, they receive their barrels, that is they do not manufacture their own barrels any more than does Sir Charles Ross at Quebec, and the further evidence of Major Pym that the wood for the stocks of the Lee-Enfield rifle is grown in Central Europe and cannot be and is not grown in England. We have the sworn evidence of Sir Charles Ross that the steel he uses in the manufacture of the Ross rifle costs him more than double the price of the steel he would require to make a rifle like the Lee-Enfield. We have the evidence of Colonel Wurtele as to the Ross rifle factory at Quebec in which he says:

I consider it a very carefully systematized factory.

We have the statement of Mr. Wallace Nesbitt that the factory at Quebec, with the plant, is insured for $1,250,000. We have the sworn evidence of Sir Frederick Borden, the Minister of Militia, and of Colonel Sam. Hughes, member for Victoria and Haliburton, that neither one of them has the slightest interest whatever in any financial way in the manufacture of the Ross rifle or the output of the Ross rifle factory. We have the further evidence of Sir Charles Ross that no person but himself has any financial interest whatever in the output or carrying

on of his business except two or three of his employees who have their remuneration based in some degree upon the profits of the factory.

It does seem to me that if that factory in Quebec, a Canadian factory employing from 300 to 500 hands, was a factory engaged in the manufacture of boots and shoes or agricultural implements, the members of this House ought to be sufficiently patriotic to help rather than to destroy its trade. And I say further that when that factory is established to produce rifles for the use of the Canadian militia at a time when they cannot be obtained otherwise, it is a very unpatriotic thing that members of this House should go out of their way to endeavour to destroy the reputation of the rifle or to make it impossible for this or any other succeeding factory ever to manufacture in Canada such a rifle as our militia will require.

Sir Charles Ross has said that it had been his expectation that by this time he would have been employing thousands of men in his factory where to-day he is employing hundreds. He has said that one great difficulty he has had to encounter has been the very strong opposition of a wealthy rival factory in Great Britain, and another great difficulty has been the studied and strenuous opposition of Conservative members in this House by which they have endeavoured to obtain political capital.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) objected to the building of the Mint. He gave evidence as to the expectation not only of Liberal governments but of Conservative governments as to the building of a Mint. He said:

Then there is the Mint. Here is another example of misrepresentation or lack of information. The history of this Mint is peculiar.

Notice these coming words which are important:

It was mooted in my time——

It was mooted in my time.

—and the government of which I was a member said: the time may come in the history of Canada when we should have a Mint, but there are so many things that we need more than we do a mint that it will have to be put off to the distant future.

It was then the idea and intention of the Conservative government years ago, when our revenue was comparatively insignificant, that Canada at some date in the future should have a Mint. The hon. gentleman further said:

It was again brought to the attention of parliament, I think by Mr. McInnes, in about 1900, and the Finance Minister himself made a reasoned speech against the establishment of a Mint not only in Victoria, but anywhere in Canada. It was a well-reasoned speech every argument that he advanced was, I believe, a good argument and each argument was sufficient to preclude the possibility of building a Mint, at least for the present.

Showing by the hon. gentleman's own words that it had been the expectation of the Conservative government, as it was the expectation in 1900 of the Liberal government, that sooner or later Canada would have its own Mint and would make its own coin.

The hon. member (Mr. Foster) pointed out that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) wired to a candidate during an election in British Columbia that the government would undertake the building of a mint. Sir, I will admit that it is a wrong thing to endeavour to bribe any constituency by the promise of a public work within that constituency that can be of only local interest and where the promise is made for political purposes; but I say that to wire to any province and to the people of any province, that the government of this country are about to adopt a new general policy such as the policy of the manufacture of our own coin has no political significance and is not a matter concerning which any blame could be attached to the government. If the people of Mr. Maxwell's constituency in British Columbia thought that they would be benefited by the building of a mint, it was because they believed it would assist in the development of their mining resources. If that were true of one mining constituency in British Columbia, it was equally true of every mineral producing community in British Columbia and throughout the Dominion. I say it was not wrong to tell these people that the general policy of this government was to build a mint for the purpose of developing the mineral industries of the Dominion. The hon. member argued that in building the mint, in building the Quebec bridge, and in many other public undertakings of this government, the cost of the work when completed was in excess of the estimate. That, I admit, is perfectly true in some instances, and, perhaps in many instances. But the same sort of thing is usually true. I appeal to any hon. member of this House who has built a private residence or a business building, whatever the cost may be from $3,000 up, if this has not been his own experience. He may get the most careful estimate he can from the best achitects whose serivecs he can employ of what would be the probable cost of the building, and, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, he will find that the cost of the work exceeds the estimate given him. If this be true of the small undertakings usually entered upon by private individuals, can it be wondered at that it is true of the great public undertakings of the government whether it be Liberal or Conservative? The hon. member for North Toronto gave us another reason why the cost of these undertakings in recent years has exceeded the

estimates. He spoke of the very great general increase in prices in Canada and elsewhere during the past ten years. He said that, in the United States, the best authorities say that prices generally have increased, in ten years, from 50 to 60 per cent. In Great Britain there has been a general increase of from 35 to 40 per cent, and in Canada he estimates the increase at from 35 to 50 per cent. This being the case, does it not furnish sufficient reason why, in great public undertakings for which the estimates were made years ago, when the work is completed it is found to cost more than had been expected ?

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) criticised the administration of this government in the Yukon and quoted figures of 1904-5, 1905-6 and 1906-7 to show that, while the revenue derived by the government from the Yukon is diminishing, the expenditure has not shown a corresponding decrease. That is perfectly true, and the hon. gentleman himself gave the reason for it. He said that the population of the Yukon in 1901 was 28,000, and in 1906 it was 8,000 while to-day he estimated it at about 5,000. So, taking the hon. gentleman's own figures, there has been a constant and very rapid decrease in the population. Still, according to his estimate, we have still 5,000 people in that country. The Yukon is as big a country as in 1901 and is just as isolated. It is just as much the duty of the government to maintain government and governmental institutions in the Yukon as when the population was at its greatest. Though the gold output has decreased and the revenues from royalties diminished accordingly, would the hon. gentleman advise that we entirely abandon the Yukon ? Would he say to the people : Now that we cannot show a surplus from administering the affairs of the Yukon, we will not attempt to keep open the courts or maintain law and order, but will take our officers out of the district ? I think he would scarcely advise the adoption of such a policy as that. But the most remarkable argument advanced by the hon. member is in relation to the telegraph line to the Yukon. He pointed out that this telegraph line, owned and operated by the government, is to-day operated at a loss. He says that, some years ago, we might have accepted an offer from the Canadian Pacific Railway to take over that line at a rental equal to 4 per cent interest on the cost of construction, and he rather censured the government for not having escaped this loss by handing the line over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, who, perhaps, would have made up their loss by charging exorbitant rates to the people of the Yukon. It seemed most remarkable that the hon. member should censure this government for not having handed over to a large corporation a telegraph line owned and operated by the government when one of the planks of the Halifax platform of his own leader is government ownership and operation of telephone and telegraph lines. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) spoke of the balance of trade as against us. He said that our imports for the time being exceeded our exports, and predicted that this government and the affairs of Canada would go to smash should this state of affairs continue. He was afraid that some one would quote the case of Switzerland against him, that being a country whose imports exceed its exports, and yet continues prosperous. He answers by saying that Switzerland exports scenery. Well, I have seen celery, but to sell scenery is a new argument among political economists. Take an illustration : A man comes here to Canada with $50,000. He buys a factory site and builds a factory and equips it with machinery. His $50,000 is gone and his friends say, your expenditure has been great, but you have had no income. His answer is, I have faith in my investment ; I believe that the $50,000 will bring me in $100,000 in a few years. We in Canada have been equipping our country as a great factory with machinery and plant that will produce great wealth every year in the time to come.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) allow me ? Suppose you had put the money into a woollen factory years ago ?

Mr. MILLER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Martin) may put it into whatever kind of factory suits him. I would point out that, in the last nine months, we have imported into Canada machinery to the value of $9,060,967, which rate of import, carried out for twelve months, would amount to $12,081,298. But in 1896, we imported machinery to the value of only $1,725,690. In the last nine months, we have imported animals for the improvement of our live stock to a value which, for twelve months, would represent $1,549,840. Thus in these two items, we have imports of nearly $14,000,000 for the purpose of equipping ourselves with plant which will produce great wealth in the years to come. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) also deplored this balance of trade against us, but said that England might be quoted against his argument, as England, in recent years, has imported very largely in excess of her exports. But he pointed out that, years ago, the exports of England were greatly in excess of her imports. What must we deduce from that ? Why, that, years ago, England was a country of comparatively little wealth, comparatively little importance, and had exports largely exceeding her imports ; but now that she has become a wealthy country her imports exceed her exports. I would point out to the hon. gentleman that while we do not sell scenery, we are receiving year by year, and have been for some time receiving, a large amount of wealth from foreign investments

in our mines in British Columbia, in Cobalt, and in other parts of Canada, and we have been receiving from outside countries large amounts of money invested by foreigners in our lands and in the building and equipment of factories. I point out that settlers have been coming into this country by hundreds of thousands, bringing with them settlers' effects that have added to the volume of our imports, and not only settlers' effects but large amounts of money that have swelled our annual income but do not appear in the trade returns.

The hon. member for North Toronto attacked the British preference. He intimates that the bargain made was a bad bargain, and yet he deplores and opposes the French treaty, and one of the reasons, he told us, was that the putting into effect of the French treaty lessened to the people of Britain the value to them of the British preference. I contend that he is arguing upon both sides of the question. The hon. member for North Toronto, as well as his friends, have been arguing against the iniquitous increase of taxation of the people which the government of this country has wrung from them through customs duties, and yet he deplores the fact that by putting into effect the French treaty we are admitting large quantities of goods from France, and from twelve other countries he mentions as well, at a largely reduced duty. So he complains upon the one hand because we are collecting too much duty, and complains upon the other hand that we are making treaties by which the duty and taxation will be diminished. Speaking of the French treaty, the 'Weekly Sun,' published in Toronto—I will not say that it is a paper opposed to this government, or unfriendly to the government, but the 'Weekly Sun' is a paper that assumes the position of a critic, and in assuming that position it is more anxious to criticise and to mention our vices than our virtues. In speaking of the French treaty the 'Weekly Sun' has an article headed 'It is a Good Treaty,' and it points out that a binder manufactured in Canada would have an advantage in the markets of France of $7 over a binder manufactured in every other country, and that every other agricultural machine manufactured in Canada will have a proportionate advantage in the markets of France. The 'Weekly Sun' points out that because of this great advantage to the Canadian manufacturers of agricultural machinery, American manufacturers are preparing to remove to the city of Hamilton all their equipment for manufacturing agricultural implements for the whole of their foreign trade. That newspaper points out further that the only persons who have found serious fault with the French treaty, or who have expressed any alarm that their trade will suffer detriment, are the grape growers and the wine producers of the southwestern peninsula of Ontario. The 'Weekly Sun' points out to them that the addition to the factory equipment of Hamilton, the large number of additional men that will be employed in that city in manufacturing agricultural implements for the French markets, will more than make up to them any losses they otherwise might sustain and lead to an increase rather than a decrease of their wine business. That newspaper further says that if the only advantage to Canada were the large increases that will take place in our manufacture of agriculture implements, that in itself would have been a sufficient reason to justify the government in making the treaty and in permitting us to call it a good treaty. But that newspaper further points out that while the Canadian farmer will be able to send his bacon into the French markets with a duty of only $2.63 per hundred weight, the United States exporters have to pay on their bacon going into France a duty of $4.39; that the Canadian exporter of apples to France will pay a duty of 17·7 cents per hundredweight, while the American fruit grower will have to pay a duty of 44 cents per hundredweight; that the Canadian exporter of dried apples to France will have to pay a duty of 87·7 cents per hundredweight, while the American exporter will have to pay a duty of $1.72.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would ask the hon. gentleman if the duty on dried apples has been reduced in the French treaty?

Mr. MILLER. I quote the figures taken from the 'Weekly Sun,' and I assume that the writer has carefully considered the treaty and carefully made up his figures.

Mr. HENDERSON. Under the old French treaty dried apples were on the minimum tariff as they are now.

Mr. MILLER. The fact still remains that the Canadian exporter of dried apples will have a large advantage, under the treaty, over our American friends exporting the same article. The 'Weekly Sun' contends that because of the French treaty our exports to the French market ought to be at least trebled in extent.

Now, I have taken up a great deal of the time of the House, for which I apologize. In conclusion I have to congratulate the Minister of Finance upon being able to present to this House such a splendid budget speech and to have been able to make such a splendid showing as he did in the budget he brought down to this House and in the figures he was able to quote. I congratulate the people of Canada in having their public affairs administered by a group of men who have shown the business ability and the business integrity that have been shown by the right hon. gentleman who leads this government and by the gentlemen associated with him in the cabinet. I trust, for the sake of the people of this Dominion, for the sake of the future prosperity of this country, that the administration of the affairs of Canada will be left in the hands of these

gentlemen for many years to come, as I believe it will be, and I trust that the Minister of Finance will for many years be spared to occupy the place in this government that he occupies to-day.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). While it is my intention to offer a few remarks on the financial condition of the country as set forth in the budget speech of the Minister of Finance, it is not my desire to take up the time of this House for two hours and a half, as my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) has just done. Therefore, I shall not travel over many of the subjects he has mentioned, but will endeavour to compress my remarks into a brief space. Now, the man in the street who reads the budget speech of the Minister of Finance will be somewhat mystified. On the one hand he will read that there is cause for rejoicing and congratulation in the fact that the country has a surplus of some $19,000,000; while on the other hand he will find that when the Minister of Finance wanted to advance $5,000,000 to the banks to enable them to move the crops in the Northwest, he apparently had not the money to do it with, and as he did not think it was advisable to try and borrow it, he went to the treasury and took from it money which is deposited there under the law of the land against the redemption of Dominion notes. Where then are those surpluses of which we have heard so much, and of which the Finance Minister is so proud, amounting, as we are told, to $94,000,000 in the last ten years? Have they been applied to the reduction of our national debt of $258,000,000, which these hon. gentlemen found when they came into power? No, Sir, they have all been spent, and more than that, the national debt has been increased to $275,000,000. But that does not represent the whole of the national liabilities which have been incurred by the present administration. On the 31st of October the Finance Minister reported that we had guaranteed bonds to the extent of some $32,000,000, backed notes, so to speak, for this amount. It is true that we have got some security for these bonds we have guaranteed. But let me point out that in the case of the Quebec bridge, something over $6,000,000 of these securities are now lying in the bottom of the river St. Lawrence, and it is probable that the Dominion of Canada will have to pay the whole of that money and add it to the national debt.

In the near future, Sir, we shall have to guarantee the bonds or back the notes so to speak of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for enormous sums in addition,—how much we do not know: nobody knows, because it is dependent upon the expenditure which they make, but all these matters have their bad effect upon the credit of the country and in my opinion will account to a certain extent for the difficulty of borrowing money at a reasonable rate which the hon. Minister of Finance told us he experienced quite recently, having to give as much as 4½ per cent on a short loan which he made. But, with this great surplus to spend and a large addition to the national debt, the ordinary man would say that surely it has been possible to reduce the ordinary expenditure for carrying on the government of the country. Here again, he will find that he is mistaken. When the present administration came into power, as they did about eleven years ago, when confederation was about thirty years of age, they found that the ordinary expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund stood at about $37,000,000 and had stood, within a million, more or less, of that amount for the preceding ten years. They have increased this expenditure year by year so that we find, at the close of the eleventh year of their administration, that they have reached the astounding total of $77,500,000 merely for carrying on the ordinary administration of the country. This does not cover the whole expenditure for they are charging such things as the bounties they pay to iron and steel manufactures, amounting to millions of dollars, to capital account and they are also charging betterments on the Intercolonial Railway, that on a privately owned railway would be charged to revenue, to capital account as well, and they are doing the same thing with regard to other matters. The present administration found, in 1896, that the expenditure on capital and ordinary account combined had averaged less than $43,000,000 for the preceding ten years. This year we are told that the expenditure under these two heads will amount to $110,500,000 and the estimates which are being prepared for next year, we expect, will increase this amount to something like $130,000,000 or $140,000,000. We do not know what the total is yet as the hon. Minister of Finance has not told us. Therefore, I say it is well that the country should ask itself: Whither are we drifting? These hon. gentlemen say that the country is so prosperous that we can well afford such an expenditure as this. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is reported as saying only the other day that the late financial crisis in the United States had 'passed almost unperceived in Canada.' I leave it to the ordinary citizen, to the farmer, to the municipalities, or even to the hon. Minister of Finance himself, to say whether they 'perceived' any financial stringency in the recent past. While I am mentioning this matter of financial stringency I would like to say a word in regard to the serious effect that the situation had upon the movement of the western wheat crop. The situation was so grave that the hon. Minister of Finance tells us that he offered a large loan to the banks to put them in a position to assist in moving the the grain. In making that offer I can only

regret that he did not provide for the continuance of a system which has been in vogue in the western country for a long time past by which advances have been made by the banks to farmers on their bills of lading. The banks got their loans from the government but they refused to grant this accommodation to farmers, and when I drew the minister's attention to the matter across the floor of the House he replied that the banks 'had to be judges of the persons to whom loans should be made.' I do not think that this met my question, and I do not think such an answer will be considered satisfactory by the people of the Northwest.

We have had the usual boasting by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in regard to the prosperity of the country and the increase in our trade and commerce, attributed, as always, to the policy of the present administration. It appears to me that it would have been the part of wise statesmanship to have laid something by, to have had some reserve to meet the time of restriction—I do not think I will refer to it as depression—that inevitably, in the history of the whole world follows upon a period of great expansion. But the policy of the present government has been a spendthrift one, they have been spending all their money, borrowing more and paying no heed to the morrow. While we all must admit the prosperity of the country, I am not disposed to give all the credit to the present administration. On the contrary, I do not think our progress has been as great as it should have been under all the circumstances. There has been a great expansion of trade throughout the world and we have shared it, but, as I have already pointed out in this House, our progress has not been as great as that of any other of the great dependencies of the British empire that were represented at the recent imperial conference, with one single exception, although, with our conditions and resources, our opportunities have been very much greater than those of any of them. I have already pointed out, and my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) reiterated it the other night, that our great rival in the southern hemisphere, the Argentine Republic, so similar to ourselves in population and in natural resources, has far surpassed us in the development of its trade and commerce. Not only that but its productiveness and exports have increased in far greater proportion than ours have done. I think I may say that is true of all the great self-governing colonies that I have mentioned and of the countries which were referred to by my hon. friend from Wentworth, while year after year we see an ever increasing the balance of trade mounting up against us and with regard to which we will have a day of reckoning at some time or other. I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, how it is that we have no commercial agent in the Argentine Rupublic. In that republic, which is grappling with so many of the same problems that we are up against to-day and grappling with them more successfully in many instances than we are doing, an agent should be able to keep us informed of the progress of events. I would strongly urge upon this government to have some capable official placed there. We shall probably find that we can get very many useful hints from the administration of our great rival in the south.

Now, I have referred to the surpluses of which the Minister of Finance is boasting to-day. In the old days he used to denounce them as so much money drawn from the pockets of the people 'without a shadow of excuse.' These were his very words. This year, over and above an extravagant expenditure which is more than twice what it was ten years ago, he has taken in taxes something like $17.50 from every family in Canada more than was necessary to meet the ordinary needs in connection with carrying on the government. I will use his own words and say that there is not the shadow of an excuse for doing such a thing and that our necessary taxes are quite high enough without asking us to pay further taxes when there is no need for them. You will remember, Sir, that between the years 1891 and 1895, rather than pile up a surplus, the Conservative administration of the day struck off duties on raw and refined sugar and gave relief to the taxpayers of this country on these items alone to the extent of something like $21,000,000.

Before 1896 when these gentlemen were in opposition they denounced as extravagant a customs and excise revenue which was less than $28,000,000 annually, and they said that the people were bled white by taxation. But this year they have taken over $73,000,000 out of the pockets of the people by means of these same taxes. The customs duties alone, for the year 1896, amounted to less than $20,000,000; the Minister of Finance did not tell us what they would be for the present financial year, but for the last twelve months for which I have been able to obtain the figures, the calendar year of 1907, the customs duties have amounted to close upon $60,000,000, being just three times as much as they were 11 years ago. The hon. gentleman for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) gave us some interesting calculations the other day in regard to our customs taxation. He pointed to the increase that has taken place in the cost of all commodities since 1896 and quoted a long list of figures to prove that this amounted to from 35 to 50 per cent. We all know this to be the case, we all know that everything we have to buy to-day is dearer than it was some 10 years ago. That increase in price accounts to a very great extent for the apparently large increase in our trade and commerce. We are not at the present

time buying so much more goods as these figures would indicate but we are paying much more for what we do buy. The Trade and Commerce returns are not based upon quantity but upon value.

Now, the Minister of Customs in reply made a long argument to prove that the present administration had adopted a policy which was leading towards Free Trade and he told us that the customs duties had on the average been reduced about 2½ per cent, or, from 18·28 per cent in 1896 to 15·73 per cent in 1906. Let us take his own figures and apply them to any specific article. Let us take for instance an article which would cost $100 in 1896, and taking the figures given by the Minister of Customs we would in 1896 have paid $18.28 customs duty on that article. But this year exactly the same article is valued at from $135 to $150 and as we pay duty on it at the rate of 15·73 per cent, we are paying duty on it to the extent of between $21.53 and $23.59 as compared with $18.88 in 1896. Therefore, the customs duty we have to pay on exactly the same article has increased between the years 1896 and 1906 to the extent of between $3 and $5. And yet these Liberal speakers have the assurance to state that they have reduced the customs duties. But the Minister of Custom did not tell us the whole story; he did not mention that the bounties granted to iron and steel manufactures, &c., these last few years have amounted to about $11,000,000 a year and that they should have been added to the customs duties in order to make a fair calculation with regard to this matter. In my opinion the bounty system is the very worst form of protection. By it you take money from the taxes paid by all the people and hand it over to bolster up the industries of just a few. The farmer gets no bounty for producing wheat but his taxes go to bonus manufacturers who produce iron and steel. The Liberal party came into power with the promise that they would eliminate the last vestige of protection and give us free trade, but their policy has been in the direction of a continuance of protection and every one of their actions has been guided by the necessity—as they undoubtedly have argued—of seeing that there was an adequate protection still maintained in this country. They cannot any longer pull wool over the eyes of the people. During the present session both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have virtually admitted that there is no difference now between the two parties as regards the question of protection. Rightly or wrongly both parties in this country find a protective policy necessary for revenue as well as for other purposes. But there are changes and readjustments which should be made here and there in the interests of producers or consumers. Take for instance agricultural implements, and in my opinion they stand in somewhat the same relationship to the farmer as the raw material does to the manufacturer. They are absolutely necessary to the farmer for the production of his finished product—the wheat. Last session gentlemen on this side of the House supported a resolution to cut in half the duty on mowers and binders but when the resolution came to a vote it was opposed by every Liberal member then in the House, including those who come from the Northwest.

Mr. KNOWLES. Does the hon. member mean to say that his friends on his own side of the House supported that resolution as a whole?

Mr. LAKE. All the Northwest members on this side of the House supported the resolution but the members on this side of the House as a whole, did not, all of them, support the resolution. I am perfectly willing to admit that. But I take very strong exception to the statement of the member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) that the resolution as proposed from this side of the House was not proposed in sound earnest by the gentlemen who supported it and who endeavoured to have it carried into effect.

Mr. KNOWLES. Is it not true that only five or six members on the Conservative side of the House supported the resolution?

Mr. LAKE. I forget exactly the number, but if the hon. member (Mr. Knowles) will multiply his figures by four or five he would be very much nearer the number of gentlemen on this side of the House who supported the resolution. The difference is that the gentlemen on this side had the courage of their convictions and they believe it would be in the interest of the country and especially in the interest of the farmers that there should be a reduction in the duty on agricultural implements, while I am just as firmly convinced that there were certain hon. members on the other side who held the same opinion but who had not the courage of their convictions and so did not support the resolution. There are various other items besides agricultural implements with regard to which it would be in the interest of the public to make changes but I have not time to go into the whole of that question now.

During the time I have had the honour to sit in this House the opposition in my opinion have conducted a fair criticism of the administration. When measures were introduced, if the opposition believed them to be in the interests of the country, they have not opposed them but by legitimate discussion they have endeavoured to make them as perfect as possible. There has been no opposition whatever to every legitimate encouragement of railway expansion, or to the improvement of the great channels of trade and commerce. The enlargement of the powers of the Railway Commission and the good results which have come therefrom, may be attributed very largely to the attitude of the members of the opposition,

Nor have the members of the opposition been reluctant to grant generous supplies and a free hand where it deemed it in the interest of the country to do so. Take for instance, immigration—an uninterrupted series of six years of bountiful harvests throughout the Northwest have opened the eyes of the world to that section of the country and a magnificent tide of immigration has set in.

The opposition has not refused plentiful supplies to encourage that immigration. Year after year sums approximating $1,000,000 have been freely granted for this service. Allow me to contrast this with the attitude of these hon. gentlemen when they were in opposition. In 1889, when the then government asked for only $95,000 for immigration purposes, the Liberal opposition moved to reduce the amount to $50,000 and divided the House on the question. That is all the money they were willing to grant to the Conservative government of the day to encourage the settlement of our great Northwestern territories, and to-day they are asking for twenty times that amount, and we have given it to them freely. We have only criticised where there has been gross extravagance in the use of the money. While we have been willing to grant liberal supplies, we want the money honestly and economically expended. Every effort should be made to bring to our shores the best class of immigrants, but we object to the system of indiscriminate bonusing that has been going on. When the only object of steamship agents is to send large numbers of people without regard to their quality, it must result in many undesirables being brought in.

Two years ago we criticised the contract with the mysterious North Atlantic Trading Company which was drawing vast sums of money from the treasury of this company, without performing, so far as we could make out, any adequate service therefor, and the government hastily cancelled the contract. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) has criticised us for not accepting the offer of the leader of the government to state privately to the leader of the opposition who were the persons that composed the North Atlantic Trading Company. Allow me to point out that that statement was to be made in absolute confidence. That being so, what satisfaction would it be to the hon. member for North Toronto or to any other member of parliament or to the country at large to know that the hon. leader of the opposition was informed in the strictest confidence who the persons were who composed that strange company? The hon. leader of the opposition did perfectly right in refusing to bind himself to keep silence on such an important matter, and I believe that the country will demand, as soon as it has a chance of enforcing that demand, to know who the people were who were engaged in that contract. Within the last two months the government have doubled the bonus on immigrants from the continent of Europe, in the interest of probably the very persons who were profiting by that contract. Can it be that these people have the government by the throat, and are threatening to reveal who the principal beneficiaries under that contract were if they do not increase the bonus?

Speaking for the Northwest, I find much to criticise in what this government have done, and still more perhaps in what they have left undone. In the first instance, they have refused to grant to the new provinces the full status of self-governing provinces. They have curtailed their powers and have withheld from them their natural resources. They nominated a government in the province of Saskatchewan and placed it in power by methods which were absolutely indefensible. When an appeal was made to the courts to set aside many of the elections which were held at that time, judges of their own nomination and appointment declared that the right of contesting the validity of the first elections in the new provinces had been deliberately withheld by the Autonomy Acts. That very government of Saskatchewan, which should have been so grateful to hon. gentlemen opposite, at the first session of the legislature, passed a memorial addressed to this government, asking that the validity of the Autonomy Acts should be appealed to the Privy Council. It would appear that the Prime Minister has taken no notice whatever of that request; at any rate, we have heard nothing of it. Although I asked for the papers in the matter nearly two months ago, they have not yet been brought down, and so I am not able to speak positively. Again, at the time the Autonomy Bills were under discussion, it was urged that the new provinces should be relieved from the burden that the exemption from taxation enjoyed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had upon them; but the Prime Minister, if I understood him correctly, took the position that as litigation was pending at the time, and as no decision had been arrived at by the Supreme Court of Canada, and an appeal could not yet be taken to the Privy Council, the matter should be put on one side for the time being. As I understood him, if the final decision of the courts was against us, he would be prepared in some measure to come to the relief of the people of the Northwest provinces. I asked for the papers in connection with this matter more than two months ago, and I have been informed, that through a misunderstanding between two departments, they are not yet ready to be brought down, and so I am not able to speak with absolute positiveness as to the details. But, from very explicit answers which were given in response to questions which I asked last session, I am led

to the conclusion that the government neglected to make their appeal to the Privy Council for more than two years, and that in consequence the Privy Council refused to permit the appeal to be made, and we were non-suited. Therefore the matter is closed and the people of the Northwest provinces have to continue under this very unjust burden. While the loss of our lands, mines and forests must affect our credit for all time and cripple our borrowing powers, the administration of these lands from a distant centre like Ottawa must always be very unsatisfactory ; and so it has proved, up to the present time. The administration in the hands of partisan officials, far removed from headquarters, must breed abuses and discriminations in favour of party friends. And may I point out to the Minister of the Interior again while I think of it that many of the lands of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company which were granted to them by this government have been escaping taxation because for some reason the patents have not been issued to the company, and so the people residing near these lands have to bear the burden of double taxation. So I hope patents will be issued immediately and that these lands will be brought under taxation.

While the administration has proved a source of dissatisfaction, what about the policy which has placed vast areas of agricultural, grazing, timber and coal lands in the hands of speculators who will be able to bleed the incoming settlers down to the last cent ? If this continues in the future it will prove to be absolutely intolerable. Hundreds of thousands of acres of our best farming lands have been sold to speculators at a dollar an acre, to be held by them at high prices at the expense of the settlers. We discovered last year one transaction in which about 10,000 acres were purchased at $1 an acre by party friends, and were sold by them within a few months at $12 an acre. That is only an example of what is going on in regard to very large areas of our land. Hundreds of thousands of acres of coal lands have been disposed of at $7 per acre to be held by speculators and bogus applicants have been paid $1 per head by these speculators to allow their names to be used as applicants for these coal lands. Millions of acres of timber limits have been sold for a mere song, outwardly under the form of public tender, but actually under conditions which destroyed all real competition, rendering it completely fictitious. Different tenders were sent in by the same individual or set of individuals under various names in order to make the public believe there had been some competition. Under this system we find that a small ring of persons are now in possession of more than a million acres of the best timber lands of the west. What will the price of coal and timber be to the settler in the future ? That is a question which the local governments in those provinces will have to face and they will be powerless to control the situation because our rightful heritage has been withheld from us and is being exploited by this government for the benefit of speculators and party friends. If our natural resources are to be made the source of profit to anybody, the entire profits should go to the people themselves and not to the middleman as has been the case. By the Ontario budget delivered the other day I see that the province of Ontario is deriving more than $3,000,000 this year from her timber and minerals. With, I believe, as great or even greater natural resources than even the great province of Ontario, the two provinces in the Northwest, can never, under their so-called system of compensation, receive more than $1,125,000 each per annum, no matter how great their population may become in the future. The land-owning companies according to the report of the Interior Department, sold their lands in the Northwest last year at an average of more than $6 an acre and the school lands that were sold by the government in Saskatchewan in 1906 and 1907, averaged nearly $21 an acre, according to an answer given by the Minister of the Interior the other day. At present we in Saskatchewan receive only $375,000 a year as compensation for the loss of our public domain, far less than the actual revenue which this government are deriving from it, and quite apart from the valuable concessions which they have been practically giving away to their party friends.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) called attention very pointedly to the fact that four or five individuals have been granted exclusive rights of fishing for commercial purposes, over thousands of miles of rivers in the Northwest and over from 15,000 to 20,000 square miles of lakes and lake coast for periods varying from 5 years to 21 years in return for a total yearly revenue for the whole five or six of them of $380 to be paid into the Dominion treasury.

While I have pointed out some of the sins of commission of this government, I must not overlook their sins of omission. What for instance has the government done to remedy the very real grievance of the farmers of the west in regard to the grain and cattle business ? We in the west believe that the construction of a railway to Hudson's bay is absolutely essential to the continued progress and prosperity of that country. The government have not denied the necessity for that great work. It was admitted last year by the Prime Minister himself who promised to make a statement on the subject within a very few days, which he did not do. It seems to me they have simply been playing with the matter, talking as they do of creating a fund for it by the sale in the

future of pre-emptions which are not in the market to-day. As yet not one real step has been taken towards the settlement of this question. The Minister of Finance told us the other day that it is time for caution and that 'large new enterprises may well be laid aside for a little time.' I hope that the great enterprise of the Hudson's Bay Railway is not one of those to which the minister then referred, and I trust that the government will be prepared to undertake the building of the road at the earliest possible moment.

But the Minister of Finance told us in the very next breath that the government will continue to push forward the building of the Transcontinental Railway. Four years have passed since that railway was commenced and all we have at present is about 250 miles of track on the prairie section—which is supposed to be about ready for traffic but which has not yet been formally opened, and no branches—after four years of effort. What a very poor showing this is in comparison with the record of the Canadian Pacific Railway who, in five years, were able to push their line right through to the Pacific ocean in the face of every difficulty as they had always to push from the end of the track further and further out into an unsettled country and were only able to carry on construction from the ends. In the case of the Transcontinental Railway, on the contrary, they can attack the work at half a dozen different places. I hope the Minister of Finance will push the building of the Transcontinental Railway and of the Grand Trunk Pacific and its branches, and let us see something in the immediate future for the money we have been expending on this great undertaking.

For the past five years there has been practically no progressive legislation in the interests of the grain growers of the west, although there has been a very strong demand for such legislation, and the position of the farmers of the west has been growing gradually worse and worse. What has been done, for instance, to remedy the ever-recurring car shortage which annually costs the farmers of that country hundreds of thousands of dollars, taking away their freedom of action to sell where and to whom they please, and forcing both farmers and dealers to carry their wheat over for nearly a year with all the charges for that period, interest on borrowed money, storage and so on, before they can ship it out and realize. The government have practically admitted that this grievance exists, and they know the position full well, yet they have not made even an attempt to remedy it. To my mind, drastic measures should be taken, and at once, to ensure that there should be a sufficiency of transportation facilities to take such grain as may be offered to the head of the lakes before the close of navigation in each year. It is true, a Royal Commission was appointed some time ago to thoroughly inquire into the whole grain trade. That commission cost the country about $30,000, and the result of its inquiry is embodied in a report which has been somewhat of a disappointment to those who had hoped that it would recommend some radical measures to get at the root of the trouble. No doubt many of its recommendations are useful—I am not denying that. But they are only recommendations which will tinker with the question and bring no real and radical relief. We would like to see the evidence which was taken by this commission printed at the earliest opportunity and distributed throughout the country. Some valuable information, at any rate, will be obtained from it.

Again, farmers are demanding more radical steps to free the grain trade, as far as possible, from the control of large corporations and combines. One measure which will materially contribute to this end is the ownership and operation of terminal and transfer elevators by the government. I would strongly urge this question upon the attention of the government. It has been unanimously asked for by the representatives of the Grain Growers' Associations of Saskatchewan and Manitoba and by the Farmers' Association of Alberta. A unanimous request has been made that the terminal elevators should be taken into the possession of the government and operated by the government. There need be no question of expense in this matter; the western grain inspection pays for itself and the elevators would pay for themselves fully, and more than fully, and the whole system would be self-sustaining.

There are other matters which, perhaps, I would liked to have discussed, but I do not desire to speak at great length at this time. Before I close, there is one other question I would just like to mention, in which I entirely disagree with the policy of the present government. I believe that a mutual preferential tariff arrangement with the mother country is in the interest of not only Canada, but of the whole empire. Speaking as a western farmer, I believe it would be greatly in our interest if we could get a preference for our products in the British markets. I do not agree with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) on this point; I entirely disagree with him when he says that our farmers do not want such a preference. I believe that the government should do everything in their power to obtain this advantage for us, and if the Minister of Agriculture will come up to the Northwest he will find that the farmers of that country are particularly keen upon this point. Now, as I said before, I only intended to make a short speech and I will no longer occupy the time of the House.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL (South Oxford). It being near six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

An hon. MEMBER. Twenty minutes yet.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. SCHELL. If it is the wish of the House, Mr. Speaker, I will speak for a short time. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake). He closed his speech in declaring himself in favour of a mutual preferential tariff with Great Britain. I do not think there will be any material differences of opinion between members on this side and that side of the House on that question. Hon. gentlemen opposite, prior to 1896, discussed the question of a British preference; they waved the flag and shouted 'Loyalty!'—professing what they would do in regard to securing a preference with Great Britain. For years they discussed the question, but made no apparent effort to secure an entrance to that market on more favourable terms or to secure the mutual preference which they professed so loudly they were anxious to secure. When this government came into power in 1896, instead of talking about what they would do, instead of shouting 'loyalty' and proclaiming their anxiety to secure a preference, they proceed at once to deal with the matter from a business standpoint. Finding that there stood in the way of such an arrangement with Great Britain the most favoured nation clauses in the treaties with Germany and Belgium, they determined that it was necessary that these treaties should be denounced. This they proceeded to secure, and when the treaties were denounced they at once gave to Great Britain a preferential entrance into our own market. They would not have objected to secure for us a preference from the British market, but when they entered into negotiations with the British government, it was found that that government were not prepared to grant us a preference in their market in return for the preference we were prepared to grant them in ours. However, this government was not slow in dealing with the matter. In 1898 they granted the British producer a preference of 25 per cent, which, in the next year, or the year following that, was increased to 33⅓ per cent. And what has been the result of the granting of that privilege? Prior to 1896 our imports from Great Britain were running down. They decreased from $43,000,000 in 1893 to $29,000,000 in 1896. Immediately after the preference was granted to Great Britain English goods were sold in Canada in a largely increased volume. In 1900 we find they had increased to some $50,000,000; at the present time we are buying from England—that is in 1906—over $69,000,000. This year, for the nine months, we have bought already over $64,000,000 of English goods. Had these goods come in under the old tariff arrangement that was in operation prior to 1896, the people of Canada would have paid into the Dominion treasury in the way of customs duties, or taxes as hon. gentlemen opposite are pleased to term them, $30,300,000 more than we have paid during this period.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do I understand that the 33⅓ per cent was applied to all the imports from Great Britain?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. The 33⅓ per cent was applicable to the dutiable imports only, and the $30,300,000 that was saved was figured on the basis of the dutiable imports, not on the dutiable and free. But that does not represent the only benefit that Canada has received from the British preference. The countries that were compiling against the British preference, in order to retain their foothold in our markets, had to reduce their goods to the closest possible margin of profit in order to retain a fair portion of the Canadian trade, and in that way also the Canadian consumer will reap an immense benefit.

Yet that was not all, or even the most important result of the preference. While we do not secure a legal preference in their market we secure an actual preference. Prior to its adoption we had not exported to Great Britain anything like the quantity of goods that we should have exported in view of the immense market, and in view of the high class quality of our products. Prior to that time the English consumer had not a very high appreciation of Canadian food products. There were many reasons for that. One of them has been referred to in the debate this afternoon, and that is that our transportation facilities to the English market prior to 1896 were not as good as they have been since. When the English people found what our government was doing, they were so appreciative of the preference given to them in our market that they began to ask about Canadian goods and Canadian food products, with the result that they found our products were of the very highest class. They found our cheese, our butter, our bacon, our fruits were equal to the best of their own growth, they found they were better than similar products they were getting from the United States. Why has our trade increased under the preference? Several causes were at work. While the English people were examining our goods and comparing their values, we had a man at the head of the Department of Agriculture who was devoting his energies to seeing that the best possible class of goods were put on the English market. He was taking every pains to see that not only the goods were properly put up, properly transported, and properly handled in going to the sea-board and going on board ship, but he appointed inspectors to see that every care was taken in putting these goods on the English market. So when the English people realized that we had as good or better products in these articles than they were getting from the United States, or from any other country, they began to inquire more

and more for our goods. Our shippers found that it was becoming easier to trade with Great Britain, and the result has been that our exports immediately began to increase at a very rapid rate. I will give a few figures to show a comparison between the two periods under the two governments. In 1886, our exports to Great Britain were $41,540,304; in 1896, they had increased to $66,689,253, or an increase in eleven years of $25,148,949. Following the introduction of the British preference our exports began immediately to climb up at a very rapid rate. In 1898, only one year after the introduction of the British preference, our exports to Great Britain reached the enormous sum of $104,998,818, an increase in one year of $38,309,565. We sold to Great Britain in 1906, $133,092,571, or an increase in ten years of $66,403,318. That is to say our exports to Great Britain alone at the end of 1906 were double what they were in 1896. For 1907, I have not the exact figures, but I find according to the returns that are in they will be about the same as they were in 1906. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we find such an increase as that in our exports to Great Britain, we begin to conclude that the British preference that was entered into by this government in 1897, was one of the principal reasons why the English market became so valuable to us, and became at once the greatest market for all our natural food products. We to-day are selling to England $12,000,000 worth more than we sold to all the world in 1896. Our total sales to all countries in 1896 were $121,000,000 and odd, while to-day our exports to Great Britain alone amount to a trifle over $133,000,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Would my hon. friend state how the preferential tariff has affected the export trade of Canada?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I think I showed you that it was because of the feeling of appreciation that arose in the minds of the English people in consequence of what Canada had done. Following that appreciation they inquired about our goods, and they had a very fine idea of the quality of our goods generally. I could quote to you from the 'Times' which referred to the preferential tariff as being the greatest move that had ever been taken in regard to securing freedom of trade between England and her colonies. The English newspapers were loud in their praises of what the Canadian government had done. Inquiries were made as well by English consumers, store-keepers and handlers of our goods and with the able, efficient and practical work that our Minister of Agriculture was doing, concurrently with the bringing into operation of the preferential tariff, in placing our goods on the British market in the best possible condition, the English people became appreciative to such an extent that the prices which had been obtained in the past for similar products increased in a very marked degree and in this way we secured a very much better place in the English market and obtained increased prices for our products.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to say whether goods from Canada are purchased in England out of sympathy for the Canadian people or on account of their quality?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. They are bought on their merits. Being six o'clock, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask what business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We will continue with the budget.

At six o'clock the House adjourned.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 26, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I beg to lay on the table the report of the Civil Service Commission with the evidence attached. The evidence is printed but not the report. It would be desirable that the report be submitted in printed form, but as that would involve some delay, we have concluded to lay it on the table as it is. A portion is typewritten and a portion is manuscript. I move that the rule of the House be suspended and that so much of the report as has not been printed be immediately printed.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). In connection with this report I desire to make a brief statement. The general tenor of the report will no doubt be discussed in due course, and I have no wish to anticipate such discussion, but there is a special feature of the report which relates to officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries which calls for an immediate statement and immediate action.

The chairman of the commission, Mr. Courtney, does not appear to have taken part in the inquiry concerning that department, and the report as to that department is made by the two other commissioners, Messrs. Fyshe and Bazin. In general but unmistakable terms they charge officials of the department with dishonesty but give no official by name; neither do they make any clear or specific charge upon which the minister could take action. The report

cites a couple of cases apparently intended to support the conclusion of the commissioners, but both these cases in the report convey impressions completely at variance with the facts.

The order in council appointing the commissioners authorizes them to inquire into and report on such changes as may be deemed advisable in the best interests for efficiency in the public service. I may venture the opinion that matters connected with the management and control of the departments can scarcely be said to come within the scope of this commission.

I suppose it may be stated also that it was hardly within the scope of this commission, or any of the commissioners, to state that the increased cost of living was the logical result of the wasting, impoverishing and demoralizing system of protection.

On page 61 of the report the following paragraph appears :

There is not only a lack of efficient organization and method in the department. There would also seem to be a lack of conscience. In connection with the enormous expenditures which are deemed necessary, the word 'discount' never appears. It is tacitly assumed there is no such thing; but the whole commercial world knows otherwise. If one gets any benefit from trade with the government except the trader then it must be clear that in these great purchases made for the government, without discount, its officers must be assisting the trader to get better prices from the government than he can get anywhere else; for everywhere else he has to give a discount. In other words, some of the government officers are serving two masters and apparently succeeding with both—scripture notwithstanding.

The two commissioners assumed that the greater amount was received and in consequence prices were paid dishonestly. The two commissioners, in support of their statement, proceeded to furnish two illustrations. They quote an official memorandum dated 17th September, 1907, in regard to the purchase of coal at Prescott, prepared for the Deputy Minister's consideration by the clerk in charge of the work, Mr. Stumbles. That memorandum reads as follows :

Mr. James Buckley, of Prescott, who furnished anthracite coal to this department at $5.75 per ton, states that this coal was furnished at a considerable loss to him. The coal cost him $6.25 and he is now willing to continue the furnishing of the anthracite coal at cost price, namely $6.25 per ton. I recommend that Mr. Buckley's offer be accepted and as he has furnished coal at a loss in the past that 5 per cent profit be allowed him for coal in future. Anthracite coal in Ottawa cost from $7.25 to $7.75 and the regular price at Prescott is $7 per ton.

The two commissioners, I suppose, must have seen a duplicate of this original memorandum on the file and evidently concluded without any further investigation that as it had been recommended by Mr. Stumbles it had been approved by the department, because they state in their report that the recommendation was agreed to. The fact is that the deputy minister submitted to the minister the memorandum with the following words written across it :

This will have to be decided on the conditions of the contract.—F. G.

'F.G.' are the initals of the deputy minister. This being submitted to me I refused to increase the price of the contract and across the memorandum I wrote :

Carry out the contract.—L. P. B.

The two commissioners stated in their report that the department had agreed to pay a larger price than the one mentioned in the contract. If they had taken the trouble to look more closely into the matter they would have found that positive instructions had been given, as I have just stated, to carry out the conditions of the contract as it was. Moreover, I may add that I have had very careful inquiry made into the payments made since the date of this contract and the prices which have been paid are those mentioned in the contract.

I would call the attention of the House to another sample of the manner in which the two commissioners have supported their statements. The officers of the department here, having had occasion to question the price certified by the agent at Quebec for a certain brand of flour, wrote to that official and asked him for an explanation of the item, before passing the account for payment. A long correspondence took place between the accountant's branch of the department and that official and the account was officially inquired into to ascertain whether the price asked was fair and just. In other words, the officials of the department here took all necessary precautions not to pay any more than what would be a just and fair price. However, the two commissioners in their report state as an instance of the carelessness of the officials of the department, that this was inquired into at the instance of the Auditor General. As a matter of fact, the Auditor General has not seen the account and the Auditor General could not and did not have anything to do with the inquiry.

While I am aware that some of the officials have been open to censure for the manner in which they have discharged their duties, I have never had any evidence to establish dishonesty on their part. The accusation of the commissioners, while general and indefinite, is of such a character as to reflect on the integrity of the officials generally. For the protection of the public interest and in fairness to the officials, it is necessary that further inquiry should be made into the accusation and I propose to take, without any further delay, the necessary steps to that end.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ontario). Mr. Speaker, it is a novel spectacle in the history of parliamentary government that an administration within a few minutes after laying upon the table the report of a commission appointed by themselves should put up one of their own members to attack not only the commissioners' report but the commissioners themselves. I do not know whether the incident we have just witnessed with some surprise has anything to do with the delay in bringing down the report. I do remark, however, that it seems to me the minister who has just now spoken has been guilty of an act of very grave discourtesy to the House in undertaking to discuss a subject which could not be discussed generally upon this motion, because no member of the House, outside the government, has had an opportunity of examining this report. Presumably the gentlemen to whom was entrusted the duty of making this investigation and who submitted this report were men in whom the government had confidence. If that confidence was justified—and I have no reason to believe it was not justified—surely it might have been permitted to the House and to the country that the parliament of Canada should make itself acquainted with the terms of that report before gentlemen occupying the treasury benches should see fit to discuss it and to discuss it at a time when no answer could be given either on behalf of the commissioners, or on behalf of the interests of the people, at a time when the minister knew that absolutely no defence of the commissioners could be made in this House. The course adopted is most unusual and I think it is not a very wise precedent for the government to set. When the report of that commission has been printed and distributed among the members of this House, no doubt there will be an opportunity to discuss more in detail the remarks which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has seen fit to make this afternoon.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I quite agree with the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that we are rather taken aback because we have not yet seen the report. Perhaps the minister will inform us whether or not the report contains any strictures on the fact that over a year ago a gentleman was assigned as a commissioner to inquire into padding of the lists at Sorel in connection with his department. Statements were made before that commissioner and charges were laid that material that had been paid for by the department or by the people of Canada had never been delivered and that these alleged defalcations amounted to $150,000. The inquiry into those serious allegations was commenced over a year ago, but there has as yet been no report laid before parliament of the inquiry. It is easy to understand this. Mr. Desbarats, the man in charge of that department, whom the minister has not seen fit to suspend while that investigation has been pending, is a son-in-law of the Hon. R. W. Scott, Secretary of State of this government.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is absolutely nothing of that kind in the report which has been laid before the House. I may say also to my hon. friend that what he says with regard to Mr. Desbarats is absolutely incorrect. Mr. Desbarats has never been directly or indirectly connected with the branch of the service to which he refers. It was a matter under the control of the chief engineer of the department and Mr. Desbarats is in charge of the yard at Sorel, and has absolutely nothing to do with it. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken.

Mr. BENNETT. I will have to accept the minister's statement. These defalcations have been the talk, not only of Sorel, but also of Montreal and Ottawa. I have had a lot of most authentic information vouchsafed to me in reference to them, and they will be aired in the Public Accounts Committee, beginning on next Tuesday. I have been informed that Mr. Desbarats is the head of that yard, because, in the Auditor General's Report, he is described as the director of the Sorel shipyard, and I understand that it comes under his purview and supervision, that he has charge of the administration of that yard and all works connected with it. When the public, as well as the government, understand that millions of dollars are disbursed there and that the bulk of the money is not spent under contract, no tenders being invited, and as I think it will be proved, and is stated in the report here, the public will think it strange that with all those things going on year in and year out, a friendly commissioner appointed by the minister has not been able to fathom them during more than a year, because the minister has stated here on more than one occasion that he has not yet been able to lay the report on the table of the House. Perhaps then the minister can give me information on another point. There has been a large expenditure in his department on what is known as the Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission. Is reference made in the report to the fact that one of those commissioners has been convicted by officers of the hon. gentleman's department for illegal fishing? One of the very commissioners appointed to inquire into the workings of the department and of the fishery regulations is to-day on record in the hon. gentleman's department of having been convicted of illegal fishing by his own fishery officers in contravention of the law. I would ask the minister whether any reference is made to that matter in the report?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no reference to that. I do not know whether I made myself clear in regard to Mr. Desbarats, but I think

the insinuation which is thrown across the House concerning that gentleman is absolutely uncalled for. The investigation which is now taking place is with regard to some contracts for the construction of piers on Lake St. Peter. These piers were constructed under the supervision of the chief engineer, Mr. B. H. Fraser, and Mr. Desbarats, neither directly nor indirectly, had anything at all to do with it. I hope my hon. friend will not insist upon the statement he has just made. Mr. Desbarats is a deserving officer, and I should be sorry if such a statement were to go abroad without contradiction.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister stated in the House the other day, in answer to a question, that the inquiry had been along the lines of padding the pay-list at Sorel. Is that padding of the pay-list confined to the supervision of Mr. Fraser?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes ; it is in that branch of the service, which has no connection at all with the administration of Mr. Desbarats.

Mr. BENNETT. That investigation, having been pending now for over a year and that inquiry having been made, is Mr. Fraser still in the employ of the department or has he been suspended?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, Mr. Fraser has not been suspended, because so far I have seen absolutely nothing which would justify me in suspending him. He has been in the service for many years, and seems to be a deserving officer. I have confidence in him until it has been proved that he is not a deserving officer.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, some light was thrown on the workings of this Sorel shipyard in another place, and it was distinctly pointed out by an officer of the government that he had found great looseness at that place. As I understand the witnesses on that occasion, their evidence had reference, not to work that was being done on the lake, but exclusively to work in and about the shipyard at Sorel. However, after I have seen the report I will be able to see whether there is any reference to that. Now, may I ask the minister—because I primarily rose to ask him the question—Is the report that has been made by Mr. Gaudet, and which he has been promising to bring down for several days past, still not available?

Mr. BRODEUR. I brought it down some days ago.

Mr. BENNETT. I asked for it a couple of times.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to inquire whether——

Mr. SPEAKER. This discussion hardly arises out of the motion, which is that this report be printed.

Mr. TAYLOR. My inquiry has reference to the report. I want to inquire from the minister before the report is printed, what is the cost of the report, have the commissioners been paid and will the minister, who disagrees with the report, join with the opposition in voting that, as the report is not favourable to his department, it be not received nor printed?

Mr. FIELDING. If I may be permitted to add a few words—if no other gentleman wishes to speak—I will first answer the question. The report has not been printed in full, as I stated in making this motion, but the evidence has been printed, and there are two good sized volumes placed on the table. The commissioners have not yet been paid, as their remuneration has not yet been determined, but that will follow in due course. Let me say that I dissent entirely from the view of the leader of the opposition that there was any impropriety whatever in the action taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in reference to this report. The minister has attacked nobody, he has made an accusation against nobody, either in this House or out of it. I think, however, that if the minister, with the facts he has before him, had not called attention to a discrepancy in the report, if I may so call it, and which I am bound to think was an error of judgment, a very important point affecting the honour and character of his own officers—if the minister had allow-that report to go out for one hour without calling attention to that particular feature making an accusation affecting the honour and integrity of his own officials, I think the minister would not have acted fairly or justly. He has made no charge against anybody, he has made no attack on the commissioners, he has simply called attention to the fact that the commissioners—we are bound to believe through erroneous information or improper judgment—have made grave accusations, not against the minister himself, as I understand it, there is not a line affecting the minister himself. But when accusations are made against officials of the department, not as to mismanagement, but accusations affecting the personal honour and honesty of officials who have been in the department for many years, officials whose integrity and honour we have trusted in the past, and which we ought to trust until just cause is shown to the contrary—if the minister, I say, had not criticised that report, a report which, as he points out, specifies nothing, accuses nobody specifically, but levies a general charge of dishonesty against all the officials of the Marine Department, although it excepts some without naming them—I think my hon. friend will admit that the minister owed it to himself and to the officials to make a statement at once that he did not purpose to allow the matter to rest there, but that such a grave accusation called for some further

proceedings, and that he intended to take such proceedings. Such, I think, will be necessary in the public interest, and such surely will be necessary in fairness to those old officials.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Is there any mention in this report of the Falconer investigation?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is the attention of the commissioners drawn to the report that this man made?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a reference.

Mr. J. D. REID. That report, I suppose the minister will remember, shows where goods were purchased in his department, and have been purchased, which the department never received at all. Now, was attention drawn to that?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not seen anything of the kind in the report.

Mr. J. D. REID. It was read in the Public Accounts Committee, and the minister will see it in the report. Then I would like to know if the minister drew the attention of the commissioners to the way these accounts are passed by the department.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am extremely sorry to have to state to my hon. friend that the commissioners never consulted me, they never came near me. I have had absolutely nothing to do with them.

Mr. J. D. REID. I suppose they must have consulted some one. I would like to know if the attention of the commissioners was drawn to the way these accounts were passed.

Mr. BRODEUR. I must correct the statement I have just made, when I say that I never saw the commissioners. I saw one of them—Mr. Fyshe. There was some complaint that he could not get all the information he wanted, and I told him that he could get all the information he wanted, and I gave instructions to that effect.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was this information given to Mr. Fyshe?

Mr. BRODEUR. All the facts were placed at his disposal.

Mr. J. D. REID. What I would like to know is if his attention was drawn to the fact——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. We are getting out of order. The mover of the motion has the right to reply and in this case the hon. gentleman who moved the motion asked if any one else desired to speak before making his reply. It is customary for the Speaker to put that question to the House before that is done. Although I must confess that I did not ask the question, the continuation of the debate at this point would be out of order.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask on what ground, Mr. Speaker? There is a motion before the House relative to this report. While I confess that this is a very inconvenient time to discuss it and while I think that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) showed a very bad example and set a very bad precedent, since it has been opened up by the motion and since he has referred to the report, is it not in order for any other member of the House to refer to the report if he so desires?

Mr. SPEAKER. Where the mover has the right to reply it is customary for the Speaker to ask if any other member wishes to debate the question before the mover has his reply. I did not do that from the chair in this instance and the hon. member from Grenville (Mr. Reid) asked that question before the mover of the motion commenced his reply. If there is any question about the matter I would prefer to let the debate go on rather than enforce the rule.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I doubt if you, Mr. Speaker, can apply the rule to a member of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not know that any other hon. member wished to speak, and I have no desire to press the point.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Grenville has the floor.

Mr. J. D. REID. I was asking the minister if cases such as the Merwin case, for example, where it was shown that a Jones Underfeed stoker was purchased for $800 and sold to the government for double that amount, were brought to the attention of the commissioners. If these facts were not presented to the commissioners I claim that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not been doing justice to the commissioners in not explaining to them the whole working of the department, and if they have not how is he going to defend himself or his officials? He stands up in the House and says he has no reason to believe that they have found anything wrong in his department. The minister stood up in the Public Accounts Committee, backed up these transactions that were disclosed there and declared that because the prices were certified to be fair and just the transactions were right and honest on the part of the government. He was the one man who fought it out and maintained that it was all right. He believes that it is right for his department to purchase from a man like Merwin an article for $960 that only cost Merwin $330. That is what the minister claims is right and fair and, in order to show the public that he believes it is right and fair, he continues doing business with this man Merwin right along. Merwin puts

in a wrong name, doing business under the name of F. L. Brooks & Co., and the minister continues doing business with him. We had this man Strubbe in the Public Accounts Committee last year and we proved that he beat the government by charging double for the articles which were purchased of him. The minister stood up in the Public Accounts Committee, fought it out and declared that it was right and just. He is the only minister I have seen in the Public Accounts Committee who has done it, and yet Strubbe's name is there and Strubbe continues doing business in the same old way and at the same old price. That proves that the minister was upholding these transactions. He cannot see anything wrong in his officials and I believe he is right because the officials have to do what the minister tells them. Does any hon. member of this House believe that these officials would have continued purchasing from Strubbe or from Merwin unless they had orders from the minister to continue? The minister has to defend the officials because I am satisfied that they acted under the instructions of the minister. I am willing to subpœna these persons before the Public Accounts Committee, and they will swear, I am satisfied, that they continued to purchase from Merwin and Strubbe because the minister told them to do so.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is absolutely incorrect.

An hon. MEMBER. And he knows it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course he knows it.

Mr. J. D. REID. We have no evidence except the official documents. The Auditor General's Report would not state what is not true, and I am not stating anything but what is in the Auditor General's Report.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have seen in the Auditor General's Report the names of Geo. T. Merwin, of F. L. Brooks & Co. and of Strubbe & Co. I have seen the evidence. I do not know how I can get at it in any other way and in so far as the officials are concerned I agree that the minister should uphold the officials if he has given orders to them to do business with these men.

Mr. BRODEUR. I say that I never gave any such orders.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not repeat a statement after it has been denied.

Mr. J. D. REID. Very well, I will withdraw it and leave it to the public to decide from the blue-books that we have on record. I would like also to state that the minister should read the report of Falconer if he has not read it because there is evidence in it which will show that there is no department which could be run in a worse manner than the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I want to do justice to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. His is not the only department. There are several others.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not discussing the motion before the chair.

Mr. SPROULE. The motion refers to all departments. It is not confined to any branch of the government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The report is upon all the departments.

Mr. J. D. REID. I will just draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the following accounts in the Auditor General's Report:

F. L. Brooks & Company, Montreal, $56,679.50—P—95.
Geo. T. Merwin, Montreal, $50,641.50—P—98.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does the hon. gentleman state that these goods have been ordered since I have been the minister?

Mr. J. D. REID. If I were to state what I think myself I would have to state that they have been, but I am not in a position to prove it and I must take the hon. gentleman's word. But there were purchased to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars, as was shown in the Merwin investigation, on which the least profit that was made was from thirty to forty per cent and it ran up to over 100 per cent. If we average the profit at fifty per cent it will be seen that Merwin made $50,000 in cold cash and that the minister let him make it since he has been the minister. That has been continued since the minister came into office. The minister has stated here before that he had to continue these contracts with Merwin. Notwithstanding the fact that we proved in the Public Accounts Committee last year that this man was deliberately and systematically robbing the government, he was allowed to go on and was paid the same prices that he was obtaining before. The minister did not reduce the prices that were charged by Merwin. The same prices are shown in this book as having been paid since these disclosures were made. The minister let him go on and take that graft and he did not do anything to prevent the people from being robbed by this man. I would like to ask if that is managing the department in a fair and proper manner and if it is in the interest of the people of this country. No minister would allow Merwin or any other man to rob this country of at least $50,000 without there was some graft going to some person. I don't think there is any person but what will agree with me on that.

I only rose to ask a question ; I have not been able to see this report, but when the time comes I will try and do justice in discussing it with the other members of the House.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has raised a tempest in a teapot after all. There are two cases, not very important ones, in which he thinks the Civil Service Commissioners are in error. The commissioners have no doubt gone through all the departments and have had before them a multiplicity of transactions and details in connection with them. Suppose that in the end they did make a mistake with reference to these two transactions the minister should be devoutly thankful that he got off so lightly. He may be devoutly thankful that the commission did not look that department through from top to bottom and take in the whole of the transactions for the last five years—take the 'Arctic,' take the pleasure steamers, take all these other things, and take that last, but not least, outrage upon the people of this country, namely, the granting of exclusive 21 year leases to political favourites of thousands of square miles of the valuable fishing resources of the country. The minister says he is filled with zeal for the honour of the officers of his department. It is not many weeks ago when he was ready to throw off all his responsibility upon the officers of the department, and it strikes me that about the same thing has taken place to-day. Did the minister know that Merwin bought at one price and charged his department double that price ? He did.

Mr. J. D. REID. Of course he did.

Mr. FOSTER. After that transaction was brought to the attention of the minister and the minister knew it, was Merwin paid another dollar out of the public funds? If so, why? Contracts—will the minister lay on the table any contracts between that department and Merwin? I have never seen any. Surely the minister knows himself that if he finds a man supplying his department and that man has doubled his price to his own advantage, that he has no right in the public interest to have any more transactions with that man; that he has a perfect right there and then to cut the connection with that man whether there is a contract or not, because he is taking from the public treasury what the people ought not to be called upon to pay and what they are called upon to pay because of the negligence or incapacity or worse of the department. Why was the people's money paid out, twice as much as it should be, to Merwin ? Who stands between the people and such a thing as that? The minister who is in charge of a department ought to. And if that money is paid out in such a way the responsibility must rest upon the minister in charge of such a department; he cannot throw it off on anybody else, not even on his officers; he is responsible for it. Two years ago and more the Minister of Marine knew that Merwin and others were doing that sort of thing, and for the two years succeeding that he has been minister he still pays money yearly to Merwin. He had abundant authority and abundant power to cut the connection at once with Merwin. Why didn't he do it? But if the minister has only had these two little things, as he states, misrepresented, how thankful he ought to be that the whole matter of that infamous supplying of the 'Arctic' was not taken up by that commission and shown in its proper light to the House and to the country. Now, what does the minister propose to do? He has told us he is going to have revenge. He is going to do something; what is it? I think the House has a right to know what he proposes to do. The only thing I see he can do, taking all things into consideration, the revelations of the Public Accounts Committee, the revelations of the Falconer inquiry, the revelations which have come out in various other ways, and this report of the commission, the only thing he can do if he does the right thing is to have a Royal Commission or an independent commission of this House clothed with full and unrestricted power and set them loose on that department to look into the management of it for the last five, or six, or seven, or eight years. That is the pass we have come to now. The country will not be satisfied with anything else. The country is not going to say, that these two gentlemen who have no interest in the matter at all have made an imputation on that department without having found reasons for that imputation. It may very well be that they have been in error in citing these two cases, but it may also very well be that it is not upon these two cases alone that they have made their imputations that things are wrong in that department. It is more probable that the commission would come to a conclusion from what they have seen in the department in the course of their whole investigation. You have these two gentlemen of honour and ability who have no interest or prejudice in any way, who make this statement with regard to that department. Put all these things together and the people of this country will not rest satisfied with partial committees, put in the way that my right hon. friend put the committee to look into certain things with reference to the 'Arctic,' a committee whose powers were so shortened that it was impossible for them to go into the whole subject and who so exercised its powers as to shut off anything like an independent inquiry. Now, Sir, that is not the kind of a commission or that the kind of a committee that the people of this country will wish to see or will be satisfied if they do not see. A Royal Commission or a committee of independent members of this House

clothed with authority to go into the whole administration of that department covering the term of the minister preceding the present minister and his own term at least; that is the least that can be done to satisfy the people of this country.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There is a good deal in the observations which have been made by the hon. member for North Toronto which is to the point and there is a good deal which is outside the question altogether. The hon. gentleman has gone far afield beyond the question at issue in throwing out insinuations generally, when he should have confined himself to the remarks which were made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries in presenting the report of the Royal Commission upon the Civil Service found that the commissioners in two instances which have been brought before the public with regard to transactions in his department, had made a singular error affecting the honour of the officials of his department. My hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) thought it right that this fact should be recognized at once, but at the same time the Minister of Marine said that there was enough in the report of the commission to warrant further investigation. He stated that the commissioners have thrown out suspicions, and made not only insinuations, but also actual statements against the officials, and that yet strange to say they named nobody, thus casting suspicion all over the department, and without any definiteness which would show who the guilty parties were. The commission not only insinuated, but stated that there had been wrong-doers but they did not disclose who the wrong-doers were. Under such circumstances. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Foster)—and as the Minister of Marine has indeed already stated—that further action should be taken. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Foster) said that ample inquiry should be held, but he also chose to say that it should not be such an inquiry as the leader of the House prescribed two years ago when the investigation was made into the 'Arctic' by what he called a partial committee. I do not admit the assertion of the hon. gentleman. That committee took the evidence and took it in the light of the day. It may not have suited my hon. friend, but that is a question which it is not necessary to discuss to-day. At the same time I agree with the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that there is enough in the report of the commission to cause further investigation to be held. Whether it should be by Royal Commission or whether it should be by committee of this House my hon. friend is not prepared to say; nor am I prepared to say. But I say that there should be further investigation.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It is a little inconvenient to deal with this question at the present time, with the limited knowledge we have of the report. But, in view of the observations made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the right hon. premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself, I think it would not be amiss to refer very briefly to some of these observations. In the first place, this Royal Commission, appointed to inquire into the management of the departments, was appointed by the government of which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a member. That commission, presumably, did its work according to its best judgment and with the best information it could obtain. And, if we accept the statement made to the House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the commission condemns very strongly the management of affairs in his department. Now, the minister himself condemns the commission appointed by himself, discredits that commission, and declares that they had not sufficient data before them to justify them in reaching the conclusion they did. The minister (Mr. Brodeur) condemns his own Royal Commission. But what does he propose to do? He proposes, as head of the department, to appoint another commission. For what purpose? I venture to say that nine out of ten people in this country will reach the conclusion that there is only one purpose, and that is to whitewash that department. He is not satisfied with the commission appointed and the report they have made, but desires to have another commission, and this one to be appointed by himself, if I understand him correctly. Is it to be another Royal Commission that will investigate all the departments? If so, the one already appointed will be, by that Act, discredited by the government. There was a proposal made from this side of the House a year ago to make an examination of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. A motion was made to that effect, and sufficient evidence was adduced, in our opinion, to justify the holding of that investigation. We gave instance after instance of the purchase of articles from friends of the government and 50 per cent, or, in some instances 75 or even 100 per cent more paid for these articles than they could be bought for in the open market. But, notwithstanding this, our proposal to have a commission or committee of inquiry to go into the department was opposed, and the minister himself said that he saw no ground for granting the request. He said that everything was fair and honourable and that the country got full value for money spent in making purchases of supplies. So, the motion was voted down.

The minister himself insisted upon appointing a Royal Commission. And now that commission condemns his department in as strong language—or, at least, as strongly by implication—as we did. And the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not satisfied

with that, but wants another investigation. I happen to have before me the facts concerning some of the articles purchased for the department by Merwin, as shown before the Public Accounts Committee. It appears that Merwin supplied one Hendey Norton lathe for $1,250. But it was shown that any agent of the department could have purchased that lathe from the manufacturer for $995. That is, the country paid $255 to this middleman, this go-between, for which it received no return. And there was no discount, no refund, no allowance of any kind. These facts were brought out before the minister on oath. The department purchased one Underwriters' pump for $1,550. The account for this was certified and the price declared to be fair and reasonable. But the manufacturers told us that the same pump was purchased for $1,024, which meant that the country lost $526 on that transaction. There was no trade discount, no remission, no rebate to the country, but the middleman got that $526 as a commission for the purchase of the article. The department, at the expense of a two cent stamp—or rather, merely by writing a letter, for a department of the government does not pay postage—could have purchased that pump for $1,024, but they bought it through the middleman and paid $1,550 for it. There were two Underfeed stokers sold to the department for $2,550, and the country paid that money on the account being certified to as correct and the amount fair and reasonable. Yet the manufacturers told us that they would supply the same pump for $1,880, or a saving of $670 as compared with the price actually paid. Yet the minister thinks that nothing wrong was done. There was a tubular boiler sold to the department and paid for with the country's money, $975. It should have cost $660, so that this go-between friend of the government got a commission of $315 for merely sending in this order which might have been sent in by the department. There was a Sturtevant engine paid for by the public which this friend of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries sold to the department at $960. It cost $335, so that the country paid $625 for nothing. Where did the money go? Who got that extra amount? Does the minister think that this was all perfectly right and that the affairs of the department in this instance were properly managed? Does he think that the man who certified that this was a fair and reasonable price was doing his duty to the country and to the department? Does he still retain that man in the service? Here is another engine sold to the department at $550, which really cost $265.50—$285 of the public money paid out for nothing.

Mr. BENNETT. Which official bought that?

Mr. SPROULE. This was purchased from Merwin, purchased, I presume, by Mr. Fraser, Am I correct in saying that Mr. Fraser was the party who authorized this purchase?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember the facts exactly. It was before I entered the department. If I remember well, it was shown in the investigation that took place that the purchase was made by Mr. Fraser.

Mr. SPROULE. I wanted to get that for purpose of exactness. I am told there are two Frasers. Which one is it?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think this is G. Fraser, but am not very sure.

Mr. TAYLOR. Superintendent of lights.

Mr. SPROULE. At any rate the sum and substance of it is this: that he sold to the department an engine for $550 for which he paid $265.50. So that the country paid $284.50 for nothing, as the department could have purchased it direct at exactly the same price. There was no discount asked and none allowed. Take the Beatty hoisting engine sold to the government for $1,100, what did it cost? It cost $770, so that there was $330 paid for nothing. No trade discount was asked or given. Take the Hendy pillar shaper sold to the government for $800. Presumably the department required it and they ordered it through the same Mr. Fraser. How much was paid for that engine? $505. Mr. Fraser purchased it for the government and paid $295 less for it than the selling price to the government. Yet this price of $800 was certified to as fair and reasonable. When this was brought to the knowledge of the minister afterwards, he saw nothing wrong in the transaction and neither suspended the officer nor did he ever try to get back the money. We paid for a steam derrick $1,250, ordered in the same way through a friend of the government. How much did that cost? It cost $756.70. Thus we paid out $493.30 over and above what the article cost and what we could have got it for ourselves on our own order. We had a McG. & G. boiler supplied for $975, bought through this same agent of the government, who paid $660 for it, thus making an overpayment of $315 for which the country got no return. Yet the minister saw nothing wrong. Then I find a capstan sold the department for $650 which cost $390, or in other words, this gentleman got a commission of $260 on that one small article. A Sturdevant engine cost the country $550 and it was bought for $262.50, so that the country paid $287 for nothing. There was no trade discount and no reduction of any kind, yet the minister saw nothing wrong, and that price was certified to as fair and reasonable. Take an O. & S. boiler for which the government paid $852.50, and that again was certified to as fair and reasonable. Yet that boiler only cost $575, and the department could have purchased it for that price if it had sent the order direct. Out of that, the government lost $277. Then there was a travel-

ling crane sold to the country for $2,500 which cost through the same source, $1,640, yet there is a certificate that $2,500 was a fair and reasonable price. Well the account has been paid and this friend of the government got $860 commission on this one article. Here is a bitumastic solution for which the government paid $1,500 but which cost only $1,120, so that the agent of the government had on this transaction a nice little commission of $380. The prices of all these artcles were certified to as fair and reasonable. Yet the same men are kept in the employ of the department and the government see no reason for suspending them or for ceasing to deal with these firms, and although the minister had all this information, he saw no reason why we should appoint a commission to inquire into the management of the business of his department. I have given only fourteen items, but these fourteen cost the country $18,000 whereas they were bought for $11,838, so that the middleman, the friend of the government, got a commission on these fourteen articles of $6,173. We could have ordered these articles ourselves and saved this commission. Yet all these prices were certified to as fair and correct although the manufacturers said under oath that they would sell them to any one on a cash basis at the prices sold to this individual and allow a discount besides. The government, however, did not see fit to order in that way and preferred to order in such a way as to enable their friends to make this rake off. And the minister goes on dealing with the same firm through the same individual. The commission very properly condemned this method of doing business, and because they condemned it, the minister rises and criticises the commission. He condemns the commission which brought to light these transactions.

Mr. BRODEUR. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to recommend the government to dismiss Mr. Fraser for those transactions? I suppose he has read the evidence. Does he say that Mr. G. F. Fraser should be dismissed ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not recommending anything at all. The minister is running his own department; but if, in the face of these facts, if he still retains the same man and allows him to go on doing the same work in the same way, the country can draw its own conclusions. The minister is the only one we can hold responsible. What does he propose to do now? Does he propose to appoint another commission to be named by himself? His own Royal Commission has condemned these transactions and he has condemned his Royal Commission and now he wants to appoint another commission, presumable to stultify it.

Mr. BENNETT. Was Mr. Gaudet appointed in 1907 to undertake this inquiry at Sorel?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember the date. It was some time ago and I pressed Mr. Gaudet to make a report. He sent me the other day an interim report which I laid before the House.

Mr. BENNETT. I will refer the minister to it. The gentleman in his interim report says :

I have been asked last year to proceed with an inquiry into certain charges laid against Mr. Ernest Roy, foreman of works, or rather of a certain part of works in the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Sorel.

I do not wish to place the minister in a wrong light. Do I understand that he appointed Mr. Gaudet himself or was the appointment made by one of his predecessors ?

Mr. BRODEUR. He was appointed on my own recommendation.

Mr. BENNETT. It appears that although this gentleman was appointed a year ago he did not move until this year. He says :

I thought I could grant him this delay and finally he appeared on the 12th of February last and gave his version of the matter.

This report is dated March 11, 1908, so that the 12th of February of this year was the first date at which anything was done in the matter of the inquiry. Might I ask the minister if that is correct ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think Mr. Gaudet states that. He states that the man against whom the charge was made appeared recently, but I understand that he had been carrying on the investigation for some time before.

Mr. BENNETT. He proceeds :

Before I proceeded with the inquisition I notified Mr. Roy either to attend the same or to be represented thereat. At the time, Mr. Roy, who had been transfered from Sorel to below Quebec, saying he was very busy for the purposes of the department. I somewhat delayed the inquiry and finally wrote again to Mr. Roy and told him it was impossible for me to delay any more and I had to proceed whether in his presence or in his absence.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already of course spoken on this motion.

Mr. BENNETT. I was simply asking the minister a question and he asked me a question.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). Mr. Speaker, I am sure the electors of Canada will be very much interested in the report that has been laid on the table and they will be very much surprised by the attitude taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in connection with the report. It is, I think most unfair that the members of this House should be thrown into a general discussion of this question without having the facts before them or having had an

opportunity of examining into the commissioners' report. The hon. gentleman will remember, of course, that the people of Canada have for many years had their eyes centred on the Marine and Fisheries Department, in connection with the investigation which has taken place in this House and in the Public Accounts Committee, and the general discussion of the estimates of the Marine and Fisheries Department. There have been rumours of scandal and it has been proven before the Public Accounts Committee that men have been supplying this government and to this department in particular goods of various kinds and charging enormous profits on them, and that the minister has not put a stop to this practice although he was the proper person having full control of his own department. We had an example of that the other day. We have had examples of it in this House. I have myself heard this hon. gentleman and his predecessors, in discussing the estimates of the department, say that the department was in splendid condition, that not a dollars' worth of goods had reached the department without a record being taken of them, and that when the goods were sent out a record was kept and at the close of the year a correct statement of every transaction would be found upon the records of the department. A gentleman interviewed the minister a short time ago and suggested that he would look into the hon. gentleman's department, and after some interviews between Mr. Falconer, a representative of an American book-keeping system, and the minister, Mr. Falconer received an order to examine into the department and after his examination of the departmental affairs in the city of Halifax, he stated that there was no record and the affairs of the Halifax office were in such shape that it was absolutely impossible for any man to give a correct statement of the assets and liabilities of that one office.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does my hon. friend think it is fair to discuss this question which is now being investigated by the Public Accounts Committee ?

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend laid the return upon the table of the House and I quoted in a former discussion a letter to which I am now referring ; therefore, if it is before the Public Accounts Committee, it will have to take care of itself. I shall make no reference to what is going on in the Public Accounts Committee. I will confine my remarks to what has already taken place in this House. A gentleman was brought in at $75 a day, some of his employees coming from New York received $40 a day, some $25 a day. A large amount of money was paid out of the treasury for the investigation of this department, and it would have been very much better if the hon. gentleman would now say that he complimented the Civil Service Commissioners upon their report, and upon having brought to light some of the facts in his department rather than to suggest that somebody had better look out, that there will be trouble and he will go after some of these employees. He did not, of course, tell us exactly what he proposes to do. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked him the question but he did not feel disposed to answer it.

A serious condition of things has been revealed. This department has been in operation for many years and there are many honest officials in connection with it, there is no question about that, but until this American bookkeeper suggested to the minister that he should straighten up the whole accounts, only a few of these irregularities had been disclosed. We were told that this is a business government and yet this department, after being under the control of this business government since 1896, is in such condition that when an expert bookkeeper went into one of the offices he was unable to give the government a correct report of the liabilities and assets of that one office. When the people of Canada understand this, they will realize that there is something wrong.

One of the strongest complaints I have to make against the minister is his willingness to protect the people who are charging enormous prices instead of the minister calling out for another commission, if necessary, and joining hands with the people of Canada and saying that if this department is wrong, if the conditions are such as have been pointed out, then he, as controller of that department, will be prepared to have a thorough and complete examination to ascertain where the public money is going and how it is being expended. Whatever action the minister may take against either the commissioners or the employees in his department, I hope that his first duty will be to see that he has an honest and fair administration of his departmen from his own office. That is what the people of this country expect, because the hon. gentleman has the power to discharge and the power to appoint. For myself I think it is a disgrace to the government of Canada, and will be I am sure a black mark upon the record of the hon. gentleman when, in his own department, after having had control of it for some time, he was unable to detect these things, was not able to bring these matters to light without the assistance of imported bookkeepers and of commissioners who have told us some of the things of the many, I suppose, that are going on in his department.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (Kings, N.B.) Before this motion passes I would like to ask the minister a question or two with respect to a return regarding charges made against Mr. Ernest Roy, who I believe occupies the

position of foreman of works at Sorel. It seems that one Victor Gaudet was appointed to investigate certain charges against Mr. Roy. As I understand it—and if I am incorrect I hope the minister will correct me—Roy was charged with padding lists and with paying for material that was not delivered. Is that correct?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Now, as I understand it also, the minister has stated in answer to a question that Gaudet was appointed in February, 1907, to investigate the charges against Roy, he was appointed by the minister himself, and that Roy, during all this time, has continued to occupy the position which he did occupy in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Is that correct?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, that is not correct, he is not occupying that position now.

Mr. FOWLER. When was he dismissed?

Mr. BRODEUR. He was not dismissed. He was employed at Sorel at first, and has been removed from there.

Mr. FOWLER. When was he removed from Sorel?

Mr. BRODEUR. About a year ago.

Mr. FOWLER. But he is still in the employ of the department?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. What position is he in now?

Mr. BRODEUR. He is under the agent at Quebec.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the minister why it is that the investigation found necessary in February, 1907, is not proceeded with until February, 1908, and in point of fact is not proceeded with yet, as only certain preliminary steps have been taken.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not correct.

Mr. FOWLER. According to the return, it is correct. This is what this gentleman says, that everybody seemed to be sick, there seemed to be a certain epidemic down in that country, and all the witnesses required seemed suddenly to be taken ill, and it was impossible to examine them. It is strange that they should remain ill for over a year since this investigation was ordered. Mr. Gaudet says that Roy did not answer the letter which he wrote him. As soon as he got instructions to hold an inquiry he wrote Roy a letter notifying him of the fact, and Roy never anwered the letter. Gaudet notified Roy of the time and place that he would hold the inquiry. He took a number of depositions, and then he again notified Roy.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then he did take some depositions?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, he took some depositions. He again notified Roy. But Roy's wife was ill and he could not appear so it was not until February 12, 1908, after something more than twelve months had elapsed, that Roy was able to appear before the commission. Then there was another witness required on Roy's behalf, a Mr. Cherrier, the member for Laprairie in the provincial parliament. Mr. Cherrier was ill, too, and consequently the inquisition, as I understand, has not been proceeded with. Now I do not quite understand how Mr. Cherrier could be a witness on Roy's behalf, how he, the provincial member, could be mixed up in the affair. Was he the person who delivered these goods, or who sold these goods to the department, or was he connected with the padding of the lists which was charged against Roy? It seems to me a strange thing that a man would be allowed to remain in the department over whom grave charges were hanging such as these. What more serious charge can be preferred against a member of the civil service than a charge that he is defrauding the government by padding lists and by making a return for material that has not been delivered to the government? Yet this gentleman is allowed to remain in the public service of Canada, shifted, it is true, from this position and given another one, and probably a better one, because judging from the action of the government in the past in cases like the Wagner case, a man always gets promotion for that sort of conduct. Now I would like to ask the minister if he can roughly state the amount involved in these charges against Mr. Roy? I understand it is a very large amount. Perhaps the minister will be able to tell us within $25,000 or $50,000 what the amount is.

Mr. BRODEUR. So far as I was able to see when the charges were brought to my knowledge, some cooks were put on the list as labourers, when they should have been paid by himself. It was a small amount.

Mr. J. D. REID. $180,000, I think.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I do not think it is $500.

Mr. FOWLER. What about the material? The minister has said that the amount of padding only amounted to some $500. That is not much, but it is the principle of the thing. If a man is guilty of stealing $500 from the public service he should not be allowed to remain longer in it. Then there is the question of material, what about that?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember that there is anything with regard to material. If I remember right, it was a charge of having padded the lists, that is to say, of putting on the list some cooks whom he was to pay himself. He had a contract for feeding some men at work on the piers on Lake St. Peter, and I understand that by his contract he was to pay for his own cooks, in-

stead of doing that, he was charged with putting these cooks on the list.

Mr. FOWLER. As I understand the matter, in addition to padding the list, there was a lot of stone to be delivered that was not delivered.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the value of that?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know. I sent Colonel Anderson to make an investigation with regard to that, even before this report came in, as it appeared there was an overcharge. I am having an inquiry made under oath.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister betrays a lack of knowledge of the workings of his department that is rather to be regretted. Here is a man charged with certain heinous offences and the minister has not the faintest idea apparently as to the amount of money that this man was charged of having defrauded the country. It seems to me the minister ought to be able to get somewhere close to it. Is it possible that this thing is of so frequent occurrence in his department that he does not charge his mind with these little things? How much has Mr. Gaudet been paid?

Mr. BRODEUR. I gave the amount the other day.

Mr. FOWLER. I mean how much for making the investigation.

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot say off-hand. I gave the answer the other day.

Mr. BERGERON. It was $600.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that correct?

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman will understand that I cannot be expected to carry all these details in my memory.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that Mr. Gaudet, the investigator, has been paid a matter of $600. He is only beginning his investigation, and has taken only a few depositions and has received the statement of Mr. Roy. I think he has been pretty well paid, and I suppose that is merely on account. Surely there is a balance still due him, and yet you are paying him over $600 for what he has done so far in this investigation. Certainly, that is a matter that the minister had better direct his attention to and be prepared, when it comes up again, to give a complete answer so that the members of the House will understand it.

Mr. BRODEUR. This question was put to me the other day and I gave an answer to it. I do not remember what the answer was but I will look it up and I will give it to my hon. friend.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister state that he has suspended the official in the meantime and ordered an inquiry to be made as speedily as possible? That is the usual course.

Mr. BRODEUR. I removed him from the place in which he was.

Mr. HAGGART. Ah, but he should have been suspended. When you prefer a charge of fraud against him and order an investigation, he should be suspended at once and have the benefit of an immediate inquiry.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know that it is British principle that a man should be convicted before he is tried.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the minister if he thinks it is British principle to have a charge preferred, to have it supported so far by the minister that he orders an investigation and to hang that up against a man for over a year?

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Mr. Speaker, it is, I think, a very extraordinary position for the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) to take in regard to the report of the commission which has just been brought down and it has too in my opinion, a very grotesque appearance. There was a commission appointed which was supposed to be an independent commission and when the report of that commission is brought down and, before the details of it are laid before the House, we hear a miserable whine from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that his department has been hit, and before any particulars are laid before the House, he gives the House notice that he protests very strongly against any insinuations that may be made in that report against the honour, or the pristine purity of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The people of Canada are beginning to take the protestations of the minister as a joke. They know perfectly well, as every hon. member of this House knows, as the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself knows and has admitted on the floor of this House, that the Department of Marine and Fisheries has been allowed to run riot, and, time after time, whenever an attempt has been made from this side of the House to get within the arena of the department to let in fresh air and, by investigation, to get at the rottenness and the scandals that have permeated that department, the minister has persistently obstructed any such step and has persistently stated that there is nothing in all these different reports—nothing at all—upon which the public should be entitled to an investigation. And yet, Sir, when there is, according to his view, something in the report of what is supposed to be an independent commission that in any way reflects upon the honour and the purity of his department, or on any one connected with his department, he comes before the House and, before we are even treated to the particulars of that report, he begins to make a noise and whines like the proverbial stuck

pig. There are limits even to the burlesque. I certainly think that the burlesque which the minister is attempting to play before the country now will be treated as such by the people. As has been suggested by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) every one would have thought that a responsible minister, recognizing his duty to the Crown and to the people of the country, would have welcomed any insinuations made by any independent commission with regard to the administration of his department, especially in view of the serious insinuations that have been hurled across the floor of this House against that department. Had the minister been worthy of the position which he holds now, had he been equal to the responsibility attached to the administration of such a great department, he would have hailed with delight the criticism of any independent commission and the result of any inquiry with regard to his department which reflected upon that department and which would enable him as a sworn minister of the Crown and a representative of the people to clear that department from the very serious suspicion which rests upon it.

I do not want to give instances or to go into details concerning the variety of scandals that have been laid at the door of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. They are notorious. Their record must always be regarded as a very dark page in the political history of this country. They are of a most serious character; yet, they have not been investigated. Whatever investigations have been made have simply been made with the idea of excusing the department and of pulling the wool over the eyes of the people in regard to its mal-administration. There are cases going on to-day. There are papers being brought down every day almost in regard to the administration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. For instance, I might refer now to a case within my own knowledge. The Department of Marine and Fisheries, upon the recommendation of its engineer, and in order to save the expense incident to the leasing of a tugboat for towing barges, buys a tug which is under lease for the recommended price of $4,000, the purchase money is paid, the bill of sale is handed over to the Department of Justice and what happens? Does the rent stop? The rent goes on just the same. The rent is paid. Notwithstanding the fact that there is a bill of sale, recognized as such by the Department of Justice, the Department of Marine and Fisheries pays $12 a day for the rent of this boat. This is an instance of what is going on in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. But, we have other instances in other departments. While I do not desire to weary the House with particular instances, I will just briefly refer to something that might well have been the subject of some criticism in the report of this commission, and perhaps it is the subject of criticism in the report, and I think I hear a sigh of relief escaping from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that this is not in his department. It is in connection with the transactions of Mr. E. A. Wallberg with the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to give me the name of the boat to which he makes allusion?

Mr. BOYCE. 'Catharine C.'

An hon. MEMBER. C.C.

Mr. BENNETT. Cold cash

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the first time that I have heard the name.

Mr. BOYCE. I have given an instance of a case in the hon. gentleman's department. Now, here are the transactions of a very favoured gentleman named E. A. Wallberg who dealt largely with the Department of Railways and Canals. There is one singular thing about the transactions of this gentleman with the Department of Railways and Canals that certainly looks very much like a coincidence and that is that where he tendered for twenty-five or thirty contracts sometimes he was high, sometimes he was low, sometimes he was medium, but he never failed to get the contract. That is one peculiar feature about the position of E. A. Wallberg.

An hon. MEMBER. He is a winner.

Mr. BOYCE. He is a winner. He is a Wallberg winner. Mr. Wallberg is essentially a middleman; or, he is not a middleman, he is a universal man. He is a man who will tender to supply anything whether or not it is within his capacity or knowledge to carry out his tender. He will tender for heating car shops, to supply the material necessary for building water tanks to build stone passenger stations, to deliver locomotive cranes or boilers, and to construct umbrella roofs. He will tender in the Department of Marine under another name as the hon. gentleman knows, to build lighthouses all over this country and in all cases Wallberg figures as a middleman. Wallberg's tender for supplying the locomotive cranes was the most extraordinary contract ever made by anybody outside of this government. Locomotive cranes were required for facilitating the handling of coal at Lévis, and correspondence took place between the Deputy Minister of Railways and Wallberg with regard to the system of coal handling at Lévis, and before tenders were invited at all there was a letter from Wallberg to the minister suggesting that a certain course should be followed. It was stated that five locomotive cranes were required for the work. Then the Minister of Railways sent out invitations to a favourite few to tender for one of these locomotive cranes and Wallberg knowing that five were required tendered for the

five and got the contract, although it appears that taking into consideration the question of duty and freight, even then Wallberg's tender was not the lowest.

Mr. BENNETT. Did he join the pulp company yet ?

Mr. BOYCE. He has got a better thing than the pulp company.

Mr. BENNETT. Oh, no.

Mr. BOYCE. He has got a concrete company and he is associated with gentlemen in that company who are in a position to make it a pretty concrete company so far as actual cash is concerned. Now who is Mr. Wallberg and what are the particulars with regard to the delivery of these locomotive cranes. Remember that Mr. Wallberg was never in possession of a locomotive crane and never was an agent for supplying them. Nevertheless, in advance of the order Wallberg got these cranes delivered from Cleveland and he reaped a profit of $1,000 on each crane or $5,000 on the five. And Mr. Wallberg's contracts with the government have been steadily increasing in number and in value ; he started with $75,000 and he has now contracts running up into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. It is peculiar, that in every case Wallberg's tender to the government is followed by some extraordinary letter to the minister or to the engineer who opens the tenders suggesting some special advantage which can be gained by this government in obtaining the article from Mr. Wallberg.

Mr. BERGERON. He is clever.

Mr. BOYCE. For instance when girders are required for ash pits for the Intercolonial Wallberg knows all about it and Wallberg tenders to get the girders. The engineer in charge knows that girders are required, and it is admitted they were part of his plans and specifications, and does he ask for them. Oh, no. There is a gentleman who is a very great friend of the department named E. A. Wallberg and Mr. Wallberg simply sends to an ordinary machine shop to get these girders and he puts $500 of the price in his own pocket, simply as a middleman. In Committee of Supply the other night I pointed out that there is a gentleman in the Department of Railways and Canals who, the Auditor General complained, had certified to Mr. Wallberg's work before that work was completed, and absolutely no notice has been taken by the government of the charge. In the Public Accounts of this year there will be found letters with regard to Wallberg's work showing that in two instances the engineer of the department certified that that work was paid for before it actually was performed, and upon that certificate a cheque was issued which was retained until the work was actually performed. Sir, the time has come when neither the Minister of Marine and Fisheries nor any other minister of this government, not even the Prime Minister himself, will be able to humbug the people any longer. Investigation must be held in regard to the disclosures in this department ; investigation will be insisted upon by the public and neither in the Public Accounts Committee nor in any of the other committees——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg). The hon. gentleman is referring to the Public Accounts Committee ; I wish to call his attention to the fact that he has no right to discuss the Wallberg matters this afternoon.

Mr. BOYCE. I have said all I intend to say about Wallberg.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The inquiry is not completed and the proceedings have not yet been reported to the House.

Mr. BOYCE. Why, I stopped speaking about Wallberg three minutes before the hon. gentleman arose. I was proceeding to say that the people of Canada will no longer tolerate the avenues of inquiry being obstructed and polluted as they have been by this government and by those who are operating for the government. The time has come when we must have a full inquiry into the public expenditures of the country. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries by the attitude he took upon this report, even before the report comes to the knowledge of this House, complaining that that report hits his department ; his action to-day is a travesty upon the rights of the people who ought to be informed upon all matters in connection with the nefarious transactions of that department. It transgresses the first right of the people to full information concerning the inner transactions of his department, and the minister shows that he is standing upon the apex of a volcano, when, before the bomb has burst he comes down to the House and in such a grotesque manner as almost to excite the laughter of the whole House he says : Here is a report which reflects upon my department and I give the House and the country notice that some one will have to suffer for it. I would suggest to the Minister of Marine that it would have possibly been more in accord with the dignity of the officer of the minister of the Crown had he kept in reserve his remarks until such time as the report had been printed and placed in possession of the members of the House. It would have better satisfied the people of this country of the bona fides and the honesty of the minister himself and of his zeal and desire to really have an investigation into his department, rather than that he should have made this hysterical scream of rage and fury that no suspicion at all should be directed against himself or his department, and that no report brought to this House whether by an independent

commission or otherwise should reflect on any officer or servant of his department.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to.

## FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 134) respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Turgeon.

## QUESTIONS.

### MR. F. W. COWIE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Is F. W. Cowie chief engineer for the government on the St. Lawrence ship channel? If so, what salary does he receive per annum?
2. What did he receive for travelling expenses during the last year?
3. Is the said Mr. Cowie also chief engineer for the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal? If so, what salary is he paid per annum by said commissioners, and how much did the said commissioners pay him for travelling expenses during the last year?
4. How much time does he devote to his duties in each capacity?
5. Where is he at present, and how is he engaged or employed?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes. $3,000 per annum.
2. $1,086.65.
3. Yes. $2,000 per annum. The Harbour Commissioners allowed Mr. Cowie as chief engineer $100 per month from May to December inclusive for board and expenses in Montreal as his home was in Ottawa.
4. All his time to both services as the requirements demand.
5. Great Britain and the continent inspecting the harbours and rivers with respect to harbour and dredging improvement.

### STONEY LAKE DOCK.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Has the government constructed a dock on island No. 19a, Stoney lake, Ontario?
2. If so, who is the owner of the island above referred to, and was the part of the island on which the dock is built purchased by the government? If so, what was paid for same?
3. Have any docks been constructed in said lake on the island by the government since 1896?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I am trying to find out if this is in my department. I have not yet found out anything about it.

Mr. BENNETT. It was a dock built for Mr. Stratton, if that will be an index.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps Mr. Stratton built it himself.

### IMPORTATIONS OF MESS PORK, &c.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

How much mess pork, ham and bacon, giving the quantity and value of each, was imported into Canada from the United States during the months of November and December, 1907, and January and February, 1908?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Pork barrelled in brine, 3,046,869 pounds ; value, $244,528. Bacon, hams, shoulders and sides, 2,112,457 pounds ; value $232,808.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. How much fresh pork has been imported for home consumption into Canada since December 1, 1907, up to March 1, 1908?
2. What amount of cured or salted pork was imported for same period?
3. What amount of all other kinds of fresh meats was imported during same period?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Pork barrelled in brine, 2,059,448 pounds ; value $166,109. Bacon, hams, shoulders and sides, 1,515,289 pounds ; value, $154,622. Mutton and lamb, fresh, 545,113 pounds ; value, $39,025. Fresh pork, 21,818 pounds ; value, $1,934. Other meats, fresh, 53,857 pounds ; value, $6,282.

### MR. W. H. P. CLEMENT.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. What position or offices, whether as legal adviser to the Yukon Council, or as public administrator, or otherwise, did Mr. W. H. P. Clement fill in the Yukon Territory?
2. During what periods did he fill each of these positions or office?
3. Under what circumstances and for what reason did he cease to fill such position or office?
4. Did he resign, or were his services dispensed with in each instance?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Legal adviser to the Yukon Council, public administrator of the estates of deceased persons, infants, and persons of unsound mind, and member of the Yukon Council.
2. Legal adviser and member of the Yukon Council from 17th October, 1898, to 8th October, 1900. Public administrator from 5th September, 1899, to 8th October, 1900.
3. Mr. Clement's services terminated on the 8th October, 1900.
4. The records of the department do not contain this information.

### MR. JAMES NOBLE.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Was James Noble, of Killarney, Ontario, convicted for a breach of the fishery regulations in the latter part of last year before an officer of the Department of Marine and

Fisheries? If so, was he fined, and what was the amount of the fine?

2. Was there a confiscation of nets or fishing plant?

3. Is the James Noble above referred to the man who was associated with John Birnie, of Collingwood, in an inquiry or investigation into the fisheries of inland lakes in Ontario?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. No, the case has not yet been tried.

2. No; but there was a seizure of a pound-net.

3. Yes.

## DOG-FISH REDUCTION PLANT, CANSO, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked:

1. How many days has the dog-fish reduction plant at Canso, Nova Scotia, operated during the season of 1907?

2. Who is manager of the plant, what is his salary, what are the terms of his engagement, how much did he receive during the year 1907 up to the 31st December last, and how long was he actually employed in the business of the plant during 1907?

3. How many men are employed at the plant besides the manager, what are their respective names and salaries, and how much was each paid in 1907 up to 31st December, for their services?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. From 5th October to 9th November.

2. A. B. Cox, $1,200. He is employed by the year. $1,200. Twelve months.

3. Two. D. S. Hensbee, $700. E. A. Kelly, $675. In addition to these, during the time the works are in active operation labourers are employed, at the rate of $1.50 per day, as required.

## SALMON LICENSES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. ELSON asked:

1. What moneys were received in 1905, 1906 and 1907, for sale of salmon licenses in British Columbia, (a) gill-nets, (b) drag-nets, (c) purse-nets, and (d) traps?

2. Are any moneys due the government under the terms of the leases or licenses granted to take fish in waters of British Columbia? If so, from whom, for what years, and how much?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

| 1. | 1905. | 1906. | 1907. |
|---|---|---|---|
| (a) Gill-nets ..... | $42,667 | $37,602 | $35,800 50 |
| (b) Drag-nets.... | 1,250 | 1,445 | 1,550 00 |
| (c) Purse-nets .. | 1,100 | 1,550 | 1,300 00 |
| (d) Traps ..... | 2,850 | 3,450 | 2,700 00 |
| Total ..... | 47,867 | 44,047 | 41,350 50 |

2. No.



Mr. J. D. REID asked:

1. What leases or licenses, other than gill-net licenses, have been granted to capture salmon in the waters of British Columbia, when, to whom, and for what term of years?

2. Do any of said leases or licenses purport to grant exclusive privileges? If so, for what waters, to whom granted, and for what term of years?

3. What undertaking were the granters responsible for in view of the special privileges granted, and what steps has the government taken to ascertain that conditions have been carried out?

4. What penalty was provided for not making use of the privileges granted, and what steps has the government taken to ascertain if the conditions have been complied with?

5. Can licenses be cancelled in case of non-user?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). That should stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for return.

Mr. MARSHALL asked:

1. Have any salmon fishing licenses or leases been granted for taking fish in the waters of Gardner's inlet or canal, British Columbia? If so, when, to whom and upon what terms?

2. What moneys, if any, were received in 1905, 1906 and 1907 from licenses or leases granted for Gardner's inlet or canal, from whom and what amount?

3. What moneys, if any, are due the government under the terms of any leases or licenses granted for taking fish in the waters of Gardener's inlet or canal, British Coulmbia, from who due, and for what periods of time?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes, to the British Empire Fish Company for nine years from 1st August, 1904, at $200 per annum.

2. None.

3. $800 from the British Empire Fish Company as fees on the said lease. The representatives of the company were informed on February 27, 1908, that if the above amount were not paid into the department within one month from that date, the lease would be cancelled.

## CHAMBLY COMMON.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Worthington—asked:

1. What is the area of the ground generally known as the Chambly Common?

2. What use does the government make of that ground?

3. Has it rented, given or loaned it?

4. To whom, on what conditions and for how long?

5. Has the government had any correspondence with any person in regard thereto?

6. If so, what is such correspondence?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. 8·75 acres.

2. A portion is occupied and used by the Department of Railways and Canals for range lights. The balance is held under lease.

3. Rented.

4. S. T. Willett. Nominal rental.

(1) That the lessee shall and will pay the rent hereby reserved in manner aforesaid, and shall and will also pay all charges, taxes, rates and assessments whatsoever which shall, during the said term, be charged upon or payable in respect of the demised premises ;

(2) And that the lessee shall and will maintain and keep in good and substantial repair all fences, ditches, fixtures and things upon and about said premises ;

(3) And that the lessee shall not nor will, at any time during the said term, without the consent in writing of the Minister of the Interior, hew, fell, cut down, tear up, destroy or injure or cause or knowingly permit or suffer to be hewed, felled, cut down, torn up, destroyed or injured, any timber or timber trees on the said demised premises ;

(4) And that it shall be lawful for the minister, or any person thereunto authorized by him, at all reasonable times during the said term, to enter upon the said demised premises to examine the condition thereof ;

(5) And that the lessee shall not, nor will, during the said term, assign or underlet the premises hereby demised or any part thereof, without the consent in writing of the minister ;

(6) And that the lessee shall not, during the said term, erect any buildings upon the said premises ;

(7) And that the lessee shall not permit the playing of baseball or other games on the said premises during any Sunday ;

(8) And that possession of the said demised premises, or any portion thereof, may, at any time during the said term, be resumed by His Majesty, his successors or assigns,upon three months' notice in writing by the minister to the lessee, and in no such case shall the lessee have any claim to compensation on account of damages in any way resulting from such resumption or from the determination of this demise.

Ten years.

5. Yes.

6. Usual correspondence arranging terms and conditions upon which lease was to be issued.

POSTMASTER, CHAMBLY CANTON.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Worthington—asked :

1. Who is the postmaster at Chambly Canton?

2. Has the Post Office Department received any complaint or complaints in regard to money said to have disappeared from that post office?

3. What is the nature of such complaints?

4. By whom were they made?

5. Has the minister or his department taken any action thereon?

6. What has been done?

7, What explanation can the minister give in regard to this matter?

8. What persons intervened to bring about a settlement of this affair?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Mr. Frederic Courtemanche.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8. The post office inspector, Montreal, reported, in May last, the alleged loss of a thousand-dollar bank note from a letter posted at Chambly Canton, addressed to the Bank of Montreal, Ottawa. This money was part of a remittance on post office account, which the assistant postmaster (wife of the postmaster) made up in a room adjoining the post office. After placing the remittance in the envelope she left it with her husband, who was in the room, until she got the wax and seal, and on return sealed the letter without verifying its contents. The letter arrived at the bank and did not bear any evidence of tampering.

The department immediately took an action in the civil court against the postmaster for the recovery of the $1,000. No person has intervened to bring about a settlement of the affair. The action is still pending before the courts.

RIFLES PURCHASED.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Worthington—asked :

1. How many guns or rifles has the government purchased since 1896?

2. What price was paid for each one?

3. What amount did the government spend each year since 1906 on such purchases?

5. What is the total amount to be paid for guns purchased but not yet delivered?

6. To whom are such sums paid and how much to each one ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (for Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1. Since July 1, 1896, the government has purchased (a) 10,359 Lee-Enfield magazine rifles ; (b) 7,800 Lee-Enfield magazine rifles; (c) 300 carbines complete ; (d) 37,500 Ross rifles delivered to March 21, 1908, out of a total of 52,000 contracted for.

2. (a) $19.46 ; (b) $18.18 ; (c) $16.02 ; (d) $25.

| | |
|---|---|
| 3. 1896-7 | $ 333,447 94 |
| 1897-8 | Nothing. |
| 1898-9 | Nothing. |
| 1899-1900 | 4,807 35 |
| 1900-1 | Nothing. |
| 1901-2 | Nothing. |
| 1902-3 | 62,971 92 |
| 1903-4 | 159,262 48 |
| 1904-5 | 203,941 41 |
| 1905-6 | 335,641 59 |
| 1906-7 | 272,926 15 |
| 1907-8 | 174,631 45 |

4. $1,574,630.29, including 75 per cent of cost of 14,500 Ross rifles contracted for but not yet delivered.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5. $234,375, 25 per cent of cost of 14,500 rifles undelivered of the 52,000 contracted with Ross Rifle Company. | | |
| 6. Birmingham Small Arms and and Metal Co., Ltd.—For 10,-359 Lee-Enfield magazine rifles, with cleaning rods, oil bottles and pull-through, at £4 or $19.46 each, $201,655.20 less for 10,359 rough stocks issued from War Office stores to contractors.. .. .. .. .. .. | $ | 191,572 44 |
| London Small Arms Co., Ltd., Old Ford—For 7,800 Lee-Enfield magazine rifles, with cleaning rods, oil bottles and pull-throughs, at $18.18 each. | | 141,875 50 |
| His Majesty's Accountant General (War Office)—300 carbines complete, $16.02 each. | | 4,807.35 |
| Ross Rifle Co., Quebec, Canada—37,500 rifles delivered to March 21, 1908, at $25 each. | $937,500 | |
| 14,500 rifles undelivered, 75 per cent of cost of same.. .. .. .. | 271,875 | |
| | | 1,209,375 00 |
| | | $1,547,630 29 |

MR. W. DODDS.

Mr. FINLAYSON—By Mr. Roche (Halifax)—asked :

1. Has the hon. Minister of the Interior any information as to who W. Dodds is, whose name was signed to a communication dated 91 Hollis street, Halifax, and addressed to one Atomian, an immigration agent, at Liverpool, as follows:

'Your eleven people were all passed; be a little more particular next time with Montreal cases. Do not let them make any sign whatever. If you describe something they wear it will be enough. I felt quite nervous when they all made signs with their hands on their ties. Signed, W. Dodds.'

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The minister has received information which leads him to believe that letters signed 'W. Dodds' were written and sent by H. L. Dickey, M.D., while he was acting as medical inspection officer at Halifax.

CHARLOTTETOWN PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Were tenders called for laying a pipe line and the building of a tank at Charlottetown?
2. What are the names of the tenderers, the amount of each tender, and the party to whom contract was awarded?
3. When was the contract to be completed?
4. Has the contract been started? If so, will it be completed at date specified in the contract? If not, why not?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways) :

1. Yes.
2. E. A. Wallberg, Montreal, $6,363.50 schedule rates; J. & G. Ives, Montague, P.E.I., $7,256.39 schedule rates; F. Schurman & Company, Summerside, P.E.I., $7,438.62, schedule rates; Morrison & Clark, Summerside, P.E.I., $7,594.70, schedule rates; Willard Kitchen, Fredericton, $6,521.15 schedule rates. Contract was awarded to E. A. Wallberg, his tender being the lowest.
3. March 31, 1908.
4. No. The contract was only awarded on December 21, 1907, no work could be done during the winter season, and the contractor has applied for extension of time to August 31, 1908.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT STEAMER.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What is the name of the steamer purchased for the use of the Post Office Department?
2. What was the previous cost per annum of carrying the mail between the Atlantic mail steamers and the wharf at Rimouski, Quebec, each year for the past five years?
3. Has said steamer been employed since coming to Canada in carrying mails? If so, how many trips has she made and to and from what point, and at what dates?
4. Does this steamer carry passengers? If so, what amount was collected from that source since coming to Canada?
5. If said steamer has not been used in carrying mails, what other work has been accomplished by her, and between what points has she sailed, and dates of sailing?
6. How many of a crew is needed when the boat is in service?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. The 'Lady Evelyn.'
2. 1902-3.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. $4,720
   1903-4 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 4,640
   1904-5 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 4,720
   1905-6.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 4,698
   1906-7 (to June 30) .. .. .. 4,720
3. Yes. The steamer transferred mails to and from the Atlantic mail steamers at Rimouski from August 20 last to the end of the season during which period 24 trips were made.
4. No.
5. Answered by No. 3.
6. Twenty-five men.

OTONABEE POWER COMPANY.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What amount of horse-power was paid for by the Otonabee Power Company of Peterborough in last fiscal year?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). The lease to the Otonabee Power Company of Peterborough was for the right to use all the surplus water, esti-

mated at the time at 625 horse-power and the amount paid during the last fiscal year of nine months was $635.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 135) to amend the Immigration Act. He said: This Bill is to cover a point which has been under consideration for some time. This point is covered by regulation, but it is thought advisable that instead of depending upon a regulation, an amendment should be made to the Act. It has reference to the admission of immigrants who come from other countries than those of their birth or citizenship. As was explained the other day by the right hon. leader of the House, when immigrants come from a country which is not that of their citizenship and the conditions are such as to require their deportation, the country from which they sail refuses to accept them and it is not possible for us to deport them. Therefore we must take the power to exclude, and that power we may exercise or not at our option.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister says they propose to take the power, and whether that power would be exercised remains to be seen. I would infer from that statement that after all, all that is proposed is to deport for unfitness or unsuitability or disability in some respect. That is if a man is diseased, if he has trachoma, if he is indigent or something of that kind you would then propose to deport him; but is it the policy of the government to send back an intelligent, able-bodied, thoroughly healthy, well-provided man who wants to come and live in this country, simply on the ground that he has bought a ticket taking him to a certain port and then bought a ticket from that place to Canada and has not come on a through ticket? If that is the policy, it strikes me as being a very harsh and unwarranted one.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It may be time enough to discuss this on the second reading. As I understand the Minister of the Interior it is impossible to exercise these powers of excluding undesirable immigrants unless he has such power as is given here.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all right if coupled with it is a declaration of the government that they do not propose to exclude those coming on double tickets unless they are undesirable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course the proper time to discuss this is on the second reading as the Prime Minister has said. I think the interpretation put on the Bill by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) could hardly be a correct one because the government already has power to exclude all unfit persons under the Act of last year. Is that not the case? Then this is not required for that purpose.

Mr. F. D. MONK. I understand that the object of the legislation is partly to enable the government to exclude Japanese immigrants reaching Canada from any other country but their own. Those who have come in have come principally from Hawaii and the object is to exclude such immigrants. I think I have mentioned that in the United States they have passed a law taking power to exclude Japanese who do not come to the United States directly from Japan. They have reserved that power under their treaty with Japan; they are empowered for reasons of policy or other reasons to exclude Japanese from the United States. In the Anglo-Japanese treaty, no such reservation was made. Under those circumstances, would this Bill give us that power against the Japanese, inasmuch as they are guaranteed under treaty free entry into Canada exactly on the same footing as Canadians themselves.

Mr. OLIVER. We have been exercising that power against the Japanese under regulations which we now propose to confirm by legislation.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DREDGING RACQUETTE RIVER.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I wish to correct an answer which I gave to a question asked I think by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in regard to the amount of dredging which had been done on the Racquette river in the county of Vaudreuil, province of Quebec. I answered that the amount was $3,086.40. I find upon further inquiry that the dredging was not done in the Racquette river but that it was done opposite the mouth of the Racquette river at the Isle au Foin. It was intended that the dredge should work in the Racquette river but the engineers determined that this work at Isle au Foin should be done instead.

Mr. MONK. Was this dredging meant to clear the approaches to the Boat Club or the approaches to an ice house which is being erected by an individual there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that it was the dredging of a channel to enable the steamers to get to Isle au Foin.

PURCHASE OF FIRE EXTINGUISHERS.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I also wish to explain a reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) as to the purchase of fire extinguishers.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course this can only be done by consent of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend called attention to the fact that I had not given the

full number of fire extinguishers purchased. I gave the number ordered by the Public Works Department. The additional ones to which he referred, and in regard to which he gave extracts from the Auditor General's Report, were ordered by the Department of Marine for use on steamers and would not be purchased through my department.

Mr. TAYLOR. I asked in reference to all departments. Perhaps there are others in addition to the ones mentioned by the minister and those which I quoted. I wanted to know the total number.

## INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the attention of the government to three returns moved for by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington): on December 4, relating to the construction of drill halls, on December 11, relating to the Ross rifle, and on December 11 relating to the contract betwen the government and the Ross Rifle Company. A very considerable period has elapsed since these returns were moved for and inquiry has been made more than once but they have not been brought down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Directions were at once given to prepare the returns relating to drill halls as speedily as possible. They are being prepared in regular order and I expect the return will be forthcoming very shortly.

## IMMIGRATION FRAUDS AT HALIFAX.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the Minister of the Interior whether any steps are being taken to ascertain what amount, if any, has been improperly taken from immigrants landing or proposing to land at Halifax and whether it is the intention of the government to endeavour to procure restitution in case money has been improperly taken from any of these persons ?

Mr. OLIVER. The question of restitution has not been under consideration, but investigation is now in progress and I will be able to report from time to time any information to the House.

## PAY OF HALIFAX GARRISON.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the attention of the government been directed to a press despatch from Halifax which reads as follows :

The salaries are overdue—A great deal of discontent amongst military at Halifax.

Halifax, Nova Scotia, March 24.—There is a great deal of discontent among the military who garrison Halifax because their pay is not forthcoming. The rank and file are accustomed to receive their wages weekly, and in some cases fortnightly. Nobody has been paid since the end of February, and there is a lot of kicking.

The only thing that prevents a real outbreak of trouble is the fact that the men are getting scrip for small amounts, but good only at the canteens.

The Canadian troops, who now constitute the garrison, are saying that never, when the troops here were British, was the pay allowed to become overdue. A year ago there was a similar delay in paying the forces at Halifax.

The non-production of supplementary estimates at Ottawa is said to be the cause of the present difficulty.

When the pay will be forthcoming is a serious question with the soldiers.

Is the condition of affairs correctly described in this despatch ? The situation seems to be regarded as somewhat serious and surely it is a rather undignified position for this country to have its soldiers paid in scrip which can only be passed at the canteen.

Mr. FIELDING. I am unable to give information as to the scrip. I am aware that owing to the fact that the supplementary estimates for the current year have not been voted there has been some difficulty in paying the men. We had hoped on Tuesday evening when the House was in committee that we would be able to reach these estimates, but as hon. gentlemen are aware, we did not make much progress. I would be happy to arrange now to go into Committee of Supply and carry the other estimates immediately if the hon. gentlemen will agree to that, but I do not suppose that would be satisfactory. However, at a very early day, as soon as the budget debate is over, we will take them up as the first order and endeavour to dispose of them.

Mr. BERGERON. Were not the main estimates of last year good until the 31st of March of this year ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, if there were enough. The Minister of Militia himself is laid aside by illness, but I hope the officials of the department will be here soon; a number of other officials were here waiting the whole evening. I do not know that the matter of the militia is of any more importance than moneys that are due to officials in other departments. We are desirous of getting the estimates for them, and as soon as the budget debate is over we will be happy to bring them on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have never yet been able to understand why there is so constant a need of these supplementary estimates, particularly in a case like this, where the amount required is pretty well known in the first instance. I have pressed upon the government a good many times as the Minister of Finance knows, that they should endeavour to make ample provision in the first instance and not resort to supplementary estimates. I think the position of the troops is a little different, because the military regulations prevent them from making any complaint. I would be pre-

pared with this side of the House to put through the militia estimates in order that these men could be paid, and I would do it at once. Everything that can be discussed on these items can be discussed on some other items.

Mr. FIELDING. I should be very happy at once to proceed with the militia estimates. I have not the officials of the department present, but they can be sent for and will be here shortly.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice when I may expect the return with reference to printing, in the case of the 'Sun,' the 'Chronicle' and the 'Echo.'

Mr. BERGERON. You will allow us to discuss all these matters later on the main estimates.

Mr. FIELDING. Every one of these questions is touched upon in the main estimates.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. With the understanding that if there were any technical question, we should be at liberty to discuss on the main estimates everything that could be discussed on these.

Mr. FIELDING. Quite so. The hon. gentleman might extend the suggestion, not merely to the militia, but to the whole of the supplementary estimates and put them all through immediately, on the same condition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We will pass the militia estimates for the moment.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not mean for the militia only, but for other items just as urgent

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would not care about consenting to that for the present. We will pass the militia estimates now, on account of this trouble which might become serious. As for the proposal of the Minister of Finance, we will take that into consideration.

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

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

Mr. PUGSLEY. With regard to the estimates of my department, there are quite a number of contractors who have large numbers of labouring men depending upon them for the payment of their wages, and it would be a great advantage to a lot of people if they could be treated as well as the militia.

Mr R. L. BORDEN. I have said to the Minister of Finance that we will pass the militia estimates first, and take the other proposition into consideration. Why were not the supplementary estimates brought on long ago? Why was not provision made in the first place? I suggested that the militia estimates should be taken first on account of the discussion which arose.

Militia and Defence—annual drill—further amount required, $235,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it possible that we have had the annual drills for 1907-8 and that there is still due and unpaid $325,000? Does the minister know what that means?

Mr. FIELDING. I am sorry but I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information.

Mr. FOSTER. It needs explanation.

Mr. FIELDING. It needs explanation, perhaps. I had the officials here the other night but I could not answer my hon. friend's question now.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, we will take it up afterwards.

Militia and Defence—provisions and supplies—further amount required, $75,000.

Mr. FOSTER. There again, does the minister know how that amount of $75,000 for provisions and supplies, and which have all been used, is being carried?

Mr. FIELDING. I could not answer my hon. friend off-hand.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that the minister should get into communication with the officials and when we go on with the estimates to-night he may be able to make a statement and put it on 'Hansard' so that we will have an opportunity of reading it before we come to those items again.

Mr. FIELDING. I will try and get them to give me a statement.

Militia and Defence—customs dues—further amount requried, $75,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister can tell us about that.

Mr. FIELDING. It used to be the practice to allow the departments to import all their goods free of duty. Of course, it is a mere matter of accounting. It appears as a charge against one department and it is credited to another. It was thought that the system was capable of abuse and in the amended tariff it was provided that all articles imported by the various departments should pay their proper duties and this item is intended for that purpose.

Mr. HENDERSON. That goes to swell the revenue of the government.

Mr. FIELDING. And it also swells the expenditure, so that it balances.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister intend to go on to-night with these supplementary Estimates?

Mr. FIELDING. I think the House will devote the evening to the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. If there is no objection we will leave item 317.

Mr. FIELDING. Very good. I have sent word to the officials to be here at eight o'clock.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital —Lachine canal—rebuilding slope walls, $124,-000.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister please explain that ?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The estimated cost of this work is $475,000. The contractors have performed this year $124,000 more work than we anticipated they would get through.

Mr. BERGERON. Who are the contractors ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Messrs. Haney, Miller, Quinlan and Robertson.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you spell it H-e-n-e-y ?

Mr. GRAHAM. H-a-n-e-y. I have it that way in my note.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Railways and Canals has no business to enter into a contract for the amount that he is asking us to vote to-day.

Mr. GRAHAM. It depends on the method of doing it. I imagine that the proper way of doing it is to say that it shall be subject to the money being voted.

Mr. HAGGART. You should bring down the total estimated cost of the work, get a vote for that and then get a vote to provide for your annual expenditure. Suppose a work is going to cost $4,000,000 and you have a vote entitling you to enter into a contract by which $300,000 is to be paid out this year, you have no right to exceed that limit. You might have a couple of hundred thousand dollars immediately available and enter into a contract for $1,000,-000 which you have no authority to do.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total amount of this work ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The estimated cost is $475,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this work near the end of the canal ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the exact location of it. This is one of the large works that has been undertaken and it is costing nearly $500,000. About $238,000 has been paid on it already.

Mr. BERGERON. How can my hon. friend control these contractors if they have done $124,000 more work than they were supposed to have done during the fiscal year ? How do we know that the work for which this amount of money has been paid has really been done ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have a government engineer who makes a report to us as the work is performed.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is the inspector there ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I could not give the hon. gentleman the information.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister had better give us an explanation now. There is about $335,000 expended on the capital account on the Intercolonial Railway and there is $1,500,000 in working expenses. The people are not out of that money all this time ; there must have been some arrangement made with them. How is it done ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will explain that matter when we come to the item.

Mr. FOSTER. How long is this amount you are asking for overdue?

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be overdue in different amount as we go along. That is the amount of work completed up to the 31st of March as I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any arrangement been made to pay the contractors in the meantime ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think so. When they exceed the estimate they do it on the understanding that it will be voted by parliament.

Mr. J. D. REID. According to the Auditor General's Report the only contractors on the Lachine canal seem to be Coulson, Quinlan, and Robertson. I cannot see where Haney and Miller come in at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. The name of the firm has been given to me as Haney, Miller, Quinlan and Robertson.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely this sloping wall could not be built in the winter.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed they worked later than was anticipated, and I believe a good deal of it can be done in the winter.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of work is it?

Mr. GRAHAM. Partly stone and partly concrete.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think they can do any concrete work in the winter and if it was done earlier in the season there was ample time to provide for payment.

Mr. GRAHAM. It could not be passed until the supplementary estimates were brought down.

Mr. SPROULE. They might have been down three months ago.

Mr. CONMEE. If the hon. gentleman knows anthing about the business he would know that a great deal of that class of work can be done in the winter as well as in the summer, and it is just as perfect when done

in the winater as when done in the summer. I have done that work mself.

Mr. FOSTER. Did you get it passed ?

Mr. CONMEE. If the hon. gentleman wants to be humorous he can make as much sport out of it as he likes. I am telling him what is going on and if he does not know it he had better make inquiries and learn something about it.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the total amount of the work ?

Mr. GRAHAM. $475,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What has been paid up to date?

Mr. GRAHAM. The total payment up to the 1st of November has been $238,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Was the whole amount voted last year ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It must have been.

Mr. BERGERON. I cannot understand where this $124,000 comes in.

Mr. SPROULE. I am still not satisfied that this concrete work can be done in the winter time, especially the building of a sloping wall. Of course if you could protect it from the frost it is all right, but nevertheless it is more expensive to build it in winter than in summer, and if it was built in the summer payment should have been provided for it long ago.

Mr. GRAHAM. I can promise my hon. friend that I will give him full information on the main estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been long enough in the House to understand that this is an unsatisfactory way of doing business. When we are discussing the main estimates if we ask for information on the supplementary estimates we are told it is not at hand and so we are jollied along without getting information. I object to that.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

## After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was this contract let by tender ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. How many tenderers were there ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Only one was received. The contract was originally let to Quinlan & Robertson. But they were getting on rather slowly with the work, and Haney & Miller joined them, and the work has been going on more rapidly.

Mr. J. D. REID. This is for electrical supplies as well?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is another item.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the estimated cost of this work?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is $475,000. So far, $238,269 has been paid and $124,000 is due.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it going to run over the estimate ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot say exactly. It is still well within the estimate.

Mr. J. D. REID. How much of the work is done ? Is there not any way of judging whether it is going to run over the estimate or not ?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no way of reaching an absolute conclusion on that subject in the meantime.

Mr. SPROULE. At what figure was the contract let ?

Mr. GRAHAM. At schedule prices per cubic yard.

Mr. SPROULE. Could it not be measured, so as to make it a contract for a specific amount ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, they have to tear down crumbling works, and, if more falls than is expected, it makes the cost greater.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the wall of the canal ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The work is re-facing the slope wall.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do I understand that tenders were called for by advertisement in the newspapers and only one tenderer answered ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is it per cubic yard ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contract is $8 per cubic yard.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that for solid stone work ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Concrete.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not laid in concrete?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed that it is.

Mr. HAGGART. The old work was not laid in concrete, it was a dry wall.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. At page W—42 of the Auditor General's Report, I find mention of payments to Coulson, Quinlan & Robertson on account of rebuilding old locks 1 and 2. That is not this contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, that is a different contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was this contract commenced after March 31, 1907?

Mr. GRAHAM. Before that.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then, there ought to be some particulars of it in the Auditor General's Report. To what page should I turn to find it?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not find it in the Auditor General's Report, but, I have no doubt, it is there, as the work has been going on for some time.

Mr. J. D. REID. At page W—18, I find record of payments in connection with slope walls. But I do not see the names of Quinlan & Robertson.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose this work is done in winter, as they could only work when the canal is unwatered?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was at first necessary to do this work when the water was out of the canal, but now they have arranged a plant which enables them to go on with the work with the water in the canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the minister could refer us to the page in the Auditor General's Report, we could see the details of these expenditures.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) will refer to page 5548 of 'Hansard' of last year, he will find an explanation of this vote. The discussion was on a vote of $90,000 taken then on account of this contract. It was stated by the minister at that time that $235,000 would be required for this contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. But the minister says that this work has been going on for several years, and in that case, the records should appear in the Auditor General's Report. The expenditures from this vote of $90,000 passed last session, of course, would not be in the present Auditor General's Report.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the minister will explain, now that we have had an explanation from the hon. gentleman from Nova Scotia, how this work, which was estimated to cost $256,000, has cost $400,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is mistaken. The hon. member for Sydney (Mr. Johnston) said the estimate was $235,000 more. The work had been going on before that.

Mr. HAGGART. He said the work was to cost $255,000, and $90,000 was required for this year.

Mr. GRAHAM. To complete the work.

Mr. JOHNSTON. For the information of my hon. friend, I would recall to him that last year he asked the minister what it would take to finish and the minister said $235,000.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. HAGGART. $235,000 and $90,000 make $325,000. It is costing, according to the minister, now $400,000. He said it would require $400,000 to finish.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is wrong. The estimate altogether is $475,000. On that there has been paid already $238,369. We now owe $124,000. The balance between these two amounts and $475,000 is what it will take to finish the work. That will be in the main estimates this year.

Mr. BLAIN. If the hon. minister will turn up page 5548 of last session's 'Hansard' he will find that the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Haggart) asked what it would take to finish. The answer given was: The total estimated cost was $235,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. That meant to complete. That is the fact anyway.

Mr. J. D. REID. I see in the Auditor General's Report on page W—2 that the total amount paid on capital Lachine canal is for electrical installation, slope walls and dredges. On page W—8 the slope walls cost $4,756.76. I cannot see whether this work was going on prior to that. If it had been, it would be in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. GRAHAM. There was very little work done this year. I cannot say anything about the Auditor General's Report because that is not part of my duty.

Mr. J. D. REID. If there is anything wrong in the report, it is part of the minister's duty to tell us why it is wrong. Can he tell us the date this contract was let?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot give that. It has been going on several years. But there will be another estimate for this work, and I will endeavour to get the information.

Soulanges canal—to pay Manning & Macdonald's claim for selected material behind walls, as certified to by Engineer Grant and Chief Engineer Schreiber, 28,452 cubic yards at 50 cents—revote of lapsed amount, $14,271.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this certified to by engineer Grant?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. The Auditor General says no. He refused to pay it on account of its not being certified to by engineer Grant.

Mr. GRAHAM. It has been certified to since then.

Mr. HAGGART. There was correspondence between the minister's department and the Auditor General. The Auditor General refused to pay because Mr. Grant would not certify that the contractors were entitled to their claim under the contract. Then it was left to Mr. Schreiber who reported in favour of it.

Mr. GRAHAM. There was no doubt a lot of correspondence but Mr. Grant gave his certificate nevertheless.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the hon. minister certain ? In his report Mr. Grant says that the work comes under the contract and refuses to certify to it as an extra. Then there is an appeal to Mr. Schreiber and the department takes the opinion of the law officers.

Mr. J. D. REID. On page W—35 of the Auditor General's Report there is a letter to the Treasury Board from Mr. Grant in which he reports adversely on the claim except as regards 1,220 cubic yards.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Grant did nevertheless give his certificate and the Deputy Minister of Justice advised that the government pay the claim.

Mr. J. D. REID. Cases of this kind, I understand, are allowed to go to the Exchequer Court. But in this matter it seems the claim was just passed through the department and had to be paid.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the Deputy Minister of Justice, our legal adviser tells us that the contractor can recover in the Exchequer Court, is it not better to pay the amount than go to court and pay costs as well ?

Mr. J. D. REID. That was after Schreiber has made his report.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. The moment the government had a man, who was favourable to the contractor, to make a report in his favour, that committed the government. That contract was let when Mr. Schreiber was deputy minister. He was the man responsible. It is like the cases we have had before the Public Accounts Committee. The man who certifies to the claim is sent to see that the claim is right. Then it comes before the Justice Department, and of course the Justice Department says it must be paid.

Mr. GRAHAM. These contracts all say that the chief engineer shall be the sole judge, and Mr. Schreiber was the chief engineer. I am free to admit that if I had my way I would revise these forms of contract, but some people do not agree with me. That is our contract.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister has repeated again and again that Mr. Grant has certified in favour of this claim. Let me read the wording of Mr. Grant's report, under date of August, 1903 :

All other filling in rear of the masonry walls is composed of all classes of material arising from the excavation on the section and was dumped in place from cars, wagons or carts, without any other labour spent on levelling it down, other than what would be necessary to keep the tip end of any high bank flattened out. Payment for this large quantity is now demanded at the contract schedule rate of 50 cents per cubic yard, no work on which was carried out according to paragraph 74 and 23 of the specifications. The claim should, therefore, not be entertained.

Mr. GRAHAM. He gave his certificate since that time and the Justice Department instructed us to pay it.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister states that the engineer shall be the sole judge of this.

Mr. GRAHAM. The contract says that.

Mr. J. D. REID. But it does not say he must and that is the impression the minister is trying to leave on the House. Here is a letter at W—364 from Mr. Butler that explains the whole matter in so far as going to the courts is concerned. It is addressed to the Auditor General dated December 22, 1906, and is in part as follows :

Mr. Hayter is not an engineer, and under the contract it is provided that the engineer shall be the sole judge of work and material in respect of both quality and quantity, and his decision on all questions in dispute with regard to work or materials, or as to the meaning or intention of this contract and the plans, specifications and drawings shall be final, and no works or extra or additional works or changes shall be deemed to have been executed, nor shall the contractor be entitled to payment for the same, unless the same shall have been executed to the satisfaction of the engineer, as evidenced by his certificate in writing, which certificate shall be a condition precedent to the right of the contractor to be paid therefor. (Section 8.)

That is what is in the contract but that is only to protect the government. The government may if they wish insist on his decision being final, but if the minister in charge is not satisfied with that then he can appeal to the courts as Mr. Butler goes on and says :

I have read the contract with care and can find no provisions in it that the Audit Office shall interpret the meaning of the contract, or how it shall be carried out.

This matter was, as I stated in my former letter, one that was handled entirely by my predecessor; and I do not feel called upon to re-open questions that were disposed of by him, and of which I can have no personal knowledge. If, under the circumstances, you see fit to refuse payment, the contractors will, I presume, have their remedy at law by action against the government for the amount with interest, from the date the certificate was sent to your office.

That is as plain as A, B, C. The government could have sent that to the Exchequer Court but for some reason they let Mr. Schreiber go down and give a certificate that the work was all right, which he could not help giving because he was the man who had certified to it up to that date. They let him give another certificate and the deputy Minister of Justice, I am satis-

fied, could not have given any other decision than he did because the government tied itself up the very moment they let Mr. Schreiber give that certificate.

Galops canal.

| | |
|---|---|
| Upper entrance—final estimate.. .. .. | $16,900 |
| North channel and cut dam between Les Galops and Adams islands—final estimate.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 15,000 |
| | 31,900 |

Mr. J. D. REID. Does that complete the contract ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. What has been the total cost of these two works ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The total cost of the Galops canal has been $6,060,192.

Mr. HAGGART. What has been the cost of the works at the upper entrance ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The expenditure on the upper entrance has been :

| | |
|---|---|
| To June 30, 1906.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $2,022,017 |
| From June 30, 1906, to March 31, 1907 | 45,000 |
| Total expenditure to March 31, 1907.. | 2,067,017 |
| From March 31 to November 30, 1907 | 54,349 |
| Total expenditure.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 2,121,366 |

Mr. HAGGART. On the upper entrance?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Cleveland contract at the upper entrance is not included in this?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Are they using the Galops channel at all ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it is sometimes used by vessels going down but not by vessels coming up.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the depth of water ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there is 14-foot navigation.

Mr. HAGGART. On the Galops ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That was the intention.

Mr. HAGGART. It was the intention but it was not secured.

Mr. J. D. REID. Not one large vessel of the class for which this channel was intended, that is grain carriers drawing 14 feet of water, has ever used this channel. I defy the minister to state that one of these vessels ever used that Galops channel. It has been used by some of the little boats that would have run down the old channel.

Mr. FOSTER. Then what was the purpose of the expenditure?

Mr. J. D. REID. It was $800,000 just thrown away. No large steamer has used it and none ever will because the insurance companies will not accept a risk on any vessel that goes down that channel.

Mr. GRAHAM. The work on the Galops channel has been going on for a great many years, ever since I was a young man. The object, as I always understood it, was to get a 14-foot channel. I am told by some men who own large vessels that as the water is very swift they would prefer going through the canal rather than take the chances of this canal with their large vessels. I cannot say whether they have ever run down there or not.

Mr. J. D. REID. I know they have not, because I have made inquiries and have ascertained that the insurance companies will not allow them to go down. This dam between Thomas island and the Galops was put there at a great cost for the purpose of making the channel so that it could be used, but it has not made the channel any better. I am quite sure it will never be used, because no insurance company will allow vessels to go down. For the last eight or nine years I have pressed on the government to stop the work because it was money thrown away, and I was told every year that that was the last year there would be any amount voted for that purpose, but the expenditure has continued. Will the present minister state that this work is actually finished, and that no more money will be spent on it? After the government had taken the work off the contractors' hands and notified the public that there was 14 feet of water, I insisted on an investigation and told them that I was willing to assume there was not more than 10 feet. The government went on afterwards and spent a couple of hundred thousand dollars to make it 14 feet, and there is not 14 feet of water there to-day.

To reimburse Lachine and Soulanges repairs appropriations—Leak at lock 1, Lachine canal, $21,700.

Mr. BERGERON. Do not the boats which caused the accident pay the damage?

Mr. GRAHAM. The boat has paid for that.

Mr. HAGGART. Did you pay the cost of repairs by Governor General's warrant?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am sorry that I had to follow the precedent that we have heard discussed. We took the money out of another appropriation, and we want to reimburse it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Was there any justification for that?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes ; we had to do the work at once or stop navigation.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would it not be better to stop navigation than to break the constitution?

Mr. GRAHAM. That depends on circumstances.

Mr. SPROULE. If navigation was stopped that might make a fairly good justification for resorting to Governor General's warrant. Then why should the minister adopt the wrong course, and take it from an appropriation that was never intended to be spent for that purpose?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend that that perhaps would have been the proper course. But emergencies like these sometimes arise—what you may call a rush order—and it had to be done immediately.

Mr. BLAIN. Last year $8,250 were expended in interlocking steel beams. Was this all that was expended, and how many were constructed for that amount?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot tell my hon. friend that until I get the report from the engineer. Those interlocking beams were really protectors to protect the gates from being carried away by tugs. The amount mentioned in the Auditor General's Report is the portion expended; I cannot say for the rest.

Welland canal—to dredge slide in deep cut, $6,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is that for?

Mr. GRAHAM. This has reference to the deep cut between Port Robinson and Allanford. There was a slide of 15,000 cubic yards and it will have to be removed before the opening of navigation.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the work been done by contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not done yet.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is there some one working at it now?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have very great doubts as to whether we will be able to pay it out of this vote, in fact, I think we cannot.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total cost of this work?

Mr. GRAHAM. We cannot tell yet. I think there is a second slide which will cause another appropriation. I think we had better drop this $6,000 because we will not be able to use it before the end of the year. I therefore beg to move that the item be stricken out.

Motion agreed to.

Welland canal—to renew entrance piers at Port Maitland, $21,460.

Mr. HAGGART. What is that for?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to complete the contract.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount of the contract and what is the amount expended?

Mr. GRAHAM. The total up to date is $62,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the amount of the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. My information is that it is a schedule contract by the yard amounting to about $84,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Does this finish it?

Mr. GRAHAM. This finishes it.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is the contractor?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Conroy, of Peterborough.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the total cost of building the Port Maitland pier?

Mr. GRAHAM. About $84,000. There is a balance of $21,460 to be applied in payment of the final estimate.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is the inspector of this work?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think I answered that question in reply to a question this year—did I not? It has gone from me now.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister answered a question put by myself. Samuel Braund, I think, he told me, was the inspector. I asked what qualifications he had for the work and on whose recommendation he had been appointed, but the reply was that there was no record in the department to show upon whose recommendation he had been appointed. I certainly would very much like to know who recommended him for that position.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister would be able to say who recommended this gentleman for that position.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no record in the department to show who recommended him. I myself seldom keep any record. The minister has to take the responsibility for all these appointments.

Mr. BLAIN. Since the minister is not able to tell the committee I think that perhaps I will take the opportunity of informing the minister myself from a record of his own department. I see a letter dated Ottawa, April 25, 1907, as follows:

I have to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 13th instant relative to the desired appointment of an inspector of crib work on the works of repair to be executed in connection with the east pier at Port Maitland, on the Welland canal.

In reply, I have to say that, on communicating with Mr. A. T. Thompson, solicitor, of this city, who controls the distribution of the patronage in the district in which the work is situated, requesting him to nominate a suitable and competent person for the said posi-

tion, he has advised the department, under date the 22nd instant, that he is in receipt of a letter stating that Mr. Samuel Braund was appointed as such inspector, and that he received official notification of his appointment a good while ago, probably, he says, three months ago. Mr. Thompson adds that he had quite forgotten the circumstance attending this appointment.

Be pleased to notify Mr. Braund when his services are required.

I am, sir,
Your obedent servant,
L. K. JONES,
Secretary.

I may say that there is a good deal of correspondence in connection with this appointment.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not mine.

Mr. BLAIN. Of course, the hon. gentleman will not repudiate his predecessor. He is responsible for the department and he will be able to take notice that it is carrying out to the letter the system of patronage. Here is a gentleman who was a candidate in the county and who had moved to the city of Ottawa to engage in his profession, about which I have nothing to say. My hon. friend's department seeks him out and asks him to name a man and this gentleman names a man who, I am informed, had no qualifications whatever for the position.

Mr. J. D. REID. He was a tailor was he not ?

Mr. BLAIN. I think if my hon. friend the minister is not able to state to the committee what qualifications the inspector had we must ask the member for the county to make a statement. Then, perhaps, I will refresh the minister's memory with one or two letters in connection with it.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) speaks we ought to know whether the hon. minister has a competent man in charge of a work involving an expenditure of $84,000, whether he or his officers think that he is capable. I am quite certain that the minister will not undertake to defend a mere piece of patronage in the carrying out of an operation involving $84,000 of the people's money in a work which requires the very best overseeing and engineering ability, I should think, and certainly sobriety and steadiness. Does the minister really know what are the qualifications of this man ? Is the Deputy Minister not able to tell the minister that he made a thorough and conscientious inquiry and satisfied himself that he was a competent man to superintend that work and do it in a proper way ? This appears to be one of the, I am afraid, many instances where these things are simply matters of patronage and in which works are controlled as to supervision by men who know absolutely nothing about them at all, and, besides, knowing absolutely nothing about them, are men you would not put in charge of any work that required steadiness. I would like to know if the minister knows anything about the qualifications of that man ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman will see when he makes the insinuation that this man was in charge of a work costing $84,000 that he is all wrong. One of the best engineers in the employ of the government, Mr. Weller, is in charge of that work and is responsible to the government. He is responsible for keeping this man if he is not a good man. We hold Mr. Weller, an engineer of eminent ability responsible for this work.

Mr. LALOR. Mr. Weller is superintendent of the Welland canal and lives thirty or forty miles from there. I know from actual experience that Mr. Weller is seldom seen in connection with the work. In the main estimates there is a very large amount for building the west pier at Port Maitland. I can tell the minister that the contractor who built this same work equally as good as it is being built to-day and with just as good material, only a few years ago bulit the pier for a sum much less than $40,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a big difference between three years ago and now.

Mr. BENNETT. Cement is cheaper.

Mr. LALOR. He told me he paid as high wages at that time as are paid to-day.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the work cost $40,000 two years ago surely it cannot cost $80,000 now.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister said that Mr. Weller was responsible for this work, but Mr. Weller is not responsible for the man the government appointed to supervise the work. No doubt that man was appointed under the patronage system which is very well described in the report of the Civil Service Commission which says :

It would seem that in the four post offices examined into by the commission letter-carriers were employed to do high grade duty and duties of clerks; that they are still designated on the pay-list as letter-carriers; that in consequence of a desire on the part of the officials not to bring these letter-carriers in their uniforms to the public notice, they to their loss, have been deprived of their uniforms as well as their street car fares. In that special branch of the public service politics was found, as a rule, to play an important part. The commissioners consider from the evidence submitted to them that on the part of responsible officials of the several departments, especially in the outside service, there is a dread of the politician, and every bit of strategy is resorted to to circumvent the carrying out of the patronage system.

In the matter of promotions the same patronage fear is apparent. Your commissioners found in their rounds that a collector of cus-

toms, a city postmaster, a post office inspector and others were appointed politically. The recent appointment of a postmaster at Kingston was on the recommendation of the patronage committee; the last appointment to the postmastership at Montreal, the most important in the Dominion, was given to an aged member of parliament, 67 years old.

As the almost universal practice is that no person is promoted out of his district and transferred to higher duties in another place, and that with few exceptions no person is promoted out of his class, it follows that young men, entering the public service in the several divisions to which they have been appointed, see that however hard they may work, and whatever intelligence they bring to bear upon their duties, there is no chance of getting out of the class to which they are appointed. Your commissioners have been told, and believe, that promotions have been made as a matter of politics, not in every case, but in many cases, and that people have been brought in from the outside over the heads of men who have given their lifetime to the departments, to fill the few positions of any superiority in the public service.

That is the way the patronage system works. The engineer has nothing to say about the appointment of this man and he has got to put up with him whether he is good or bad.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the particular work of this gentleman ?

Mr. GRAHAM. His duty is the supervision of the work under the control of the engineering staff headed by Mr. Weller, and he sees that the specifications of the contract are carried out in detail.

Mr. FOSTER. Was Mr. Weller asked to report on this man's competency to do that work ?

Mr. GRAHAM. In our department information is sent out to the engineer saying that so and so has been appointed or recommended and asking the engineer to see if he is qualified for the position, and we hold the engineer absolutely responsible. It is his duty to dismiss a man that is not competent no matter by whom he is recommended.

Mr. FOSTER. Was inquiry made of Mr. Weller in this instance ? I want the minister if he knows to say so and if he does not know, not to say so.

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot say positively. I have no reason to think the rule is not followed in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the minister can find out.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a large work and a great deal of money is involved, and if you are to have an inspector at all he should be a good man. If there is no inspector of course the whole thing is in the contractors' hands except for an occasional visit from the engineer. What should be done is to leave the engineer a free choice to select the best man and then hold him responsible, But when you send Mr. Weller a man, or send any other engineer a man for the position, you will not find one engineer out of fifty who will interfere with the minister's appointee. He simply looks upon it as a matter of patronage and if the minister sends a man he will not interfere. I suppose we never will know how many millions of dollars of money has been wasted in the construction of works in this country because the minister has forced upon the work the nominees of party supporters instead of throwing the whole matter upon the engineering staff and holding them responsible for proper inspection. The system now in force has been the system for many years and it is a bad system.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister is to be congratulated that the inspector has not been appointed by the contractor but by the defeated candidate. If we look to the Public Works Department—I hope the present minister will not ruffle his pin feathers when I mention it—the practice is for the contractors to appoint the inspectors.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You say the contractors appoint the inspectors?

Mr. BENNETT. Certainly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not.

Mr. BENNETT. Why the inspector swore to it in a case we had before us.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That may be a long time ago.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, we will see what the present minister will do. Of course there is a great advantage in having the contractor appoint the inspector because the inspector is subservient to the contractor. In the case of the Penetanguishene Dredging Company the inspector swore that the secretary-treasurer of the company appointed him and he felt very thankful to him for it. In the case of the Great Lakes Dredging Company which does a lot of dredging all over the country, Mr. Bowman and Mr. Bowman's brother, half owners of the stock of that company, they appoint all the inspectors for work done on the Georgian bay.

Mr. BERGERON. Who pays the inspectors ?

Mr. BENNETT. The government does. Take another company, the Dominion Dredging Company, at Midland. Who appoints the inspector? Mr. Tudhope, the local member, who has the patronage. In past seasons—they are not doing dredging now—every one has been laughing at the fact that the scows go out with little or nothing in them. And when the contractor comes down and is pressed for an answer to ques-

tions, he admits that the inspector is not there, but he is sure that the inspector's reports are right, because his man tells the inspector what is taken out, and his man is a truthful man. To make sure they start out at five o'clock in the morning, when the inquisitive public are not likely to see them going out. I congratulate the minister (Mr. Graham) that he is not caught in this case —not saying that there are cases in his department on which he could be caught. To my mind, this is an exemplary case as compared with some that are known.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister say that the engineer is responsible for this man's qualifications and for his discharge of his duty?

Mr. GRAHAM. I said that the engineer was responsible for the work this man does, as he is for the work done by every man under him. If the man does not perform his duties properly it is the duty of the engineer to discharge him.

Mr. BERGERON. But if the engineer is forty miles away——

Mr. GRAHAM. The engineer may have his residence at some distance, but he is superintending engineer of the canal, a permanent employee of the department, and he has his staff. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not say that we do not engage a sufficiently large staff.

Mr. LALOR. The inspector seems to have complete charge of this work. Mr. Weller may be held responsible, but I doubt that he is often seen near the work. I have had a contract on the Welland canal myself, and I know that we did not see much of the engineer in charge.

Mr. BLAIN. Just to show how the politicians press themselves and their appointments on this government——

Mr. GRAHAM. Or any government.

Mr. BLAIN—let me read this letter :

Ottawa, September 24, 1906.

The Department of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa.

Sirs,—Re Port Maitland piers—repairs.

Extensive repairs are being made, or are about to be made, at Port Maitland, in Haldimand county, on the piers there.

The Department of Public Works writes me that they know nothing of the matter, and that probably it is being done by Railways and Canals. If this be so, I ask the privilege of suggesting an inspector for the works, as I was asked to do so when the Dunnville dam was built by the Public Works Department.

The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) will take note of this.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was it the contractor who wrote that letter?

Mr. BLAIN. No, it was the politician.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said it was the contractor who named them.

Mr. BENNETT. I said the contractors had the monopoly in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Pugsley's) department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has a very vivid imagination.

Mr. BLAIN. Let me finish this letter :

If you have not got these improvements in hand, can you inform me what department has?

Yours truly,
ANDREW T. THOMPSON.

That is signed by the government's candidate in the last election. Now, to show whether the hon. gentleman can hold the engineer responsible for this man or not, here are three letters :

Department of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, October 10, 1906.

Sir,—I have to request to be pleased to inform the department whether an inspector will be required for the works of repair to be executed in connection with the piers at Port Maitland, on the line of the Welland canal.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
L. K. JONES,
Secretary.

J. L. Weller, Esq.,
Superintending engineer, Welland canal,
St. Catharines.

St. Catharines, Ontario, October 11, 1906.

L. K. Jones, Esq.,
Secretary, Department of Railways and Canals, Ottawa, Ontario.

Sir,—Replying to your communication of the 10th instant, file No. 5270, I beg to say that an inspector of crib work will be required in connection with the contract for the renewal of the pier at Port Maitland. The services of this man will not be required for some time, however, but when the contractor begins active operations.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
J. L. WELLER,
Superintending engineer.

St. Catharines, Ontario, April 13, 1907.

L. K. Jones, Esq.,
Secretary, Department of Railways and Canals, Ottawa, Ontario.

Sir,—Referring to your communication of the 10th October, 1906, file No. 5270, I beg to say that I shall shortly require an inspector of crib work for the renewal of the east pier at Port Maitland. If you will send the name of the party recommended, I shall notify him when his services are required.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
J. L. WELLER,
Superintending engineer.

That shows that the engineer had no power to select the inspector, but the first information he gets is a letter that Mr. Thompson has recommended a certain man, and that man is appointed. Surely the minister will not suggest, in the light of this

correspondence, that the engineer could be held responsible for his work. The man was appointed in the usual political way, the politician recommending, the name being sent to the engineer, and the man going to work without regard to his qualifications.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does Mr. Thompson recommend the salary he is to get as well as the man?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) is not so innocent as he pretends to be. He has supported governments and recommended men for positions time and time again, and he knows that I know a lot of them. And I am afraid that my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) is not so innocent as he pretends to be. What these hon. gentlemen have said may be a argument in favour of this country looking into the question of civil service reform. But these arguments would have applied just as well at any time since confederation. But when these hon. gentlemen blandly insist, contrary to all precedent or custom that the government in power should not suggest the men to be appointed to positions, I think they do not expect the country to take them seriously so long as we have our present system.

Mr. BERGERON. So long as the men can do the work.

Mr. GRAHAM. No person has suggested that this work is not well done.

Mr. BERGERON. We do not know.

Mr. GRAHAM. The engineer in charge, who is responsible for the work, has reported that it is well done. Unless somebody is prepared to say that the officials do not do their duty, it seems to me safe to believe that the work has been done satisfactorily.

Mr. LALOR. In my own section, whether the work is done properly or not, people say that the cost is far in excess of what it should be. Who is responsible for the excessive cost I do not know. But I should think it could be traceable to its source. In the original estimates, which I cannot find at present, there was a large amount for building the west pier which seems in excess of what should be required.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a matter of estimate. As a matter of fact, three tenders were received after public advertisement, and the contract was given to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there more than one inspector on this work ?

Mr. LALOR. In reply to a question of mine, the minister said that the contract for the west pier had been given to the same contractor who had built the east pier and at the same price, without any public tender.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is an item in the main estimates for that work and it would be more in order to discuss it then.

Mr. J. D. REID. I know these works down on our own canal and in every case the engineer in charge is never allowed to appoint a man. The appointments are always recommended by the Liberal committee and the superintending engineer is powerless to dismiss them. Can the hon. minister's deputy tell him of one case where the superintending engineer ever dismissed a man ? He dare not do so. I want to ask the minister what kind of material was removed out of these piers ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Old cribwork and stone.

Mr. J. D. REID. So much a yard for removing the stone.

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot produce the schedule prices but will bring them up on the main estimates if my hon. friend insists.

Mr. LALOR. There were three tenders, and the lowest, that of Mr. Conroy for $29,831, was accepted. But we find that the work is costing $84,000. How does the minister explain the difference ?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a case of moneying out approximate quantities. The exact quantities cannot be found until they do the work.

Mr. LALOR. The engineer's estimate of the total cost was $35,230, and a tender was accepted for $29,831. But now we find that the contractor was paid $84,000. Who is responsible ?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend would not say that this work should not be done.

Mr. LALOR. No.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is considered the most practical way of asking for tenders to call for schedule prices on an amount only estimated. The amount may be more or it may be less. The lowest tender is according to the schedule prices, and my hon. friend will see that it is impossible to say just what these things will total. There was not a yard more paid for than the work performed, and it was paid at the price of the tender, which was the lowest price.

Mr. BARKER. What does the minister think would happen to an engineer of the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway who estimated to his company that a work would cost $35,000 and accepted a tender for $29,000, and then the company had to pay $84,000 ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not wish to place my opinion against that of my hon. friend because he is a man of experience, but this work was done at schedule prices.

Mr. BARKER. These companies would expect their engineer to go somewhat nearer what the work would really cost.

Mr. GRAHAM. Railway work is quite different from hydraulic work.

Mr. HAGGART. When building a pier, the engineers should know the quantities and they do know them, and they estimate according to the actual amount of work to be done. The engineer estimated the work would cost $35,000, the contractor was willing to do it for $29,000, and the amount actually expended is $84,000. Either there is the most gross carelessness on the part of the engineer or the government have been paying out money to which the contractor is not entitled. In such a work as building a pier at Port Maitland, the quantities can be estimated to a certainty. What confidence can we place on the estimates of the engineer of a department such as the Department of Railways and Canals when these estimates are exceeded by fifty per cent and sometimes doubled in the actual results ? The minister should have a better staff of engineers. The moment the estimate of an engineer is so much exceeded by the work performed, that ought to be a notice to him that he is no longer required. Is engineering an exact science or is it only rule of thumb work ? I do not know if the department placed in the mouths of the minister's predecessors the statements as to the quantity of work that would be required and which have been so generally exceeded. It would seem from these statements that engineering is not an exact science, but apparently these statements were considered sufficient to gull the people of the country and the House in order to get the estimates through. We have had enough work of this kind. This is a serious matter, the estimates of last year were exceeded by over $6,000,000. If the engineering branch of this department is so far wrong in its estimates then surely it is no longer a branch on which the department or the House can rely.

Mr. LALOR. I think we can rely on the estimate of the engineer, Mr. Weller. He is a thoroughly competent engineer and I would not at all dispute his figures. If the minister will look up the building of this same pier, which has been rebuilt several times during the last 25 years, he will find that the engineer's estimate was very close, very liberal in fact, even considering the increased cost of material. The cost of the material has been increased so greatly; stone would not cost more than it did some years ago, labour is very little higher, and the only serious increase is in the cost of the timber used. When you come to consider that the cost was $50,000 more than the estimate of the engineer and $56,000 more than the tender itself, it does look as if there was something radically wrong in connection with this matter.

Mr. BENNETT. In connection with certain inquiries that have been made in reference to dredging some very suspicious circumstances have developed; it has been shown that some rival tenderers were employing the same envelopes. The estimate in this case was $35,000 but the cost is $85,000. Any innocent man, looking at the file which I hold in my hand, would say: Here is a case of bona fide honest tenderers, here is Conroy, of Peterborough, tendering at $29,831, and here is Joseph Battle, of Thorold, tendering at $32,045. I know who Mr. Conroy is. I know a case, although I cannot recall where it was, that was under discussion some seven or eight years ago, a case of grave suspicion. From that case I would look with suspicion upon any dealings of Conroy with this or any other department. I do not say that the dealings to which I refer were with this department. He is a pronounced Liberal, a Stratton Liberal, and everybody knows what that means around Peterborough. I will not say that Mr. Battle is a Liberal, as I want to be certain about my facts, and I know there are a number of Battles around Thorold, some Liberals and some Conservatives. My hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) says that this Jos. Battle is a Liberal. A deposit had to be made with each tender. By a perusal of this file it is seen that a deposit was made by Mr. Conroy and Mr. Conroy got the contract. Mr. Conroy had a perfect right, at a certain stage of the work, to ask for a return of his cheque. Let me read not a letter but a telegram which is on this file:

Thorold, Ontario, October 22.

Department of Railways and Canals,

L. K. Jones, Secretary, Ottawa, Ontario.

Have you sent cheque and when to Edward Conroy, contractor, Peterborough, for September estimate Port Maitland pier? Telegraph reply.

JOSEPH BATTLE.

Fearful and wonderful ! Here are the deadly rival contractors and one of them asking whether this estimate cheque has been sent to the other. At first blush I thought it was the cheque that had been deposited with the tender, but no, it is the cheque of one of the estimates on the work and here is Joseph Battle wiring and asking if it had been sent to Conroy. The minister will answer that Conroy got the contract and that he and Battle apparently had some dealings between themselves, consequently Battle was interested in the contract. It looks very suspicious, and odd. Is it the same old story that we have heard in connection with the dredging contract, the Great Lakes Dredging Company, putting in a tender at 9 cents and A. F. Bowman of the same firm putting in one at 22 cents and then trusting to the dishonesty of the

then Minister of Public Works, if there were no tenders between 9 cents and 22 cents, allowing them to pull out the 9-cent tender and substitute the 22-cent tender. I do not know whether or not there was any collusion between Battle and Conroy in the matter of this tendering; I do not say there was, but it does seem odd that Battle is so concerned about the payment to Conroy that he post haste wires the department.

Let us go into the question of over-running the estimate. May I ask the minister how much dredging has been paid for under this contract up to date?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no dredging under this contract, I think.

Mr. BENNETT. The first item on it is for dredging.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed there is a little dredging for crib seats.

Mr. BENNETT. The estimate is that it would run to $3,200. May I ask the minister what it did run to?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not the information in detail of the different parts of this work.

Mr. BENNETT. Has it run nearly three times as much? I assume the dredging bills went up to $9,000 instead of $3,000. Then we have an estimate for removing the superstructure, $3,000. That was a fair estimate I suppose for that? Mr. Battle's tender for this was $4,500 and Mr. Beggie's $4,200. I do not know who Mr. Beggie is, I do not know whether he was a friend of the Battle people or not, I do not know the practice in that part of the country. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) says he is not a contractor at all, but a painter.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is all wrong. I have known Mr. Beggie for fifteen or twenty years. He has been connected with some of the largest contracts of this kind and of other kinds, in the province of Ontario.

Mr. LALOR. I am not aware of his ever having a contract. I know the family of Beggies, they are painters and paper hangers, and have been engaged in that business all their lives.

Mr. GRAHAM. He was a member at one time of the firm of Larkin & Sangster. He was a contractor also in connection with the building of large public institutions. I first met him in the village of Iroquois when he was a contractor on a work there.

Mr. BENNETT. This pier was of certain dimensions, and would require certain specified kinds of timber. Now the timber is a big item, $10,400. I ask the minister if the proportions of the pier were changed?

Mr. GRAHAM. My information is that they were not. This was tearing down an old work and replacing it. That is not like building a new work where you can make estimates with something like accuracy.

Mr. LALOR. It was tearing down and rebuilding an old pier, and the contractor, I presume, received a certain price for removal of the old material. What was done with the stone taken out of the old work?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will bring down the contract, all these things will be in the contract itself.

Mr. BENNETT. The removal of the old pier is estimated by the contractor at $3,000. It is not a question at all as to schedule prices, it is a complete tender for the removal of the superstructure at so much per cubic yard. The next question is concerning the dimensions of the pier and the quantity of timber required. The prices contracted for amount in round figures to nearly $20,000; was that all for timber alone? Will the minister make a nnote of it, and when he goes into his estimates again will he let us know exactly what the prices were for each article that was in the schedule?

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister also ascertain why Mr. Weller has never been asked for a report as to why his estimate of $35,000 has run up to $84,000?

Mr. LALOR. On December 16 last I asked certain questions of the minister regarding Port Maitland piers to which I received these answers:

Mr. LALOR asked:

1. What was the amount of Battle's tender for building piers at Port Maitland?
2. Have there been any extras? If so, what amount?
3. What is the total amount paid for work on piers at Port Maitland?
4. Is it the intention of the government to build both piers at Port Maitland?
5. Have any tenders been asked for building the west pier?
6. Who is the government inspector of the work?
7. Upon whose recommendation was he appointed?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Mr. Battle's tender was not accepted by the department for building piers at Port Maitland. The contract was awarded to Edward Conroy at his tender price, on schedule, his being the lowest.
2. No extras. On May, 1907, the superintending engineer reported that on examination, the east pier showed that about 290 feet towards the shore end was in a badly damaged condition—requiring dredging out and replacing, and made suggestion for remedying the trouble. Authority was given for completing the necessary work on schedule prices as in tender.
3. $52,780.

4. No decision has been reached by the department.
5. No.
6. Samuel Braund.
7. There does not appear to be any evidence in the department as to who recommended him.

But now we find from the return brought down that there is a very considerable amount of evidence as to who recommended Mr. Samuel Braund. Mr. Samuel Braund is one of my constituents.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend would not say that he did not do his work properly ?

Mr. LALOR. I am not prepared to discuss that, but I am prepared to say that Mr. Samuel Braund was apparently appointed inspector upon the recommendation of Colonel Andrew Thompson, and that the government made no inquiry whatever as to his responsibility or capability for doing the work, but appointed him apparently upon the recommendation of the defeated candidate. Now if public works all through this Dominion are carried on in that way, and if such exorbitant amounts are paid in excess of contract prices and inspectors are appointed purely on the recommendation of defeated candidates, it is no wonder that such large amounts of money are being wasted in Canada to-day.

Mr. BENNETT. There is further correspondence in reference to that in a letter dated St. Catherines, May 20, 1907, from Mr. Weller to the department. This paragraph occurs.

Mr. Joseph Battle is doing this work for the contractor, E. Conroy, of Peterborough, and his idea of the cost of this piling is high. He asks $1.50 as per his letter, copy of which I inclose.

It would appear then that Battle & Conroy were pretty close together.

Mr. GRAHAM. The work was done on schedule prices. The letter read by my hon. friend itself explains a lot of large amounts.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to draw the attention of the minister to the report of the Civil Service Commission, to one paragraph only, and I want to ask whether this paragraph applies to my hon. friend's department.

Your commissioners have been told and believe that promotions have been made as a matter of politics, not in every case, but in many cases, and that people have been brought in from outside over the heads of men who have given their lifetime to the department, to fill the few positions of any superiority in the public service.

Is that a custom of the department over which the hon. gentleman presides ?

Mr. LALOR.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend does not say that refers to my department in particular.

Mr. BLAIN. I am asking for information.

Mr. GRAHAM. It will open up a long question if I wanted to go into a discussion of that matter. It is not always a truism that the old employee is the best employee for certain work, but the rule that I am trying to follow in my department is that where I find an employee who is capable of advancing, I give the preference to the person in the department always if he is able to perform the work in a position next higher up.

Mr. LALOR. If the minister would accede to my request I would like him to hold the item over and bring down the inspector's estimates from time to time as the work progressed so that we will know the amount of material that is removed from this work, the amount it cost to remove it, what became of the material and particularly what became of the stone that was in this pier that was removed.

Mr. GRAHAM. The inspector never makes any estimates; the engineer does that.

Mr. LALOR. He has to make progress estimates from time to time for the contractors to get paid.

Mr. GRAHAM. The engineer makes the estimates. If my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) allows this to pass I will see he gets all the information. It will be up again in connection with the main estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. The estimated cost of this was $35,000, the actual cost is $84,000, or a difference of $40,000; in other words, the amount expended was more than double what the minister told the House the work would cost. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, once in a while, when matters come up for discussion involving large expenditures, twit the opposition by saying : You allowed this to pass, you did not enter any protest or make any motion to strike out the item and therefore you are responsible. In this case the minister presiding over that department told the opposition that this work would cost $35,000. The opposition allowed it to pass; $35,000 was put in the estimates. Then, the following year, the minister comes down and says : We have exceeded the estimate ; instead of spending $35,000, we have spent $84,000, or an increase of $49,000, on that one item. I want to point out to the Minister of Finance that when he twits the opposition in future perhaps it would be well for him to reprimand some of the ministers under him and point out that there is a very great deal of money expended without the sanction of the hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side or on this side either. Ministers take it upon

themselves, as the Minister of Railways and Canals has done in this case, to exceed the estimates submitted to parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM. What the minister must have said last year when asking for this vote was that it was estimated that it would cost $35,000 to complete the work because there was an amount nearly equal to that expended before that time. Twenty-five thousand dollars or $27,000 had been spent on this work. We have paid in addition to this $21,000, $62,000 for this work.

Mr. BERGERON. What were the tenders that were submitted?

Mr. GRAHAM. They were based on schedule prices. It was an old pier and had to be removed.

| | |
|---|---|
| Rideau canal— | |
| To complete purchase of tug and fittings | $ 1,500 |
| Rebuilding apron below bulk head at Hog's Back | 16,000 |
| To rebuild waste wier at Black Rapids | 3,500 |
| Improvements | 3,000 |

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the name of the tug that has been purchased ?

Mr. BERGERON. Why not get a tug from some of the other departments that have lots of tugs ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I presume that they would draw too much water for the Rideau canal. The 'Loretta' is the name of the tug.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister has a tug down at Morrisburg, the 'Alert,' that does not do anything but run around with the superintendent of the Williamsburg canal. For the last forty years there has never been any necessity for a steamer for the superintendent of the Wiliamsburg canal, and now the superintendent has a tug that the minister knows well, the one that was purchased from Mr. Murphy. They have got her all fitted up and this man has this steamer running up and down the river simply as a pleasure boat. That would have been a splendid tug on the Rideau.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does she not draw too much water?

Mr. J. D. REID. No. At all events, she is now only used by the superintendent of the Williamsburg canal. I would like to ask the minister if he really thinks it is necessary to have a fine steamer fitted up like that boat is and which is costing $4,000 or $5,000 a year to run for the accommodation of the superintendent of the Williamsburg canal who lives at Morrisburg.

Mr. GRAHAM. You could not very well attend to this work unless you had some means of getting around and getting at the work. This superintendent goes from Cornwall up to the Murray canal.

Mr. BERGERON. On the Soulanges canal the superintendent has a yacht. Last summer I saw that the government were building a very nice boat for the superintendent. The ministers have their private cars——

Mr. GRAHAM. Official cars.

Mr. BERGERON. Official cars—and these superintendents must have boat which the government pays for and which add to the cost of maintaining the canals.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am surprised at the minister making the statement that the superintendent of the Williamsburg canal requires a large steamer such as that. He lives at Morrisburg——

Mr. BRODEUR. At Cornwall.

Mr. J. D. REID. At all events, if he wants to go to Morrisburg he goes on the train, or it is only a drive of an hour and a half or an hour and three quarters. In order to go from Cornwall or from the head of the Iroquois canal to the Murray canal, he has to have a steamer. It is simply a pleasure boat. It is used the same as the boats of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are used. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has half a dozen pleasure yachts running around the river. The Minister of Railways and Canals is doing the same thing.

Mr. BENNETT. And the Minister of Public Works has a hundred thousand dollar one—the 'Speedy.'

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes, the Minister of Public Works has one too. It seems to be contagious. This, I think, is a very flagrant case of expenditure of this kind. I have spoken about the increased cost of managing these canals. Here is a sample. There is absolutely no reason why this man should have that boat. Knowing the situation and having lived in Morrisburg as long as he has the minister must agree that I am right in that matter. There is not one Liberal in Dundas or in Brockville who, if you got him to state his own opinion would agree with what the minister has said here to-night. The minister has to swallow these expenditures the same as some of the other ministers do, even though they know they are not in the public interest. I do not believe his deputy minister would allow it if he had not to keep the friends of the government employed. It is simply a pleasure yacht for them to run about in.

Mr. HAGGART. What did this boat cost altogether ?

Mr. GRAHAM. About $15,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What did you do with the old boat ?

Mr. GRAHAM. They allowed $2,500 for her on the bargain.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is building the boat ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Polson and Company.

Mr. BENNETT. Were tenders called for?

Mr. GRAHAM. There were three tenders and Polson was the lowest.

Mr. BENNETT. Who were the other two tenderers ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not remember now.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the cost of running this boat during the summer ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot say. These boats are not at all for pleasure purposes. They are used for towing scows and transferring the repair gangs. A man has to go through the canal to see the banks on either side ; he can't go through the canal with a horse and buggy.

Mr. J. D. REID. The inspection can be very well made from driving along the canal bank. Formerly it only cost about $800 a year to rent a boat for the canal work but now it will cost $4,000 or $5,000. You send your inspector up the Murray canal in one of these boats at a cost of a couple of hundred dollars a trip when a horse and buggy would do just as well. I am surprised that the minister should state it was necessary to have a boat on that canal.

Mr. BENNETT. He is used to it.

Mr. J. D. REID. Not at all. When he lived in Morrisburg he knew it only cost $17,000 or $18,000 a year under the Conservative regime to operate that canal and now it costs $45,000 a year.

Trent canal—to complete purchase of boat, $4,063.

Mr. BENNETT. Where did you get this boat ?

Mr. GRAHAM. From the Polsons.

Mr. BENNETT. Were tenders asked ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the cost of this boat ?

Mr. GRAHAM. $19,062.

Mr. BENNETT. How many tendered ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Two.

Mr. BENNETT. Who was the other ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not remember, Polson was the lowest.

Mr. BENNETT. What boat has been used in the past on this canal ?

Mr. GRAHAM. They rented a boat formerly, but the canal is being enlarged all the time and it was thought cheaper and more satisfactory to purchase one.

Mr. BENNETT. Did not the government own a boat called the 'Bob Hall ?'

Mr. GRAHAM. She was not sufficient for this work.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. FOSTER. What work has she to do?

Mr. GRAHAM. Towing barges with repair gangs and all the work that offers, and attending dredges on the canal. This boat is very much used.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is the engineer in charge of the Trent Valley canal system ? Is it Mr. Kerr ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is Mr. A. J. Grant.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is Mr. Malone who has been engaged on the Holland river dredging ?

Mr. GRAHAM. He is assistant engineer under Mr. Kerr, who is resident engineer.

Mr. BENNETT. Where does Mr. Malone come from and how long has he been in the employ of the department ?

Mr. GRAHAM. He is a graduate of one of the universities—I think Toronto University, but I am not sure. He has been employed by the department, I believe, for three years.

Mr. BENNETT. In the matter of dredging the Holland river, the position seems to be peculiar in this, that they are simply dumping the dredgings on the bank. Would it not be well to put in scows and take the material away ? It is looked upon as one of the most jocular things in that section of the country to see this loose sand taken out by day and left there to fall back at night.

Mr. GRAHAM. I regret to say that the contractors on that work have lost a very large amount of money.

Mr. BENNETT. How is that?

Mr. GRAHAM. Perhaps I can better explain in the discussion on the main estimates. Owing to unfavourable conditions, they have not been enabled to earn anything.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, the favourable conditions they enjoy under the Public Works Department will reimburse them for anything they lose on the Holland river. They are the same company, the Penetanguishene crowd. This company is headed by Dr. Spohn, an old friend of the Minister of Railways and Canals. They have invaded that desirable ground for politicians, the dredging business. With the assistance of the inspector appointed by Dr. Spohn, I am quite sure that anything they lose on the Holland river they will make up on the Georgian bay, unless the Minister of Public Works sends out an inspector from Ottawa or some other outside place. I would sound a note of warning to the Minister of Public Works that he is in a department that is worked for all it is worth by the contractors. As to these dredging inspectors, the inspector at Collingwood was put out on the ground that he was playing into the hands of the contractor——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought the hon. gentleman said that inspectors never were dismissed.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, this man happened to be dismissed. Even their own friends protested against his appointment. For some reason or other he was driven out. But the Minister of Railways and Canals can console himself with the thought that whatever these parties lose on the Holland river they will more than make up on Georgian bay.

Mr. BERGERON. This will cost $19,000, I understand. What is the cost of running a boat like that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not wish to take the chance of being inaccurate. I will get the figures and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. BERGERON. Could not the minister get them from his deputy? Could not he say how much it would cost a month—$2,000, $3,000, $4,000 a month?

Mr. GRAHAM. We will be more economical than that.

Mr. BERGERON. I can remember that on the Beauharnois canal in the old days the superintendent used to go over the works frequently. He put in accounts which I used to think were pretty large, but nothing compared with the cost of running this boat. And he did the work perfectly well, though he had no boat at his disposal. This is a new thing. I wonder if the superintendent of the Lachine canal has a boat?

Mr. GRAHAM. A small one.

Mr. BERGERON. This is a new thing. Ten years ago or over there were none of these boats.

Mr. GRAHAM. There has been a tug to attend the dredge for years.

Mr. BERGERON. But the superintendent had not a boat at his disposal. I do not say that these are pleasure boats altogether, but they are too costly, and the work should be done in a cheaper way.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are going to try to show that there will be no higher cost, but more efficient work.

Mr. FOSTER. You will have to show it quickly.

Railways and canals—chargeable to collection of revenue—Railways—Intercolonial Railways, $1,400,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister tell us how these parties have lain out of their money, or how he made provision for payment?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Intercolonial is not on the same basis as other railways are. It must be remembered that it has earned this money—that is, when it comes out even it has earned the money. The receipts of the Intercolonial are paid into the bank to the credit of the Receiver General. Many members have spoken to me as though they thought the money received was spent by the Intercolonial and only the balance dealt with at the end of the year. But that is not the way. All the receipts of the Intercolonial go to the Receiver General, and we have to get a vote to pay wages and everything else. As a matter of fact, the custom has been for the Auditor General to allow us a certain amount of credit—a credit balance that we can use. He has done that with this amount, and that is the short explanation of it. The month of March alone will make up, perhaps, half of this amount or more. Last year our traffic increased $810,775.90 and our wages alone increased $224,000. The department, in making an estimate, made an error in the amount required, and did not ask for even as much as had been asked the year before.

Mr. HAGGART. I may be mistaken in my recollection of the affair, but I understand that all the moneys collected by the Intercolonial, instead of being passed to the credit of the Intercolonial, go to the Receiver General. The Minister of Railways and Canals took an estimate at the beginning of the year for the total amount required for expenditure on the Intercolonial for the year. He has exceeded that estimate by $1,400,000, and, as I understand him, he has taken the money that he has collected and has paid this $1,400,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Then who are your creditors?

Mr. GRAHAM. As I explained, the Auditor General gave us a credit for that amount, as is the custom.

Mr. HAGGART. The Auditor General cannot give you a credit. You get your credit from the House, in the shape of a vote of what you estimate to be necessary for the running of the Intercolonial for the year. The money collected you pay to the Receiver General, and you have no right to touch it. You have exceeded that estimate by $1,400,000. I will ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who ought to be able to explain the matter, if what I have stated is not a true representation of the facts?

Mr. FIELDING. The general principle that the money, being paid into the hands of the Receiver General, cannot be touched by the Minister of Railways and canals is correct. My recollection is that there has been an old practice, as described by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), whereby, as this is practically a cross entry, the money coming in for the receipts

and going out for the expenses, an arrangement is made with the Auditor General by which a credit is allowed. I have not had the matter before me for some time and would not speak definitely on the subject until I had had an opportunity to make inquiry.

Mr. HAGGART. That used to be the practice both in the Department of Railways and the Postmaster General's Department. But there has been a change. The Postmaster General takes a vote for the full amount required and all the receipts go to the Receiver General, the same as in the case of the Intercolonial Railway. If the hon. minister has a sanction, he has a sanction which the Auditor General has not the power to give him. You have exceeded your estimate $1,400,000 and you have paid it out of amounts which were not at your disposition and over which you had no control.

Mr. FIELDING. As regards the increase in working expenses over the estimates, you cannot estimate in advance what the working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway are going to be. That will depend on the volume of business. The minister would naturally ask the largest estimate and the Finance Minister would say to him: The volume of business may not be so large, you must be content with a less vote, and come at the end of the year for the balance. That is precisely what happens with the Intercolonial Railway. In any special work, there ought to be an estimate which would guide the House, but no one can estimate in advance what will be the expenses of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the original vote?

Mr. GRAHAM. $7,600,000. That is considerably less than what was estimated the first twelve months. It struck me that possibly, in making the estimate, they might have gone on the basis of the previous fiscal year which covered only nine months.

Mr. FOSTER. What was spent the preceding year?

Mr. GRAHAM. Something over $8,000,000.

Mr. HAGGART. It is only a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, it is much better to take the full estimate. I shall try and do that in the main estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my hon. friend will do it for another reason. It is a bad habit to get the Auditor General into, that of making appropriations, for that is what he is really doing. Parliament, after discussing the whole matter, gives the minister $7,600,000. That is what he asks for. Then in the latter part of the year, the Auditor General comes in and says: I do not care about parliament, I am going to make an appropriation myself, and I will give you $1,400,000. You cannot keep an Auditor General up to his duty if you allow him to do things like that. Here is the Marine Department which wants some money. The Auditor General says: You have no appropriation out of which to take it; you may take it out of such and such an appropriation, if you promise you will get a vote of the amount from parliament later on. The Auditor General has no business to do that, and if he does it in one case, the way is open for him to do it in every case. I hope that the minister will take a vote for really what he wants and have no Auditor General make an appropriation for him afterwards.

Mr. GRAHAM. In fairness to the Auditor General, I ought to say that a large portion of the $1,400,000 is not due until the 15th of April. We shall have the appropriation for March, which is over half this amount, before we get the money.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, the $1,400,000 has to do you up to the 31st March. What money you get for next year you cannot take and use to pay this.

Mr. FIELDING. With reference to the Intercolonial Railway, whatever the department has been doing it, has been following the old practices.

Mr. HAGGART. But we got out of that and got into a new one.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not saying that we ought to keep to the old practice and not change, and now that my attention has been called to it, I shall make it my business to see the Auditor General about it.

Lachine canal—staff, $15,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. The amount estimated was based on the opinion that the operating staff would be reduced about one-third, and we expected that the electrical machinery for the operation of the lock gates would enable us to do that. We have not got that machinery to work yet and have had to retain the staff.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the staff not been paid?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is to pay the staff.

Mr. HENDERSON. Have the men been living without their wages?

Mr. FOSTER. Evidently they have.

Statistical officers—salaries and contingencies.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. $ 5,500

Additional to persons employed permanently in the public service, and remuneration to any other persons for services rendered for, and in connection with, passing vessels through the canals of the government of Canada

| | |
|---|---|
| from midnight on Saturday to midnight on Sunday, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.. | 4,500 |
| | 10,000 |

Mr. GRAHAM. A considerable portion of this is due to the fact that we employ an agent to collect our rents in Montreal and pay a commission of 5 per cent. That is the most practical way of getting the rents collected promptly. The other item is largely for Sunday work.

Mr. HAGGART. Was that vote exceeded ? You had a vote for that work.

Mr. GRAHAM. That estimate was exceeded by $4,500.

Mr. FOSTER. When did these men stop their work ? They have not been working through the winter. The canals close, I suppose, about the 1st November. Have these men been out of their pay four months or have they been paid ?

Mr. GRAHAM. These men have been paid. That raises the question again of paying contingencies out of some other fund than a special vote. I do not like the practice myself.

Mr. FOSTER. Out of what fund was this paid ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall get the information, but my opinion is that while perhaps there may be some cases where this has to be done we should stick as closely as possible to paying money only out of the special votes for each purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. I would strongly urge the discontinuance of the practice. The minister cannot expect to have an honest department if he educates them to take funds out of one vote and use them for another purpose. I hope the minister will stick to his ideas as otherwise the discipline of the department is utterly ruined.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it would be far better to take a larger vote than we need.

A question was asked the other night in connection with the amount of rolling stock purchased out of revenue. Up to December 31, 1907, the amount of rolling stock purchased out of revenue was :

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 160 | 60,000 lbs. box cars at $990 each.. | $158,400 00 |
| 130 | 30,000 lbs. hoppers at $562 each .. | 73,060 00 |
| 5 | 60,000 lbs. refrigerator at $1,590.. | 7,950 00 |
| 100 | 80,000 lbs. flats at $878.. .. .. .. | 87,800 00 |
| 9 | 60,000 lbs. stock at $900 .. .. .. .. | 8,100 00 |
| 8 | Conductors' vans at $1,640 .. .. | 13,120 00 |
| 1 | dining car.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 20,587 50 |
| 1 | sleepng car.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 19,500 00 |
| 2 | express cars at $7,000 each .. .. | 14,000 00 |
| 2 | postal cars at $8,675 .. .. .. .. .. | 17,350 00 |
| 4 | locomotives valued at $19,500 each finished this year and of which $54,400 was charged against last year's revenue and against current year.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 23,600 00 |
| | Total .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $443,467 50 |

This amount was expended for new rolling stock and charged to revenue.

Mr. HAGGART. Nevertheless the fact was that last year there was not in the return brought down a single locomotive charged to revenue.

Mr. GRAHAM. There were two as I will show when the main estimates come up.

Mr. HAGGART. In your report you do not give it.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is on another page.

Department of Public Works—to provide for the appointment of a chief clerk to the position of Assistant Deputy Minister of Public Works from the 1st of January, 1908, at a salary of $3,600 per annum, $425.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This is to pay the salary of an assistant Deputy Minister of Public Works from the 1st of January up to the 31st of March. Mr. Hunter, who has been chief clerk in the department at a salary of $1,900, has been assigned to that position by order in council. It is proposed to fix the salary at $3,600.

Mr. TAYLOR. How long has he been in the service ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Since 1900. He is a very capable man and has been in close touch with the work of the department. It was thought desirable, when Mr. Gobeil sought leave of absence as a preliminary to his superannuation, that Mr. Hunter should be appointed assistant deputy.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a new office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Had you a vote to establish it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, this is the vote now.

Mr. FOSTER. But how did the minister establish an office and make a charge without having a vote for it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has been appointed acting deputy minister in the meantime.

Mr. FOSTER. How could the minister appoint him without a vote ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has been acting as acting-deputy minister. Of course he cannot be actually appointed to the office until a vote is made. He has received no salary and this is to pay his salary from the first of January.

Mr. FOSTER. Has he been appointed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has been appointed and has authority to act as deputy minister in the absence of the deputy.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the order in council simply appoint him to act in the place of the deputy minister or is it an appointment as assistant deputy minister ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is appointed to act in the place of the deputy minister. The deputy was given leave of absence from the 1st of January and Mr. Hunter was appointed in his place to act in his absence.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why call him assistant deputy ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because it is intended, with the consent of parliament, to create the office of assistant deputy minister.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is he not the acting deputy at the present time ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but it is intended to have an assistant deputy if parliament makes the appropriation. I may say to the committee that since I have become the head of the department I have been convinced of the absolute necessity of having an assistant deputy minister. It is proposed to make Mr. Hunter the deputy minister upon the retirement of Mr. Gobeil from the service on the 1st of July next, and then I propose recommending that an assistant deputy shall be appointed who shall be a first class engineer, who will give great assistance to the deputy by reason of his technical knowledge. The work of the department has grown very rapidly and I am satisfied it would be to the public interest to have an assistant deputy who, as I have said, would be an engineer as well. Mr. Hunter will receive only his pay as assistant until he becomes deputy on Mr. Gobeil's retirement.

Mr. BENNETT. The department has been shorn of a great part of its former work as the St. Lawrence ship channel between Montreal and Quebec has been transferred to the Marine Department. What salary is paid to the present chief engineer, Mr. Lafleur, and will this gentleman be superior or inferior to Mr. Lafleur ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer receives $3,500. With regard to the work of the department, I may say to my hon. friend that while a portion of the work has been taken away from the Department of Public Works, that is in connection with the St. Lawrence ship channel, yet the other work of the department has vastly increased in the work of dredging harbours, building wharfs, the erection of public buildings all over the country.

Mr. FOSTER. There will not be quite so many in New Brunswick now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no reason to suppose that there will not be just as many, and I would hope possibly there will be a few more.

Mr. BENNETT. Has Mr. Gobeil's superannuation been fixed yet ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that it has not been fixed, it is before the Treasury Board.

Mr. FOSTER.

Public buildings—Ottawa—Dominion Archives—fittings, &c., $19,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Steel fittings and contingencies make up this item, principally.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who supplied these fittings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Eclipse Manufacturing Company.

Mr. TAYLOR. By tender ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are two concerns in Canada furnishing these fittings and tenders have been called for from time to time. These were supplied by special arrangement at the price which represented the lowest tender for previous supplies. It was done by special order in council.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any real competition between these two companies ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no connection between them, competition is keen between them.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the minister take any steps to have an estimate made of the real value of these fittings ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not. These fittings were purchased before I came into the department.

Mr. BLAIN. I believe this vote is in connection with the filing away of documents. Does the minister propose to introduce Mr. Falconer to his department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I have seen no occasion yet for making any change in the mode of bookkeeping in the department. We have a very good accountant, and I am inclined to think the bookkeeping is all right.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister had an expert go over his department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My predecessor in office had an expert who went through the department, and he was of the opinion that there was not much chance of improvement.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was the expert ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. McKay, of Toronto. He was employed by my predecessor to look over the bookkeeping in the department, and generally to see if any improvement could be made. He came to Ottawa and looked matters over, and came to the conclusion that there was not much room for improvement. He made no charge.

Mr. BLAIN. How does it happen that a Toronto gentleman was not able to look over the other department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will have to ask me something easier than that, I was not then in charge of the department.

Ottawa new departmental and justice buildings on west side of Sussex street—compensation to David Ewart, chief architect of the Public Works Department, for services rendered as member of the board of experts appointed to frame regulations for the preparation of competitive designs by Canadian architects for the erection of the projected new buildings, look into the merits of the designs submitted and pass judgment thereon, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When it was proposed to call for designs for the new departmental buildings and the justice building, competition was invited from all Canadian architects, and a board of experts was appointed consisting of Mr. Burke, an experienced architect of Toronto, and I think president of the Architects' Association of Ontario, Mr. Chaussé of Quebec, who is president of the Architects' Association of that province and Mr. Ewart, chief architect of the department. They devoted a good deal of time to the subject, there were quite a large number of designs submitted, and after very careful examination they awarded four grades of prizes to the various competitors. We have thought that it would be right to pay Mr. Ewart for his services, which were entirely extra and outside the ordinary duties of his office, services which were performed largely at night after office hours, and this amount of $1,500 would be his proportion of the bill which the board sent in.

Mr. KEMP. Are the government going to adopt any of the designs furnished by the architects referred to ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not decided. There were four prizes, and the successful competitors have received their prizes.

Harbours and rivers—Red river, Manitoba—improvements at St. Andrew's rapids, $62,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief reason why this amount is required to be placed in the supplementaries, is that some time ago, shortly after I became minister, representations were made to me that it was very desirable that the work on this lock and dam at St. Andrew's rapids should be hurried along with all possible speed, because it was represented that just as soon as these improvements were completed they would be of enormous advantage to the city of Winnipeg. I need only mention one advantage, it would enable the city to obtain its fuel supply from Lake Winnipeg, along the shores of which there are vast quantities of wood, and it would make a great difference in the cost of wood fuel to the people of Winnipeg. It was also represented to me that if a change were made in the material from granite to concrete, by covering the structure with a temporary roof and heating it the work of laying the concrete could proceed all through the winter. After going into the matter carefully the chief engineer was of the opinion that far from adding to the cost of the work, it would really reduce it. So we made that arrangement, and the work of construction has been going on during the present winter very satisfactorily. This amount is required to pay for the work up to March 31. There will be quite a large item in the main estimates.

Mr. KEMP. When was this work commenced ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was started several years ago but the present contract was let to the firm of Quinlan & Robertson in October, 1906.

Mr. KEMP. Who were the contractors who were on the work previous to that time ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Kelly Bros., of Winnipeg.

Mr. KEMP. Why was the contract transferred ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know all the details. Perhaps it would be a long story, but the work did not proceed satisfactorily and certain arrangements were made by which it was taken off their hands. The contract was given to the firm of Quinlan & Robertson, of Montreal, and since that time they have pushed the work forward with very great rapidity and satisfaction.

Mr. KEMP. I understand that Kelly Bros. are very large contractors, that they built the Winnipeg and Vancouver post offices.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, they are experienced in the building line, but not in work of this character.

Mr. KEMP. The idea that prevails is that the contract with Kelly Bros. was a more advantageous one for the country than the other one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Kelly Bros. received the contract several years ago and a settlement was made with them. The claim that they put in was submitted to the board of arbitrators in the department, they were settled with and a new contract was given to the present firm. I cannot say as to which would be the more advantageous, looking simply at the amount of the contract, but the report of my engineers is that nothing could be more satisfactory than the way the work is now being performed.

Mr. KEMP. When the main estimates come down I would like to inquire why the contract was transferred, and I would be obliged to the minister if he would get all the information on this subject.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be very glad to.

Mr. KEMP. May I inquire also how many tenders were received at the time the contract was awarded to Kelly Bros., and who the tenderers were ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will let that stand, there is a large amount in the main estimates and when they come up I will get the information for him.

New Brunswick.

| | |
|---|---|
| St. John—quarantine station on Partridge island—water service, additional amount.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $6,200 |
| St. John—Dominion buildings—improvements, repairs, &c.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,200 |
| St. John—quarantine station on Partridge island—compensation to Harvey Ring in full of all demands for losses sustained in connection with his weir fishery near the inner side of the Negro point breakwater, as a result of the dredging performed for laying a water supply pipe from the main land to Partridge island .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 2,400 |

Mr. DANIEL. What will the whole cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $54,980, inclusive of maintenance during the fiscal year.

Mr. DANIEL. What does the minister mean by maintenance ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The service will have to be maintained. The total estimate for balance for water service in connection with Partridge Island is $6,200.

Mr. DANIEL. Was there not a big leak discovered there last season ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, this includes that.

Mr. DANIEL. What was the damage done to Mr. Ring's weir fishery ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In laying the water pipe between the mainland and Partridge Island, it passed right by a weir which Mr. Harvey Ring had there, and by the laying of the pipe his fishing station was damaged and he suffered loss in respect to it. He made a claim of $2,500. The matter was very carefully investigated by Mr. Valiquet, engineer of the department, who went to St. John, took evidence under solemn declaration, reported the loss of $2,400 and recommended payment of it. This item is for the purpose of paying the claim.

Quebec—Montreal—pneumatic postal station—preliminary work, &c., $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the whole cost of that to be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a little difficult to say what the total cost will be for the reason that we have the pipes on hand. The plan of establishing a pneumatic station was abondoned, we have the pipes on hand, the department owns a lot of land in Montreal and this $2,000 is needed to pay $1,000 to Mr. Perreault, balance due for preparing plans and sketches, and the other $1,000 is for the purpose of erecting a shed on the lot of land that is owned by the government in Montreal. We have thought it a more prudent thing to do that than to continue paying rent.

Mr. KEMP. What is the total amount paid Mr. Perreault?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Perreault was paid $7,000 altogether and this $1,000 will make $8,000 as the total amount paid to him.

Mr. FOSTER. What for ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For his services in drawing plans and making all the preparations for going ahead with this work.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then you have abandoned the work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has been abandoned.

Mr. TAYLOR. Got the pipes and then discovered that the thing was no good.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot quite say that. It was thought it would be perhaps too costly to make it advisable to carry it on. At all events, the view of the department was that it would not be desirable to carry out the proposed arrangement. We have the pipe on hand and we hope to dispose of it at a very fair price.

Mr. BLAIN. What has been the total expenditure on this pneumatic station ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry to say it is quite considerable. The total expenditure is $64,102, but that will not represent the total cost to the country because we have the pipe on hand which will be disposed of, and we have a site in Montreal which no doubt we will be able to sell to good advantage in the near future.

Mr. FOSTER. Whose scheme was this ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was inaugurated when Sir William Mulock was Postmaster General

Mr. BLAIN. What did the site cost and what did the pipe cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site cost $37,000; the pneumatic tubing cost $11,610.88. The cost of the site will not be lost and I should think the tubing will be worth substantially what it cost. We have several inquiries for it.

Mr. HENDERSON. If some other person could make the system practical why not the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It can be used for water pipe.

Mr. MARSHALL. What is the size of the pipe ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Ten-inch.

Mr. MARSHALL. When was it purchased ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 1904.

Mr. KEMP. It wont enhance in value by holding it; why not sell it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have several tentative offers for it and I think we will be able to sell it soon.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did you ever offer it to Strubbe ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the pleasure of knowing him.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps Merwin would buy it from you and work it off on the Minister of Marine.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am thankful for those suggestions.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this system in operation in other cities in Canada ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told not.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When Sir William Mulock was Postmaster General he thought the pneumatic system could be adapted to Montreal and Toronto, but it was found the expense would be greater than the advantage and it was decided to adopt the decentralization post office system which has proved satisfactory. The pneumatic system is a success in London and Paris but Montreal and Toronto are not yet large enough for the luxury.

Mr. FOSTER. What became of the automobile service ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That was only under trial.

Mr. FOSTER. That was another Mulockian idea.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Sir William Mulock had many good ideas.

Mr. BENNETT. His best idea was to get out with a good job.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was expended on the pneumatic system in Toronto ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The pipe was purchased for both cities. There was no site purchased in Toronto .

Ottawa post office, $1,250.

Mr. KEMP. What was expended on this post office ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The expenditure from the 4th of January, 1904, to the 1st of March, 1908, was $218,113.38 which includes remodelling the interior fittings and putting in the passenger and freight elevators.

Mr. TAYLOR. You could get an entire new building for less money.

Edmonton public buildings, $30,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total probable cost is $285,785.67, which includes cost of site and building, heating, electric wiring, furniture, &c.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the material ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Partly stone and partly brick; it will be a very fine building.

Mr. FOSTER. Do the other public departments, besides the post office find accommodation there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

British Columbia—Fernie—public building, $10,500.

Mr. FOSTER. How much will this building cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The architect's estimate of the total cost of the building, including heating, electric wiring, lock boxes, &c., is $66,261.96.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Fernie ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the memorandum prepared by my clerk, that is left blank. But, to show that this is an important place, I may say that the money orders issued last year were $140,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the postal revenue last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was $6,613.98.

Rents, repairs, furniture, heating, &c.—Ottawa public buildings—telephone service, $2,500.

Mr. KEMP. I see that the total vote for rents, repairs, furniture, heating, &c., is $164,100. That seems a tremendous amount for a supplementary vote in a service in which there is not much change from year to year. What was the total amount voted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that there will be an item in the main estimates under this head, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) will intimate what he desires to know, I will get the information before that item is taken up.

Mr. KEMP. I want to know why the minister cannot get nearer to a correct estimate for this service than to require a supplementary of $164,100 ? What was the amount voted last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In order to give that, I should need to go through the separate items. But I may give an illustration. Take this first item of telephones. There was a vote of $12,000 by parliament for the rental of the Bell Telephone Company's authorized connection. As a matter of fact, the cost of 349 telephones was $14,082.25, with extra telephones in the House of Commons bringing the amount up to $14,500. We know that the demand for telephones is increasing.

Mr. FOSTER. What class of employees are allowed telephones ?

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman would give those in private houses, that would be an explanation. Down to what grade of clerks are they allowed telephones in a private house ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I find none below secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. Any in the houses of messengers ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not in the Public Works Department, but if there is any that the hon. gentleman has in mind——

Mr. FOSTER. Try the Marine Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a telephone in the office and residence of the minister, the office and residence of the deputy, the office and residence of the private secretary, the office of the accountant, the office of the assistant chief engineer, the office of the messenger, but not in the house, the office of the clerk of supplies, the office of the fisheries exhibit, the office of the minister in the House of Commons, the stores branch, the accountant's branch, the correspondence branch, the Commissioner of Lights, the fishing bounties office, the residence of Mr. Venning—that is all.

Ottawa public builings—repairs—improvements in ventilation and lighting, furniture, &c., $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Why such an advance ?

Mr. BENNETT. What is the big item ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure for 1907-8 is $215,000 ; the appropriation is $175,000, leaving this balance of $40,000 to be provided for by supplementary estimate.

Mr. KEMP. So, you did not come within 25 per cent of the amount necessary? To go back to another and smaller item in this general vote, the vote for heating of the Ottawa Public buildings, including salaries, of engineers, firemen and watchmen, $8,000 ; it seems strange that the department cannot estimate to within less than $8,000 what it costs for men to take charge of the heating of this building. When the main estimates come down, will they be as much less than the amount required as those of last year seem to have been ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope the officers of the department have figured with sufficient accuracy that they will not require too large a supplementary vote for the coming year.

Mr. BENNETT. How much of this $40,000 is for furniture ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the memorandum before me, furniture, including carpets, is only one item of the general amount for supplies, including lumber, paints, oils and so on. This item amounts to $7,745.61, but the amount for furniture is not given separately.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to ask how many engineers and firemen are employed and how much you are paying them per day ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When we come to the main estimates, I shall have that information.

St. John, New Brunswick—harbour improvements, $330,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a vote of $150,000 last session for the purchase of a dredge to carry on the work at St. John. The dredge was not purchased but contracts were let after tenders were called for.

Mr. BENNETT. Who has the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are two contracts —the Dominion Dredging Company and G. S. Mayes. There will be another amount in the main estimates on which we can discuss this.

Mr. BENNETT. Is Mr. Gordon Stewart the secretary-treasurer of the Dominion Dredge Company ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. I think he is the president.

Mr. BENNETT. Is he not a son of one of the members for Ottawa ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That I could not say.

Yamaska river dredging, $20,510.

Mr. BENNETT. Who has the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. W. J. Poupore & Co. The work is done at schedule rate, $5 per cubic yard for rock and all other materials ten and a half cents per cubic yard.

Bronte dredging, $5,100.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has this work been done ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount has been actually done and this money is required to pay for it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is that like some other items, paid out of some other estimates ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, in my department we have not seen how it was possible to do this because each item is so distinct. We cannot take the money voted for dredging at one place and apply it to the work at another place. The contractors know that under the contract they go on at their own risk and expense after the appropriation is exhausted and in these cases of dredging and harbour work, the contractors are simply waiting for their money.

Mr. HENDERSON. What dredge did the work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The dredge 'Hamil.'

Mr. HENDERSON. Owned by whom ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Phin was the contractor and of course he would be the owner of the dredge.

Mr. HENDERSON. How much has been spent in Bronte harbour since the government came into power both on account of dredging and the construction of piers ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $30,923.93 has been spent since the 1st of July, 1900.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does that include the lighthouse ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that is not in my department, that is in the Department of Marine.

Tiffin—dredging opposite the wharf, $76,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a new place but one that will be heard of by and by. It is one of the Georgian bay terminals of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this $76,500 in addition to the amount voted for Tiffin last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. What was voted for Tiffin ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $50,000.

Mr BENNETT. So there was spent last fall ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $126,500.

Mr. BENNETT. Will there be an item in the main estimates for dredging there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. I have no objection to the work being done ; it is a most essential and necessary work to be done, and I hope a good amount will be appropriated, because two large grain elevators have been erected at this point ; but I hope the minister will read over the evidence given the other day by the manager of the Owen Sound Dredging Company as to the manner in which the country has been paying for thousands and tens of thousands of dollars worth of dredging in and about Midland in the last ten years. Having read that evidence he will arrive at the conclusion that the popular opinion in Midland that the country is not getting value for the money they have spent there is justified.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say I have read a number of things in regard to Midland and among other things a resolution of the town council of Midland complaining most bitterly of the criticism the hon. gentleman had made of the dredging operations at Tiffin, and alleging that the hon. gentleman had no foundation whatever for the statements he had made. I think he is aware of that resolution.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, that resolution was passed by a town council of Midland some of whom were interested in this dredge. When I made the charge on the floor of the House that the country was not getting value for its money—and I make the charge again and the evidence given shows that some of those parties in the town council are interested in the dredge. If the minister will consult not the owners of the dredge, but some leading Liberals in Midland as to who shall be the inspector, there will be a great change in the inspectorship. The manager of the dredge himself confessed that the inspector had to rely on the reports given by the crane man and engineer on the dredge. I do not care a snap of the finger for this resolution sent in by these people who are interested as heavy stockholders in the dredge. You do not find any of these men in the town council to-day; I attended to their case and none of them are left in it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No one would be happier than myself to receive really valuable suggestions for the improvement of the service. The difficulty I find in taking suggestions from my hon. friend is that he is very extreme in his views, and sometimes I imagine he relies on imagination and hearsay rather than on fact. It may be his misfortune that this is the case. I might say to the committee that we recognize in the department that in view of the very large amount of dredging work going on in all sections of the country it is impossible to exercise too great care in the public interest and, after consultation with my deputy and the other chief officers of the department, a plan has been adopted which I think will meet with the approval of the committee and of the public. In the first place, I have sent out a notice to all inspectors that every inspector must be at his work and see every scow load go out; he must not take any one's word.

Mr. BENNETT. These have always been the instructions.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And they have been informed that any failure to perform their duty in that respect will result in instant dismissal. In addition to that we are sending a form of solemn declaration to which every inspector must depose when sending in the return showing his hours of work and swearing that he has a personal knowledge of every scowload sent out. These I think are proper precautions. While I do not think there is very much to justify the criticism of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) yet we have felt it would be desirable to take these precautions and any others that may be of value.

Mr. TAYLOR. That has been brought about by the member for Simcoe.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not prepared to say that at all.

Mr. BENNETT. Since the minister has said there is nothing to justify my statement I would point out that I started in to prove in the Public Accounts Committee this year that the owner of the dredge appointed the inspector and I proved it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In what case?

Mr. BENNETT. In the Penetanguishene case where Gendron the inspector swore that in addition to swindling the country out of $200 he divided one half the fees of a man who was never there, he was appointed by Dr. Spohn, the president of the company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not understand Gendron to say anything of the kind.

Mr. BENNETT. The evidence is printed and his sworn evidence is that he was appointed by Dr. Spohn.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was appointed by the department.

Mr. BENNETT. On the recommendation of Dr. Spohn. What is the good of quibbling about it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The moment the fact came to the knowledge of the minister that Gendron was not personally in attendance upon the dredge and watching all scowloads that went out, he was dismissed; my hon. friend knows that.

Mr. BENNETT. That shows how little the minister knows about it; that was not the reason of his dismissal. Another man was on one dredge and Gendron on the other. The other man was paid by the department $3 a day for looking after the dredge and was not here at all as he admitted under oath in that committee. When the matter came up last year the Minister of Agriculture was acting as Minister of Public Works and he said Gendron would be dismissed for his connivance at the theft and I will do the Minister of Agriculture the justice of saying that he carried out his threat and the man was dismissed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was dismissed.

Mr. BENNETT. Surely.

Mr. PARDEE. As soon as the department knew what he was doing.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct, but it all goes to prove my former statement that Gendron was not only deliberately putting up a fraud on the department and conniving with the other man but that he was practically the manager for this company.

Mr. PARDEE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Why, there was a stack of cheques in there to show that he kept the time of the men, but you can never make any man in that part of the country believe that any of these scows were ever half filled. The public won't believe it; and I invite the minister or any other gentleman to go up there and I will discuss the question with them in any of those towns along the front where it is alleged they have been filled. Leading Liberals in the town of Midland have pressed me to bring this matter before the department. So far as this inspector at Midland is concerned, he is too insignificant for me to notice. If the department wants to keep him on there they can, but I have done my duty in the matter.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister has expressed a desire for information respecting dredging. I would say to him with reference to the dredging at Bronte in the county I have the honour to represent, that before he does any more dredging or spends any more money in that harbour, I would advise him to have a competent person look into the situation and see if the expenditure can be justified. The minister says that since 1900 the sum of $30,923 has been expended on this harbour. I have no hesitation in saying that almost the whole of that money has practically been thrown away, there was no great call for it. I have admonished every Minister of Public Works since 1900 that such expenditure was uncalled for, and I am of the same opinion still. Only a few days ago I made inquiry of a resident of Bronte how many vessels came in there during the past year, and he told me there was one vessel with a cargo of about 500 tons of coal. Apart from that, there were possibly two or three stone hookers ; the other vessels that came in were fishing crafts, 18 to 20 feet long, which could have come in without any dredging. The money sepnt on dredging last year, I am satisfied, was of no material benefit to the public. I was at Bronte while the dredge was working there, and I think they were simply dredging out mud to fill in time. That is the opinion of the people there, they were simply putting in time to earn money for the dredge, but it was doing no permanent benefit for the harbour. Now I say in all sincerity, although the money has been spent in my own county, that it has not been expended on my advice. I did not recommend it. When Sir Wm. Mulock was acting Minister of Public Works I did say that a small sum of two or three thousand dollars might be spent to advantage in improving the harbour for the benefit of the fishing trade; but beyond that I have never approved of any portion of this expenditure. I do not like to see the money of the country thrown away in that manner. A continuous expenditure of that kind is a mistake, and I am satisfied the minister will not be doing justice to himself or to the department if he continues that expenditure.

There is no trade there, there is no probability of any increase of trade; consequently looking to the future, there is nothing to be gained by expending money further on this small harbour.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not propose to submit to contradictions as to the evidence. An opportunity will be afforded me when this evidence is reported from the Public Accounts Committee, and I will then deal with it in connection with dredging.

Point Edward—dredging, $10,300.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does the minister make his dredging contracts by scow measure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There have been some instances where the measurements are in situ, but I think in the great majority of cases they are scow measure.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In preparing a contract for excavating by measurements in situ it would be necessary to have very careful and costly survey made first.

Mr. J. D. REID. In the Department of Railways and Canals the opinion of engineers is that in situ is the only honest way to let a contract, because that represents solid material. Of course when it is excavated and put in a scow a solid yard in situ would make about three yards in the scow.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no. If we paid on that basis you would have some ground of complaint. The ordinary expansion is recognized as from 25 to 33 per cent. They always charge more per cubic yard in situ.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then look at the position the government is in, for they generally choose for inspector a shoemaker or tailor or something of that kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is too imaginative. Since I have been in the department, I have noticed on the part of the deputy, and the acting deputy, in the case of every inspector who is named to do a particular work, that great care is exercised to learn if he is qualified by experience, judgment and capability to perform the duty to which he is assigned.

Mr. ALCORN. I think that this rule goes very far to sustain the contention of the hon. member for East Simcoe that these inspectors as a rule are people wholly unworthy of confidence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman would not be justified in drawing that inference from my remarks. Banks have their inspectors who go around and it does not follow that the bank officials are dishonest but this is regarded as a fair measure of business precaution. Of the many officials scattered all over the country, hundreds of them suppose there should be even one who was neglecting his duty, we do not want, even in one case, that there should be any wrong-doing or impropriety. I do not think it is any reflection upon the officials that we should take the ordinary business precaution of seeing that they are performing their duties.

Mr. ALCORN. Do bank inspectors swear to their returns?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not say that they swear to their returns, but they light down on the branches at the most unexpected times. It is not because there is a belief that there is dishonesty, but it is regarded as a fair measure of business precaution.

Mr. ALCORN. The minister cites the bank inspectors case as a parallel case which it is not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not exactly the same but is similar in principle.

Mr. BENNETT. There is a gentleman who considered that I had done him an injustice because I had mentioned his name as being connected with one of these dredging companies. I want, on this the first occasion that has occurred to me, to make a public statement in reference to him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Whose name is that?

Mr. BENNETT. Senator McMullen. I made the statement in the House that Senator McMullen's son was either directly or indirectly interested in what is known as the Midland Dredging Company. I want to publicly state that Senator McMullen has assured me that his son has no interest in that dredging company.

Mr. FIELDING. Why should he not have? Would there be any wrong?

Mr. BENNETT. Senator McMullen's son had stock in this dredging company and the returns were so large and the scandal that is attached to it was so great that Senator McMullen told me openly that he had his son sell his stock out. Actually the returns and the scandal that is attached to it are so great that he had his son sell out his stock. They go around in the most braggart way telling that they are making 50 and 75 per cent out of these dredging stocks. Take the case of Mr. McKay, of Owen Sound, the leader of the opposition in the Local House, a few years ago he and Dr. Horsey, who was not at that time a member of this House had an old dredge worth $4,000 or $5,000. What do we find to-day? Mr. McKay and those associated with him have one dredge alone that they boast is worth over $125,000 with the scows. They boast around that they are making 75 per cent profit on that and everybody believes it. However, I only rose for the purpose of making that explanation with reference to Senator McMullen. He had heard so much of

it and he was so startled by the returns of the company that he actually had his son sell out his stock on account of the odium that attaches to his being mixed up with dredging operations in the province of Ontario to-day. The minister says that he is simply taking this new method because he thinks it will be better. The minister is accepting it because he has been stirred up and there are members who have told him that the matter has to be looked into. What did the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell) say here?—that he was being chased around by contractors trying to induce him to go into one of these dredging companies. Another hon. gentleman told me privately, while discussing this matter, that he had been asked to take a block of stock in one of these dredging outfits and that he would not touch it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a great wonder that they are willing to let outsiders in.

Mr. HENDERSON. We are not all like you New Brunswick men.

Mr. BENNETT. That was the reason that the hon. member for Gengarry intimated that he was being invited to go into it. The minister is not accepting this new plan and going to make the inspector swear to the returns of his own volition at all. Long before the minister came into the House, dredging at Port Arthur and Fort William was being done by Whalen & Bowman and they were being paid twenty-five cents a yard for work and had the appointment of their own inspectors practically.

Mr. PUGSLEY, Practically is quite a qualifying word.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Hyman, the then Minister of Public Works, so framed the advertisement that no one else but that firm could tender for the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not so.

Mr. BENNETT. Not so? Well, the minister had better get posted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am posted.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister is not posted or he would not make that statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What was the advertisement?

Mr. BENNETT. The advertisement required that the dredge had to be in the harbour of Port Arthur at a certain date when it was impossible for an outside dredge to come in.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman must know he is entirely in error as to that.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not in error, I am correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have seen the advertisement.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister is in error when he says that. The minister will hear more of this on another day. He can thank hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, myself included, for the fact that, whereas, the members of the government and the then minister never asked for tenders, and as a result they were paying 25 cents a yard, the work is now being done for 9 cents a yard. There will be more of this question of dredging before the session is over.

Mr. TAYLOR. This question will come up on the main estimates and we will have an opportunity to thresh it out, because I want to show the minister where they are paying 75 cents a yard for doing dredging and where the contractor is farming it out at 15 cents a yard. I will show it to him in the Auditor General's Report. They are paying 75 cents a yard to a man who is farming it out at 15 cents and they are paying for thousands of yards at that rate. I will not take the time to do it now.

Mr. CONMEE. I just want to correct the remarks of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). On several occasions he has made similar remarks. They are just as false to-night as they have been on other occasions. I believe the hon. gentleman knows they are not true. What is his position? He has stated several times that the minister was forced to change the advertisement and that by reason of that the price of the work has been decreased. Let me explain to the committee how absurd that is. Either the hon. member does not know, or he has temerity enough to make, year after year, statements which have been contradicted, which he has been told are false and which, if he has the ordinary common sense that members should have in this House, he must know are false.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. By all means let the hon. gentleman have the same license here that he has in the Railway Committee. Let him have the special license that attaches to his position and person.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The word 'false' is not parliamentary; 'incorrect' is the term to use.

Mr. CONMEE. I am quite willing to substitute the word 'incorrect' for the word 'false.'

Mr. BENNETT. Give him his ordinary license.

Mr. CONMEE. The change in the advertisement to which the hon. member alluded was from the 5th of April to the 1st of May—15 days. Now, it is claimed that that change of fifteen days caused a reduction in the price. It had nothing whatever to do with it. No dredging plant could have gone into that harbour on the

1st day of May or on the 1st day of April either and it was not necessary for them to be there. It is absurd to talk like that. Those who tender for these works do not tender because their plant happens to be on the ground. The harbour was covered with ice both on the 15th of April and the 1st of May, and it is not true to say that the tenderers could have the information if the tenders were called for at another season of the year which he could not get at the time when the tenders were called for. No one tenders on such a basis as that. What is done is that the department prepares plans and maps and drawings of the contour of the area to be dredged and these are exhibited in the department and the man tendering gets his information there and it does not matter what season of the year it is. Now as to the reduction in the price. The hon. member (Mr. Bennett) states it was because of this change in the advertisement, and that the Waddell Company put in a tender they would not have otherwise put in. That is not true. The Waddell Company did not tender for any work in that harbour until a year afterwards. I have told the hon. gentleman before and I will tell him again what caused a reduction in the price. The previous work advertised for was for bringing the harbour down to a uniform depth where there was only a light cut and other pieces of work such as entrance channels to new elevators and wharfs that had been constructed. It was what is known as patch work and not regular work of any magnitude. That class of work always commands a higher price than the ordinary work where there is a heavy bank. The minister stated at the very time to which the hon. member makes allusion, that he was only calling for tenders for that season's work, that it was his intention to call for tenders for the dredging of the Mission channel, for the widening and deepening of the harbour in sections where it was necessary to extend the harbour works, and that it was his intention to give the contractors fair notice by advertisement and to have the contract continued not for a few months but for a term of years in order that they might equip themselves with proper plant and be able to do the work at economic prices. That is what caused the difference in the price. The work that was done at the 9 cents in both harbours is a different class of work altogether. In Port Arthur it is nearly two miles from the work that was being done previously and in Fort William harbour it is several miles away. The work is of a different character entirely. They are now dredging under conditions which give them from 12 to 20 feet of a face. Every one that has any intelligence knows that class of work can be done at a very different price from the work the hon. member has mentioned. There is therefore not a scintilla of truth in the statements which have been made. The hon. member, has had this matter explained to him on several occasions and yet he repeats the same old story. If the hon. gentleman chooses to make these allusions again, for my part I suppose he will have to take the standard of his own measure in that respect.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is now 12 o'clock and I would suggest to the leader of the House, that as several of his own friends do not want to pass the estimates the committee had better rise.

Mr. FIELDING. I think I could make a better suggestion than that. I think we should pass these supplementary estimates now because they all form part of the one Supply Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. That can be arranged tomorrow. There is no use sitting up if hon. gentlemen opposite are going to delay the business of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. Let us finish the Public Works estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) is so fond of reading lectures to members on this side that I wish to point to a statement which he made the other night and which is not a correct statement. In order to try to make some political capital he said the other evening that Dr. T. F. Chamberlain, inspector of prisons and charities for the Ontario government had been dismissed by Mr. Whitney and a Conservative put in his place. The hon. gentleman stated in reply to me that Dr. R. W. Bruce Smith was a Conservative.

Mr. CONMEE. I never used the name of Dr. Bruce Smith, I do not know Dr. Bruce Smith. I made the statement that Mr. Chamberlain was dismissed and I repeat it now, and I made the statement that the inspector who comes up our section of the country is a Conservative. I do not know his name and I did not give his name then.

Mr. BLAIN. Now we have got the member for Rainy River where we want him. The member for East Lambton read from Dr. Bruce Smith's report and my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee) said it was a partisan report.

Mr. CONMEE. I repeat that now if it will do the member any good.

Mr. BLAIN. He repeats that now ?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. Chamberlain was not dismissed by the Whitney government. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. Chamberlain resigned when the Ross government were in power and contested the county of Dundas.

Mr. CONMEE. That was ten years previously.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) must not try that bluff. He knows very well that Mr. Chamberlain did contest that county some years ago, but he also knows that he resigned his seat and contested the county in 1904 and I have the report in my hand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. To what item is the hon. gentleman speaking?

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) undertakes to read a lecture on truthfulness to this side of the House, and I propose to answer him. I repeat that when he makes the statement that Mr. Chamberlain was dismissed by the Whitney government, he knows well that that is not a correct statement; he knows that Mr. Chamberlain resigned and contested the county of Dundas in the last federal election in 1904, and I have under my hand the record, which shows that the Ross government paid this man a gratuity, the payment of part of it being left as a legacy to the Whitney government. And the gentleman who took his place, was Dr. Bruce Smith and was not appointed by the Whitney government, but by the Ross government. He was taken from the Brockville asylum and put into that position. I have the record here. I do not wish to take up the time of the House, but when the hon. gentleman is reading a lecture on veracity to this side, he may just as well be a little more careful about the statements which he himself makes.

Mr. CONMEE. I made my statements in good faith.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. CONMEE. No, I will not take it back. But I will make my inquiries and, if I am wrong, I will take it back.

Mr. BLAIN. I will hold the hon. gentleman down to that statement.

Saskatchewan and Alberta—Lesser Slave river—urgent provisional improvements, $6,000.

Mr. LAKE. What is the explanation of that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a vote last year, and the work has been going on. This is an additional vote to pay for the work of the present year.

Mr. LAKE. But what is the necessity for the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To improve the channel by blasting out rocks, and so on.

Mr. LAKE. But what is the necessity for it? Is it for the fishing companies?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That new country, though far north, is developing. There are boats upon the lake, and this is to assist navigation.

Stanley island, Lake St. Francis—wharf—to complete payments, $350.

Mr. J. D. REID. This wharf is owned by a private individual, is it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am informed that this is a wharf needed for the public accommodation. The Richelieu and Ontario steamers call there. The place is a great resort for tourists, and the wharf is greatly in the public interest. It may be that the island is owned by private individuals, but the wharf is public and the roads approaching it are public. I suppose it is as public a place as can be found along the St. Lawrence.

Mr. J. D. REID. There was a wharf there owned by the parties who own the hotel. And I take it that they are making lots of money out of the place. The minister might just as well say that he will build a wharf at the hotel at Gananoque.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am informed that the large steamers of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Line did not call at this island until the wharf was built.

Mr. TAYLOR. What does the hon. minister mean by roads leading to the wharf? This is on an island.

Mr. J. D. REID. The only road leading to it is the walk that leads down to it from the hotel. This is an instance of where the department is building a wharf for a private individual. The government cannot do anything with the wharf, because private individuals own the land up to the wharf. Is the government going to charge an annual rental, or will they get any revenue from the amount invested?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) is evidently misinformed. My information is that the owner offered all the ground and the old wharf property and the right of way.

Mr. TAYLOR. Right of way, where from?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Down to the wharf.

Mr. TAYLOR. The way to the wharf is by water. The wharf is on an island.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is no highway, only a walk from the wharf to the hotel.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is there only one hotel?

Mr. J. D. REID. Only one hotel. The owners of the hotel own several private houses. How much has this wharf cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The appropriation for 1907-8 was $3,500. In addition to this being used by the steamers of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, my memorandum shows that this makes a harbour of refuge. It is a great protection to the small vessels navigating that part of the lake.

Mr. J. D. REID. The man who made that memorandum certainly was only trying to give the minister some excuse for having this amount voted. As to a harbour of refuge, there are islands all around this. It is not necessary to have that wharf for a harbour of refuge. Besides, the parties who own the island must have a wharf there and have always had a wharf. There has been a boat between this point and Cornwall for twenty-five years. I want to know if the government are going to get any revenue from this wharf ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not know very much about this matter myself, but if the gentlemen who are well acquainted with that locality desire that it be struck out, I do not see why it should not be struck out. My hon. friend from Charlevoix (Mr. Forget) is here, and he has knowledge of the operations of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company. On a former occasion, it was represented in this House that this wharf was for the accommodation of that company as well as for the general public. If it is not so, then, so far as I am concerned, I would be prepared to join my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) in moving that this item be struck out.

Mr. KEMP. Who made the representations to which the hon. member (Mr. Johnston) referred ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) will look through the discussions of the estimates as reported in 'Hansard' he will find it to be as I have stated. If the hon. gentleman will say that this matter has not been discussed within the last eight or ten years, I will undertake to convince him that it has.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not care whether the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company use it, or what line of steamers may use it. But I want——

Mr. JOHNSTON. I will support you in striking it out.

Mr. J. D. REID. All right, if the minister will strike it out. But this vote of $350 is only a small portion of what has been spent. And the minister will not tell me whether the country will get any revenue out of it. It simply means that the department has given thousands of dollars to the owners of this island, who are strong supporters of the government.

Mr. FORGET. The Richelieu and Ontario Company did stop their steamers there in years gone by, to help the hotel. But for the last two years, it has been a bankrupt concern. And, besides, I think this is one of the most dangerous spots on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. J. D. REID. And it is within the last two years, when the steamers have stopped calling, that this money has been spent. And it is on the representations that have been made to him that the minister is willing to spend $5,000 or $10,000 on this work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost is $3,250. My information is that the steamers of the Richelieu and Ontario are calling at this wharf, and that, in addition, this is a point of transfer for people to other localities there.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is a summer resort and when people want to make little trips to Lancaster, Summerstown and other places, they have to take a ferry boat. To help the owner of this island, the government are putting up an expensive wharf. It is absurd to talk of its being a convenience to the public. My hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Forget) says that now the hotel is bankrupt.

Mr. ALCORN. Is any land required at this point for the wharf ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that the old wharf and the roadway to it have been acquired by the Crown.

Mr. BENNETT. Has there been a conveyance ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say.

Mr. BENNETT. Why, the minister has just told the House that it has been acquired. He is being imposed on by his department. His assistant handed up to him a reference to a petition presented by the town council, but anybody who has ever been at Stanley Island knows that it is nothing but a little summer resort, which belongs to a very strong Liberal party man, a Mr. McLennan, and that is the reason this wharf is being built at the expense of the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The title to the wharf and roadway has been acquired and invested in the Crown.

Mr. TAYLOR. What right of way to the wharf ? Is it the right of way from the wharf to the hotel ?

Mr. J. D. REID. It is only 100 feet from the wharf to the hotel. The minister refuses to state whether there is going to be any revenue. Here is a wharf costing over $3,000 which is being built on private land, owned by a private party.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This wharf will stand in exactly the same position as every other wharf. When transferred to the Marine and Fisheries Department, the ordinary tolls will be levied.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have come to the foot of the page and we ought now to adjourn.

Mr. FIELDING. Will my hon. friend not consent to our voting the balance of the estimates ?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, we have done very well, and we can finish them to-morrow.

Mr. FIELDING. Evidently our hon. friends are determined to keep our unhappy militiamen out of their pay. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Some resolutions reported.

THE CIVIL SERVICE REPORT.

Mr. LEWIS. Was it fair in the Minister of Finance to give to the leading Liberal newspaper in the city of Ottawa a copy in advance of the Civil Service Report so that that newspaper got an advantage over the other press ?

Mr. FIELDING. If I had done so, there would be no wrong, but as a matter of fact I did not. No newspaper received it, so far as the government are concerned. The only copy we had was the copy laid on the table, and no newspaper man saw it before then.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That newspaper had a staff of seven people copying it here.

Mr. LEWIS. The leading Liberal paper had eight columns of the report in its issue and none of the others had.

Mr. FIELDING. That shows the Liberal paper is the most enterprising. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.25 a.m. Friday.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 27, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SUPPLY—BREAKWATER AT PETIT ROCHER.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). Before you leave the chair, I want to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to a return that he brought down a few days ago in reply to an order of the House. It reads as follows :

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Return to an address of the House of Commons, dated January 15, 1908, for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, orders in council, and tenders, with the names and amounts of each, in possession of the government or any member or official thereof, respecting the construction of a breakwater at Petit Rocher on the southwestern side of the Baie des Chaleurs, as detailed on page 74 of the Minister of Public Works for the year ending March 31, 1907.

I moved for that return, and the return has been brought down, and the last document in that return is dated Ottawa, November 25, 1905, and that is the last reference to anything having taken place. The order of the House says, all papers and documents up to the 31st of March, 1907. Now, if the minister had read his report he would have seen that the return which he has brought down has not complied with the order of the House, and perhaps for a good reason, because it comes up to the point just where the critical work commences. I will read the report he presented to the House, page 74 :

Petit Rocher is a farming, fishing and lumbering settlement on the southwestern side of Baie des Chaleurs, twelve miles north of Bathurst.

To afford protection to the fishing boats and vessels trading in Baie des Chaleurs, for which there is no natural shelter in the vicinity, and to facilitate the shipment of lumber, a contract was entered into May 31, 1904, with Simon McGregor, for the construction of a breakwater, consisting of a main work 209 feet long on the outer face, and a wing or 'L' placed at an angle of 74 degrees 30 minutes with the main part, 160 feet long on the outer face. The width on tip will be 30 feet. At its inner end the breakwater will be 480 feet from the shore. The depth along the inner face varies from 11 to 18½ feet at low water.

In 1904-5 a right of way 860 feet long from the public road to the shore was opened up, graded and fenced.

As I stated a few minutes ago, the last document on the file of the return is dated November, 1905.

The contract work was began on March 18, 1905, and by the end of 1904-5 two cribs, 96½ and 40 feet long respectively, had been built and sunk in place. A crib to form the remainder of the work was started on February 19, 1906, but on March 11, when it had reached a height of about six tiers, it was carried away by the ice.

I fancy, due to the fault of having appointed an inspector that knew nothing about his work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That assumption does not appear from any facts.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, that is my opinion.

It was, however, recovered on May 14. The outer section, which was intended to complete

the main part of the breakwater, was found to be intact and the work on it was resumed. By the end of the fiscal year this crib had been built to a height of 19 tiers, and the two cribs sunk in 1905 had been filled with ballast and built up to half tide level, and the upper ballast floors were laid.

During the fiscal year of 1906-7, the crib forming the remainer of the main work was sunk in place and a crib to complete the 'L' was begun and placed in position.

The work is going right along, but no correspondence on the matter is brought down, not a word said. It was about what occurred then that I wanted the correspondence.

The building of the superstructure was continued on the main part up to about high water level, when two storms, on November 12 and 16, carried away nearly the whole top, the break being about 9 feet in extreme depth.

Another inspector no doubt who did not look after the construction properly, and it was carried away the second time, the first time by the ice and the second time by a couple of storms.

Work was resumed on March 7, and by the close of the fiscal year the remains of three damaged piers of face timbers had been removed, and a part of the wrecked superstructure near the southern end rebuilt, the interior being filled with ballast. The expenditure for the fiscal year 1906-7 was $5,029.60.

Now I think we ought to have something about all this in the return. It is no wonder that the civil service is demoralized, because, when he got this report and saw there were damaging statements in it, the minister says: Tear that off, and we will bring down a return up to 1905. Certainly the minister must obey the order of the House and bring down all the correspondence, not cut it off in 1905 when the order says down to the first of March, 1907. It appears by his own report that this pier had been carried away twice and either under a new contract or the old contract extended, or in consequence of the work being done by the day, in some way it is carried on, and $5,000 spent last year and not a word of it in the return brought down. I want the minister to explain why he has not complied with the order of the House.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). When motions are made for returns in my department, the practice is to send the order to the deputy minister, and from him it goes to the clerks in charge of the department from which the information is desired. In this case the ordinary course was pursued. I gave no instructions whatever to the deputy minister or to any clerk in the department, I gave no instructions as to keeping back any correspondence or any paper. I did not see what was in the return, but simply submitted it to the House in the ordinary way. I think it is unworthy of my hon. friend, when calling attention to what he says is an incompleteness in the return, to suggest that the minister gave directions to remove certain portions and to send down an incomplete return. I am very much surprised that the hon. gentleman should feel it to be his duty to make a statement of that kind without the slightest foundation, and without having any facts which would authorize him or warrant him in making such an insinuation. Although a portion of the breakwater may have been carried away by storms subsequent to 1905, it does not follow that there would be correspondence on the subject.

Mr. TAYLOR. But I know there is.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, all he would have to do at any time would be to call my attention to the fact that this return is incomplete, and I would give the necessary directions to the department to see if there was any further correspondence, and if there was, I would have it brought down. But I think it is most unfortunate that my hon. friend could not rise in his place to call attention to what he thinks is an incompleteness in the return, without making unworthy and unfounded insinuations.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (East Hamilton). If, in the administration of the minister's department, it turns out that works are carried away, is no inquiry made? Do they go on renewing the work, paying for it without a word being said as to whether the engineer, the inspector or anybody is to blame? Does nobody care? This is the kind of thing we read in the report of the Civil Service Commission. Surely the hon. gentleman does not mean us to suppose that where works are carried away he is not called on to take action. If no inquiry is made in such a case to ascertain whether an official of the department is at fault surely the money of the country is not being properly looked after.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who suggested that there is no inquiry? I made no suggestion of that kind. Whenever information comes to the department that a work has been carried away, instructions are at once given to the resident engineer to make a full inquiry and report.

Mr. BARKER. These instructions should be on the return.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These instructions would not form a part of a return or correspondence.

Mr. BARKER. Certainly they would.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all. The chief engineer would give his directions to the

resident engineer. I do not understand that upon an ordinary motion for a return the directions which are given by the head of the engineering staff to the resident engineer would be included. If my hon. friend desires those instructions that would be a different matter altogether ; If there is any further information my hon. friend would like I would be only too happy to ascertain if it is in the department and to bring it down as a supplementary return.

Mr. J. D. REID. I want to make a somewhat similar complaint. One document, the most important of all, was missing from a return ordered to be brought to that committee with reference to the purchase of the boat 'Catherine C.' When we ask for a return we expect that all the papers and correspondence in connection with the matter will be brought down. That has been the custom in other departments. The incompleteness of these returns would indicate to my mind that there is something wrong in that department. On the discovery of the omission the clerk of the Public Accounts Committee communicated with the Public Works Department and a clerk from that department came over and told me that search would be made for the missing document. The minister snould see that these returns are complete, as matters stand there is no doubt in my mind that for some reason or other the Public Works Department does not want to produce these documents.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the first intimation I have had, from my hon. friend or any one, that any document in connection with the purchase of this vessel had not been produced. I repeat that the instructions to the deputy minister are to produce all papers on the file of the department called for by any motion, either of the committee or of the House. I shall have a search made for the document if my hon. friend will furnish me with a memorandum.

## INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. LAKE. I would ask the Prime Minister when we may expect a return to an address ordered by the House on the 19th of February last asking for a copy of the memorial passed by the legislature of Saskatchewan in regard to the validity of the Autonomy Act and correspondence relating thereto.

I would also call the attention of the Hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) although he is not present, to three returns which have been ordered by this House which I would very much like to see brought down. These returns relate to the disposal of Dominion lands ; one was ordered on February 19, and two on February 26 last.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

## BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether the commission appointed to inquire into the British Columbia fisheries has made a report and if so why that report has not been submitted to parliament. The information which comes to me is that the report was made in November last, and that for some reason which I cannot appreciate it has remained in the Archives of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries Department ever since.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The report was submitted to me some time ago and it has been ordered to be printed. It has probably been printed by this time and the moment it is received from the printer I shall lay it before the House.

## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have been asked by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington), who had to leave for Toronto last night, to inquire why the report of the Public Accounts Committee with respect to the Ross rifle has been so long delayed ?

## COST OF NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether all the information embraced in my question with respect to the cost of the National Transcontinental Railway is covered by the motion for the papers. My question on this subject was dropped at the suggestion of the Minister of Railways. In dropping that question I did not wish to be understood as withdrawing my request for all the information covered by the question, and therefore I trust the hon. minister will see that the return brought down covers not only the formal terms of that return, but everything embraced in the question as well. I would like the hon. gentleman to be prepared, when his main estimates come up, to give very thorough information to the House with regard to the cost of that road up to the present, and an estimate, as far as possible, of what the entire cost of the road will be.

## ADDITION TO HOUSE OF COMMONS—ALLOTMENT OF ROOMS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is any arrangement or allotment being made in respect of the rooms in the new wing of this building ? If that matter is being dealt with I would suggest to the government before any final conclusion is reached that it would be only

fair that gentlemen on this side of the House should be consulted a little as to the nature of the arrangement ?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I expect very shortly to look the rooms over in conjunction with Mr. Speaker, and after that I shall be very happy to have communication with my hon. friend with regard to their allotment.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a matter for the Minister of Public Works or for this House? As I understand this addition is intended to add to the capacity of this central building which is largely at the disposal and for the convenience of the work of the House. It seems to me that whilst the Minister of Public Works is the builder thereof, the disposer of these rooms should be the Speaker acting for both sides of the House, and that before any cut and dried arrangement is made by any person else the House itself should be consulted I would like to know what is really going on, whether a large number of rooms is being provided and if it is proposed that these rooms shall be placed at the disposal of members of the House. Are we going into an arrangement of having elaborately fitted up rooms in large numbers for members of the House and all that follows ? Some statement of the policy to be pursued, I think, ought to be made. It seems to me that the Speaker is the proper person to make that or some one connected with the House itself.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is aware that the Minister of Public Works has always had charge of these matters. I agree with my hon. friend, however, that the Minister of Public Works has no more power in this matter than anybody else. He has more power, but technically the House itself can dispose of these rooms as to it seems best. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), however, has stated that he intends to consult with Mr. Speaker with regard to the disposition to be made of these rooms, and I have no doubt that the arrangement that is come to will be quite satisfactory.

## GEORGIAN BAY FISHERY COMMISSION.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) when the report of the Georgian Bay Fishery Commission, of which Mr. Birnie is the head, will be brought down and printed ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think that report has been sent to the Printing Bureau to be printed and it will be brought down afterwards.

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

Public Works—chargeable to income—land and cable telegraph lines, Gulf of St. Lawrence, maritime provinces, Cape Breton Island telegraph lines—Meat cove, North Sydney, Port Hawkesbury section, extension of Grand river station, Loch Lomond branch line to Enon, $400; North Sydney, Scatarie section—improvement of, $600; $1,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Minister proceeds I would like to say that as we are endeavouring to run over these items somewhat hurriedly in order that the public service may not suffer, we understand that any item, or any subject included in these items, may be discussed later on under the main estimates even although it should not be quite relevant to any subject embraced in the main estimates.

Mr. FIELDING. Quite so, if not discussed now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If not discussed now or if not duscussed fully now

Mr. FIELDING. I quite agree to that.

Public Works—miscellaneous—gratuity to the widow of the late Captain Thomas O'Leary of the government cable ship 'Tyrian,' accidentally killed November 28, 1907, in the Intercolonial Railway yard at Halifax, $1,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of that ?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The only vote that is larger than the usual gratuity to employees is that providing for a gratuity to the widow of the late Captain Thomas O'Leary. Captain O'Leary was in a very responsible position and had been for a great many years Captain of the cable ship. When going to his vessel and when passing over the railway at Halifax, some cars which were standing were suddenly shunted back and he was killed. He leaves a large family and the government after very careful consideration thought it would not be unreasonable to allow the widow and family $1,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The other gratuities which are provided for here are paid in consequence of natural deaths ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. How much is paid to architects employed outside of the regular staff ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are very few architects employed out of the regular staff.

Mr. J. D. REID. Have you any idea how much is paid ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not tell my hon. friend, but it is not very much.

Mr. J. D. REID. $5,000 or $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably not as much as that.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the department been in the habit of paying gratuities to the widows of deceased officers ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. The rule is that in the case of employees a gratuity equal to two months' salary is allowed when the husband dies in the employ of the government.

Graving docks—maintenance and repairs, $8,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How comes that amount to be necessary ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. These are repairs to the docks at Esquimalt, Kingston and Levis. There are receipts from each of these docks, but this is the balance which is required to pay for repairs during the present year.

Mr. FOSTER. Have the repairs been paid for ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Telegraph line—land and cable telegraph lines, Lower St. Lawrence and maritime provinces, $15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be done with this money ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Constant repairs are required in connection with the cable and telegraph system.

Mr. FOSTER. There is not very much food for us in that information, but I suppose we cannot expect a full meal on the supplementary estimates. When the minister brings down his main estimates I will expect him to go fully into that matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have all the information when the main estimates are being considered.

Telegraph lines—Ashcroft-Dawson, $17,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the year's revenue and expenditure for that line?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to pay outstanding accounts for rents, repairs, living and travelling expenses and supplies, $5,500 ; salaries, $11,500. The total expenditure up to March, 1908, so far as can now be ascertained, is $198,141.41. The appropriation was $180,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get that when the main estimates come down.

British Columbia—Cape Beal lines—to provide for the settling of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's claim for their share of the cost of maintenance, $7,800.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. J. D. REID.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Canadian Pacific Railway operate the lines and we contribute half the cost of maintenance.

Mr. FOSTER. And get half the receipts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure as to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Or do we pay half the loss, which is it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have the use of these lines in connection with the Pacific cable.

Mr. BERGERON. Do we get anything out of receipts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but these lines are in remote places and the receipts are not large.

Militia—annual drill, further amount required, $235,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The question that arose last night over this item was as to whom the money is owed, and as to whether those to whom it is owed have been out of their money for any length of time.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Of that amount $65,000 was over-due the previous year and paid out of the annual vote of the current year, although the expenditure was incurred in the previous year. The following are the amounts due : Appropriation over-drawn, $91,000; railway claims awaiting payment, $102,000; city corps, to pay 2nd Regiment, infantry, $9,500 ; 10th Regiment, $6,750 ; 21st Regiment, $3,500; 22nd Regiment, $3,000 ; 24th, $2,250; 25th, $2,500; 38th, $5,250; 1st Regiment, infantry, Montreal, $5,900; 5th Regiment, $3,350 ; Foot Guards, Ottawa, $1,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Have the militiamen personally received their pay?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not those I have mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER. Those are the city corps?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Mostly, Toronto and Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. How long has that money been overdue?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Between one and three months.

Mr. FOSTER. Any kick?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not serious. In the city corps the men themselves do not get the pay individually, it goes into the regimental fund and it does not matter very materially whether it is a week or two late. There is no serious inconvenience to the men.

Mr. FOSTER. How is it that $65,000 has been paid out of the current year's expenditure to pay for what was due on the previous year, instead of taking a vote ? A

balance of that size must surely have been known.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This $65,000 was for railway accounts, and these accounts are sometimes slow in coming in.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it the policy of the Miliitia Department to pay out of one year's appropriations what is allowed to be overdue on the preceding one ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is not.

Mr. FOSTER. But the policy is more honoured in the non-observance of it than the observance ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, this is the total amount out of a total vote of nearly a million.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we want to know how it is that the minister has overdrawn by over $91,000. On whom did you overdraw ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. On the general credit given to the department.

Mr. FOSTER. In this case again the Auditor General has made an appropriation of $91,000 to the Militia Department. I want to call the attention of the Finance Minister to this thing, which is getting serious. Parliament is coming to be pretty nearly a farce, so far as voting money is concerned. Last night we had an appropriation of $1,400,000 practically made by the Auditor General and now we have another. If the department is well directed, I do not see why you do not call for what you want, and do not keep to the rules.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think it is fair to admit the force of the hon. gentleman's observations, but it never has been the practice of the department to keep very strictly within the vote. When I came into office, the laches were even more serious than they are now. It seems to have been a custom that has grown up in the department not to expect the main estimates to cover the whole expenditure, but to look forward to a supplementary vote. The custom has existed since confederation. I venture to think that it is an undesirable custom, and I have attempted to put an end to it.

Mr. FOSTER. The attempt seems this year to have been very unsuccessful.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In the main estimates which I have submitted, with the exception of the item of annual drill, I expect that every dollar of expenditure for the year will be covered.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of the item of $155,000 for pay of the permanent force has been overdrawn ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. None.

Mr. FOSTER. All that $155,000 is owing?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, chiefly to the men, for a month and a half's pay.

Mr. FOSTER. When the minister is not brave enough to put in what he requires and have it voted, he runs the risk of having the army of the country——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Sometimes he is brave enough, but the Finance Minister may be stronger than he is.

Mr. FOSTER. That point will have to be settled between the two ministers. The hon. gentleman is the War Minister of this country, and he sees the gravity of this. We might be attacked at any time. The Japanese might come over, or the United States or some other enemy might send a brotherly contingent, but anyway you are a month and a half behind in paying your army I think Crowns have been overthrown for less provocation than that. What would the minister have done if they had marched up in force from Halifax, and attacked the citadel here for non-payment of dues for a month and a half?

Sir FREDERICK BOREDN. I should have called on the patriotic critic of the government to give us the money at once, and he would have done it.

Mr. FOSTER. The patriotic critic would have delivered you over to your enemies.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I may say as a matter of fact that the estimate was based on the total number of 2,800 for the permanent force, but it was found that the work could not be efficiently carried on at the different depots with that number, particularly at Halifax, and the number was increased to 3,000. Each member of the permanent force costs something like $500. Most of this amount is accounted for in that way. The force will be carried on during the coming year at the increased number.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the minister agrees that it is really too bad that they should have been kept out of their pay ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Of course I do.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the troublesome part of the matter is this. We passed all the estimates which the minister submitted and which he told us would be sufficient to drill the force for a year. Now he asks for $225,000 more. It shows that there has been bad judgment in estimating what was required or there has been some extravagance in the administration of the department. If it was known what number of men were to be drilled, the calculation ought to have come closer to the actual amount required.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think I can explain that. An estimate is made usu-

ally on the experience of previous years. We never know beforehand exactly how full the regiments will be. We provide for the usual number per regiment, but last year a larger number of men than usual went into camp. In addition, we had last year for the first time the permanent camp at Petawawa, and it was difficult to estimate exactly the cost involved. We considered 2,800 as sufficient, but we found it was not and the number was raised to 3,000 which is sufficient. We were making our first experience in carrying on the garrisons of Halifax and Esquimalt and were naturally anxious to reduce the number as low as possible. At the same time we are under an obligation to the imperial authorities and ourselves to keep those garrisons up to proper strength and we found we could not do that with 2,800 and increased the number to 3,000.

Mr. LALOR. What is the cost per man for the annual drill?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About $25.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it a fact that ten or twelve years ago the expenditure in the Militia Department was $1,600,000 and now it is about $6,000,000?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot see that answering that question gives very much valuable information. Six years ago we had no Esquimalt and Halifax to support. To-day the amount of money required to support those two garrisons is between $1,500,000 and $2,000,000. The pay of men is just double. The headquarters staff has undoubtedly been increased, for reasons I need not go into now. The strength of the militia has been increased 50 per cent.

Mr. LALOR. Is $25 per head the amount each man receives or is that the cost to the country?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is the cost of feeding, transporting and paying per man in camp.

Mr. OWEN. Is there a militia commission?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There are a great many commissions in the militia. There is a Militia Council.

Mr. OWEN. What is the number?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There are four military and two civilian members, besides the minister who is the president of the council. There is besides a secretary.

Mr. OWEN. What does that cost the country?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It does not cost anything because we simply utilize the heads of the different departments, who meet once a week to discuss the affairs of the militia and advise the minister as to what should be done.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). Is $25 per man the cost to the country for the season's drill?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Is that the total cost?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That does not include the cost of the uniform.

Mr. A. MARTIN. If it only costs $25 to drill each man, you have a very large vote.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The militia is something like 50,000 men.

Mr. DANIEL. How many are drilled altogether?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. 44,000.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister had 9,400 more than he expected.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Probably that includes the permanent force.

Mr. DANIEL. Are they included in the annual drill?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They were this year. At Petawawa and some of the other camps, the permanent force turned out to assist in the camp.

Mr. DANIEL. They do not get anything out of this vote?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. How much do you pay each man per day?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The smallest pay is 70 cents a day up to $1 a day according to the number of years in camp. Fifty cents is really the basis, but for the first year's good conduct a man gets 20 cents extra. They practically all get it. For the second year he gets 15 cents, and the third year 15 cents.

Mr. LALOR. Does the minister contemplate anything better in the way of providing stores and taking care of the stores of the rural battalions? I have some little experience with the battalion of my own county. There is not very good provision for taking care of the rifles or uniform or stores especially where there are no armouries or drill halls. Might I take advantage of this opportunity to remind the minister, as I have frequently done before, of the great necessity of a drill hall in the town of Dunville.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am much obliged to my hon. friend. If he could come to my assistance in procuring the funds necessary to construct small or larger armouries generally throughout the country, he would have no complaint to make on that score. As a matter of fact the practice has

been to give each captain a certain amount of money to pay him for taking care of the arms and clothing, and to provide storage. That has been the practice since confederation, and it has worked very well. But we seem to have reached a time now when something more is necessary. My own idea is, as I have explained to the House before, that in the rural districts small armouries should be built at a small expense where a company, or perhaps two companies if they were located near together, could have room at their own headquarters in which to store their arms and clothing, and a room large enough where they could have lectures and meetings occasionally in the evening. I hope that will come about, we are gradually doing it already. The particular place mentioned by my hon. friend will be considered in due course.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I would concur in what my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) has said with reference to the necessity of a proper place for the storage of arms. That is a great necessity for some of the companies in the province from which I come. I drew the attention of the minister several years ago to the fact that in my own town of Minnedosa there is no proper place where arms can be cared for. At that time they were in a room situated in the town hall, but the company had to vacate that during the last year; the town authorities notified them that they required the room for other purposes, so they were compelled to rent a room on the outskirts of the town. I understood that the room they procured has been broken into by some person or other and considerable damage done to the arms. I also brought to the attention of the minister at that time the necessity of a drill hall in the town of Minnedosa, and the minister, in order to cut my remarks short, stated that there was in the estimates of that year a lump sum for the purpose of erecting drill halls throughout the province of Manitoba. I also drew his attention to the fact that there were special sums for the erection of drill halls at both Brandon and Virden. This was in the year 1904, just before a general election, and probably that is why they were specifically put down for drill halls. Now, the town of Minnedosa has a company just as strong as the town of Virden or the city of Brandon. I have here a communication from Major Dyer in reference to the necessity for a drill hall in Minnedosa, and I will read it:

As I promised, I herewith give you a few reasons why I consider it vital that 'D' squadron, 12th Dragoons, should have a drill hall at its headquarters in the town of Minnedosa. We are the only squadron in Manitoba, with the exception of Souris, that has not one. We have a large and expensive equipment belonging to the government, which it is very difficult to keep as it should be kept, without proper quarters.

We have proved ourselves one of the most efficient squadrons in the regiment, having won the Lieutenant Governor's cup for greatest efficiency in shooting under active service conditions, each year since it was presented, and have been repeatedly commended for the steadiness and good behaviour of the men. There has never been a member of 'D' squadron in the guard-room or up before the orderly room for misconduct.

The squadron is composed chiefly of independent farmers who already make great sacrifices to make themselves efficient for the good of the country, and a drill hall here would do much towards increasing their efficiency, and would also tend to bind them more together and take an even greater interest in their work. Many of the members of the squadron who enlisted for three years have nearly got their time in, and the establishment of a drill hall here would be a proof to them that their work was appreciated at headquarters, and a great inducement to sign on again at the expiration of their term of service. Then again, almost all of the men are farmers, and their time is taken up in summer with their work, and in winter when they have the time to spare we cannot drill or instruct as the climate forbids it out of doors, and we have no place that we can drill indoors.

The building of a drill hall would also be a good advertisement, and we should be more likely to get the best men if it was in evidence.

Yours very sincerely,
HUGH M. DYER.

That I think shows the necessity for a drill hall in that particular town. The squadron is composed of 68 non-commissioned officers and men, and 6 officers, the same as in the town of Brandon. The allowance for care of arms and stores is only $80 per annum, and $5 is allowed for books, postage and stationery. I think that the damage done to the arms by reason of the storeroom having been broken into for want of proper protection, is certainly considerable. I would press upon the minister once more the necessity for a drill hall in that town. As the major truly says, that is the only town in the province of Manitoba having a militia company, with the exception of Souris, that has no proper place in which to store its arms, and no drill hall.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I sympathize fully with the views expressed in the letter which my hon. friend has read; and if I were able, I would be glad to have an armoury constructed in that town, and in all towns in similar circumstances, as soon as possible, and it will be done as soon as possible. It would take a large vote of some millions of dollars to construct even the most simple kind of building that would be suitable, if it were done all over Canada. I admit that the difficulties are probably greater in the west than in the east, because it is more difficult to get buildings in the west, and rents are much higher. But our friends there will have to be patient. At the present time we are constructing perhaps a larger percentage of such buildings

in the west than in the east, relatively to the strength of the militia. As the hon. gentleman has brought the matter to my notice again I will not forget it this time, and will see what we can do.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The then Minister of Public Works promised me three or four years ago that he would have something in the supplementary estimates for the purpose of purchasing a site ; and he promised that if the Minister of Militia would recommend the erection of a drill hall he would put something in the estimates for that purpose.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Of course the work has to be done by the Minister of Public Works, although it is done on the recommendation of the Minister of Militia.

Mr. LALOR. I would ask the minister if there is being built an armoury in the town of Welland, and if so, what is the cost of that armoury ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman will let his question stand until the estimates come up again, I will give him the information.

Mr. LALOR. I can understand that the minister, probably for want of funds, has some difficulty in making all the armouries and drill halls that are needed. I want to impress upon him the great necessity for drill halls in the rural towns. I fear that so much attention is given to the city battalions that the rural battalions are being neglected. No doubt the rural battalions deserve more consideration than they are receiving. I think it is the battalions in the rural sections that we want more particularly to encourage. I know that there is a great necessity in the town where I live for a proper place in which the arms can be taken care of. The captain of the company in that town is a very efficient officer and he informs me that the amount he receives for that purpose is not nearly sufficient to take proper care of the arms, and he has himself to be at considerable expense in order to take care of them. I feel that the grants for taking care of arms of the rural battalions should be increased.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I agree with what by hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) has said as to the desirability of having armouries in the different towns where there are militia companies organized. It does seem to me there is something radically wrong in the system. We have armouries over a large part of the country. In my own county a drill shed or armoury was built in nearly every township 30 or 40 years ago and there are three or four in ever county. Another one was built in the town of Dundas a few years ago. These sheds for a great number of years have been used only once a year for the township fair. The militia use only a small space at one end of the shed where the arms are stored; perhaps one-tenth of the shed is set apart for the armoury. The militia use the main part of the shed perhaps once a year in preparing for the annual drill at camp or something of that kind. These sheds should be used and I believe a great saving might be accomplished if a large part of the drill was performed in them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend will observe that there is a difference between a drill hall and an armoury. There may be an armoury in a drill hall, but an armoury is not necessarily a drill hall. These halls to which my hon. friend refers were built as he says many years ago when the system of carrying on the militia training was entirely different from what it is now. Then the militia were drilled in units, under cover ; they are now drilled in camps. The rural militia and sometimes the city militia go under canvass each year, and so these old drill halls have been abandoned largely, many of them have been sold at auction and we have allowed the public to use them. The armouries of which we are talking now are small buildings which will give accommodation for arms and accoutrements of all kinds and a committee room large enough to permit the men to meet together in the evening and listen to a lecture on military subjects. There is no intention to construct any large drill halls in the future outside of cities.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Is it not a mistake to abandon the idea of drilling in these country halls? The consequence of the present system is that at the annual drills 50 per cent of those who enter the companies are men from the towns and cities out of work, generally men who are absolutely transients and who will not be in the country a year from now. I would say that not 50 per cent of those drilled in the annual camps of rural battalions are men likely to be in the country or at the service of the country if they are required. Farmers' sons at that time of the year when the drills are held are so busy that it is impossible for more than a very small percentage of the number required for each company to turn out, although these are the men who would be the most useful members of the militia. One of these men is worth 20 of the ordinary men who go to camp. These farmers' sons then have no opportunity to drill unless they can do so in these armouries in the winter when it is too cold to drill out of doors. I think it is a mistake to abandon that system, as it would enable the very men whom we desire to have in the militia to receive sufficient drilling.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Has the minister any explanation to give concerning the reported disorganized condition of the 5th Regiment in Victoria, B.C.? It seems to me to be important at this time to have some information on this subject.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have nothing official in the department as yet. I am not officially really seized of the fact that anything has occurred there. As soon as I get the information I shall of course bring it down.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is the newspaper report that the annual drill of the militia is not likely to be held this year correct? I have seen it stated that a certain portion of the militia will be taken to Quebec, I think 60 per cent of the militia regiments in Ontario and the eastern provinces. If this is to be done, will the cost of taking these men to Quebec be taken out of the vote passed the other day for the battlefields celebration, or will there be the usual grant for militia camps?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The plans have not yet been completed, in fact, they have scarcely been begun. It is the present idea that it would be desirable that a portion of the vote for the annual drill should be used in the transportation and mobilization of a considerable number of the militia at Quebec where they will be under canvass under the usual conditions of camp, and the duties ordinarily performed in camps of instruction will be discharged there, and of course the troops will take part in the review to be held at Quebec in connection with the celebration. I do not know how many days that will take, but whatever the cost will be it will be charged up against the vote for the annual drill and the officers of my department think that this will be a very valuable experience. The money will not be, to the extent of a dollar, taken from the $300,000 voted for the purpose of the celebration of Quebec.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is the percentage stated correct, 60 per cent?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About 50 per cent.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. In what way will the men be selected, by the local officers or by the department at Ottawa?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They could not be selected in any other way than by their own officers, and I think it is proposed that no one shall go who has not had at least one annual training. No absolutely raw recruits will be permitted to go.

Mr. FOWLER. Fifty per cent of the whole militia or of each company

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Of each company ?

Mr. FOWLER. So there will be skeleton companies ?

Mr. SPROULE. What about the other 50 per cent? Will they receive their training?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As far as the cities are concerned there will be no difficulty, and as far as the rural corps are concerned, one-half the number will be pretty well up to the usual number who go to camp.

Mr. WHITE. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) in regard to rural regiments and the necessity of their having drill sheds. I have the honour of belonging to a rural regiment which has its headquarters at the town from which I come, and I think that the department should endeavour to at least provide a drill shed at the headquarters of the regiment. Our men have very little chance of getting any drill until they go out to camp and they are therefore somewhat handicaped, but I think I am quite safe in saying that the rural regiments, for the amount of training they receive, show up very well at the camp with the other regiments. As a matter of fact I think our men do remarkably well for the short time they are able to train. In reference to our own regiment, our men do not get more than a couple or three weeks of training before they go to camp and they generally, do just as well as most of the city regiments. Another matter which I wish to call the attention of the minister to, is that last year at the Petawawa camp there was some hitch in the arrangements for transporting the regiments. I know that our regiment, when camp broke up, was given orders to entrain at noon and I think the regiment was kept there until seven or eight o'clock at night. That simply meant that the men were left there with practically no provisions whatever and only that the officers happened to look around and get something for their men they would have fared pretty poorly.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think there is a good deal in what the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) and the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) have said, but it is difficult for us to provide money to meet all these different suggestions. As I said a little while ago I think there should be a small armoury connected, as far as possible, with every company, or every unit, or certainly, with every two or three companies of the rural militia. A large portion of the rural militia are not situated where there are towns, and I dare say it would be difficult to get many of them together in the evening. But there should be in connection with this armoury a room large enough for a lecture room, and it seems to me that if we could have the young men brought together once a week in a building of that kind to listen to a lecture from their officers on military subjects it would be a good thing for the men and a good thing for the officers. I think a great deal of valuable information could be acquired and that it would largely meet the demand. Then, there is another way in which the point mentioned by the hon. member for Wentworth is being met, perhaps

not so much in the country, but in some of the more populous sections and that is by the establishment of a cadet corps. The very thing is being accomplished by that means which my hon. friend mentioned as being so extremely desirable. Boys from thirteen to twenty are being formed into cadet companies and instructed at a time in their lives when they will be more impressed by such training and when they will likely receive such impressions as they will never forget. This is being done more and more every year, and I think the time has come when, in every school where there are boys of thirteen and up, there should be a certain amount of teaching and training of that kind.

Mr. HERRON. I would like another word of explanation from the minister on the point that has been under discussion. I think the minister said that 50 per cent of the strength of the different regiments would be in field. Do I understand that he meant 50 per cent of the full strength of the regiment or does it include 50 per cent of the men happening to belong to the regiment at the time ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Fifty per cent of the authorized strength.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence if he recollects receiving a petition from the league of western rifle associations. This is a league composed of a number of rifle associations in Manitoba and Saskatchewan organized about a year ago for the purpose of having competitions and practising, and I think they had their first meeting in the city of Brandon last year. Upwards of 100 men turned out to that competition, they were put to a great deal of expense, as naturally they would be in the first year of their organization. However, the meeting stimulated a very great deal of interest in these competitions and it is the intention this year to enlarge it. It is not their intention to meet at the same place permanently, but as other towns are strong enough to have a rifle association, the league will move around from point to point in succeeding years. It is hoped this year that upwards of 200 men will assemble for such competition, naturally they have to go to considerable expense and they have sent a petition to the minister asking that he grant them $500. I am in receipt of a letter from the president of the league asking me to lend my assistance and support to the prayer of the petition. I would like to ask the minister if he has given this petition consideration and if the request is likely to be granted.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The petition has been received, I have seen it, and all I can say is that while I sympathize very much with the desire of these men we could not very well accede to their request unless we adopted the policy generally. I think that is a thing which the local authorities have been doing in other provinces. However, the matter is under consideration. The petition came too late for an amount to be put in the estimates this year, even if we had felt that we were able to grant it, but the matter will receive every consideration.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. This is not a request from a single rifle association but from a combination of associations.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I understand that it is all over the province.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Yes, and it covers part of Saskatchewan as well.

Mr. HERRON. Will the troops from the western provinces take part in the celebration at Quebec, or has the minister arrived at any conclusion yet ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, I am afraid not. The time required to move them and the very great cost that would be entailed would scarcely justify doing so, but they will get their annual drill, of course, in camps as usual. How far it may be intended to bring representatives from every part of the west I do not quite know, but it seems to me it is probable there will be representatives brought from every corps in the west as well as from the east but not to the same extent.

Mr. FOWLER. How far west will you draw from ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Port Arthur.

Mr. HERRON. I would recommend the minister to have representatives of the western regiments of cavalry as they will show up to great advantage.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am informed just now that it is intended to form a composite regiment made up of representatives from different parts of the west.

Mr. FOWLER. That would be an infantry regiment ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. How about the cavalry and artillery of the west ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have hardly developed the thing sufficiently to give any particulars, but the idea is to have this as a representative gathering as far as possible

Mr. FOWLER. Since we have decided upon this celebration at Quebec it may be made, if the department take the matter up in earnest, a very valuable thing for the militia of Canada. Bringing them all together will tend to incite them to make greater efforts than have been made in the past to bring the militia up to the mark, and

it will be an object lesson to the country as to how quickly the troops can be mobilized, it will give not only the rank and file greater advantages but it will give an opportunity to the staff officers to show whether they are up to the mark and whether or not they are earning the money they get.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I agree absolutely with that view.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand those corps which do not go to Quebec will still have their ordinary annual drill.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Those of the west.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it the intention to take a percentage from every corps in the east, rural and urban?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. The minister made a very important statement regarding the camp at Quebec and I think the country is entitled to hear at the earliest possible moment the full details of what is intended to be carried out. I understood the minister to say there will be no annual drill for the rural corps this year.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No other annual drill.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I also understood the minister to say that the city baltalions would go full strength.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. We will have to apply the same rule to all.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. What method of selection will be adopted? Will the department cause the colonel of each regiment to instruct his captains to select 50 per cent of each company?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The selection of course must be made by the officers subject to certain orders that will be issued, and one of which will be that no man shall go to Quebec who has not had some previous military training. It is assumed that every captain and every colonel for the sake of the good appearance of his regiment, whether it is a city or a rural battalion, will select the very best men. The department will leave that entirely to the judgment of the officers.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Is it the intention of the minister to have the cadet corps take part?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. A good many requests to that effect have been made, but I am unable to give an answer at this moment. Parliament will not prorogue next week I suppose, and there is lots of time between now and July to give the fullest information.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I desire to endorse the suggestion of my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron). This is a great historical occasion, and it would be unjust and unwise to entirely exclude all western representation from it. I agree with the minister that the distance is too great to bring to Quebec anything like 50 per cent of the western regiments, but I strongly urge upon the minister that he should favourably consider the request of my hon. friend (Mr. Herron) and have representation from the west. In a great gathering of this kind the inspiration that a few men will take back to the regiment would be of great benefit, and it would show the western people that they are not entirely forgotten in this great national celebration. Even if it takes more to bring the western men to Quebec that it does others, I think the people of the country would justify the expenditure.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have already said there would be representation from the west, but we have not yet been able to work out our plans. I agree with the spirit of the hon. gentleman's remarks.

Mr. BLAIN. This proposal means that 50 per cent of the men of the militia in the province of Ontario will have no drill this year.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not quite. There are some regiments with a strength of 400 which go to camp frequently with less than 200, and this year these regiments will go to Quebec 200 strong so that the probabilities are that many regiments will go to Quebec with the same strength as they go to the annual camp.

Mr. BLAIN. Will it mean that all the officers will go?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As I understand it, yes. Each company must have its captains and lieutenants. The half of the city regiments which remain at home will drill at headquarters in the cities.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it expected that this will cost more than the usual appropriation?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. We have in the main estimates $1,000,000 for the annual drill. The sum necessary to drill the whole militia will be something like $1,200,000. I am going to reserve the right to ask for a supplemental vote for this particular item whether they go to Quebec or not. Our estimate for this expenditure is considerably less than $1,000,000 so that there will be enough to carry out the rest of the annual drill in the case of the west and in the case of some regiments which may not be able to go to Quebec.

Mr. FOWLER. Are you charged with the cost of transportation on the government railways?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. According to the explanation given by the minister it will work out that practically all the men of the rural battalions will go to Quebec.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Only half the strength.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. But the minister quite correctly says that these rural battalions are not usually up to strength.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Some are not.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Then under the scheme, practically half of a battalion will go which would be its usual strength in any case. In the city battalions the companies are practically all complete, and so in the case of the city battalions half of the men would be left at home.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, but those who do not go from the cities will get their annual drill at home, whereas the balance of the rural regiments will get no annual drill at all.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I quite understand that, but so far as the trip to Quebec is concerned it will work out as I say.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is hardly a fair way to put it.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. That is the way it works out.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We are sending half the rural and half the city militia right through and no process of logic will make anything else of it.

Mr. FOWLER. I think the statement of the minister had something to do with my hon. friend's remarks, because the minister rather overstated the case when he said that the rural corps were largely under strength. In my own province they are pretty nearly full strength in both the infantry and the artillery.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is true of the maritime provinces generally.

Mr. FOWLER. People from the big cities like Toronto and Montreal seem to think that we who represent the country have no rights in these matters.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The minister has not told us whether he has yet taken up with the railway companies and the boat companies the arrangements for the transportation of the troops. I think he should request the transportation companies to provide the most efficient service that can be rendered in a given time in order to show what they could do in case of an emergency. Experiments of this kind should be turned to practical advantage; and when the minister does take up the matter with the transportation companies, I hope he will insist upon their showing what they can do in the way of transporting troops to a given point in the shortest possible time and in the very best possible condition.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The department appreciate the importance of this matter of transportation, and the very first thing we did was to address letters to all the transportation companies to ascertain what kind of accommodation they will be able to give us. The answers are coming in now.

Mr. FOWLER. I think that is a very good suggestion. In connection with the ordinary annual drill there is a great deal of difficulty with respect to transportation. Volunteers going to camp are often kept on the trains, and not with the very best accommodation, for hours, when it seemed to be absolutely unnecessary for them to be so detained. I think this is a matter the department should address itself to at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. In connection with the camp at Niagara the same thing occurred. Men were kept waiting, I think over twelve hours, on various trains from the time they left camp until they reached their homes, where they arrived almost starved. The transportation facilities seemed to be very bad. There is a good deal of complaint in the country because of the increased amount of the annual expenditure for military purposes. I do not share in that complaint, if the money is spent judiciously. I do not care how much in reason is spent, if our military equipment is being put on a first-class basis. But it seems to me that the method of procuring the food supplies is somewhat loose. There is a great deal of variation in the prices at different camps. The common necessaries of life cost twice as much at some camps as they do at others. It seems to me that there should be some system of purchasing by which this would be prevented. I will give a few instances, as shown by a return which has been brought down. Flour varies in price from $2.20 in one camp to $3 in another, beef from 5 cents to 12·75 cents a pound, mutton from 4 cents to 12½ cents, evaporated apples from 8 cents to 33 cents, bread from 1·14 cents per pound at London to 4 cents at Aldershot.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The bread was nearly all made at Aldershot and in most of the camps.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Cheese was 9 cents at Toronto and 14 cents at Niagara, 15 cents at Three Rivers and 18 cents at Port Arthur; jam ranged at 6¾ cents to 20 cents a pound.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I suppose my hon. friend objects to the low price of jam.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The low-priced jam is no doubt adulterated, while the specifications call for pure jam. I wish to point out the great injustice there. When a dealer tenders, expecting to supply pure jam, according to the specifications, he tenders at the price of pure jam. Another dealer, knowing that almost anything will pass, tenders at the price of compound jam, and gets the contract every time. That is not fair, either to the dealer, the poor soldier who uses the jam, or the country. The supply officer for one of these camps says in his report:

I am further directed to say that Mr. Seguin's prices for meat and groceries are considered enormously and shamefully excessive.

This was Mr. Brown's remark in regard to prices paid Mr. Seguin for supplies for the camp at Rigaud, Quebec, where bacon was charged at 22 cents per pound, potatoes at 5 cents per pound, beans at 4 cents per pound, jam at 20 cents per pound, butter at 30 cents per pound in June, sugar at 6 cents per pound, and everything else in proportion. It occurs to me that there is a lack of system in the purchase of these supplies. There is no necessity for the country paying two prices for any of these articles of food because the local grocer happens to tender on the supposition that he has a monopoly of the tendering.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The system is that in every case without any exception these supplies are purchased after public tender, advertised for two or three or four weeks before the camp. Tenders are invited by newspaper advertisement and by posters put up in post offices and public places near to where the camp is held.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Tenders are invited simply from certain people.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, posters are put up in all the public places. That is the universal system. It was done under the late administration and is done under this.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you take the lowest tender?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Always. I have in my department a gentleman who gives his whole attention to this and makes a special study of prices. I do not know what better we can do. If we do not ask for public tenders, we are in danger of being blamed; and if we do ask, we do not escape.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The prices at Rigaud the supply officer himself said were excessive and extravagant. The government ought not to accept any tender, when the prices are excessively high.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does any officer make an inspection of the goods purchased?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is an inspection every morning by the Army Service Corps.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How then is it that an inferior quality of goods is served to officers and men?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not correct. That may happen in a particular case such as the one referred to by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith). It seems to be difficult to get pure jam. We have had samples submitted to the department of Inland Revenue for testing, and are doing everything in our power to secure the delivery of pure goods. We may be deceived sometimes, but the goods, as a rule, are of excellent quality.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. According to these returns, two-thirds of your jam supply is compound jam, whereas the specifications call for pure.

Mr. MARSHALL. My hon. friend would lead the House to believe that compound jam is not healthy. As a matter of fact, I know it is. My hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) puts up pure jam, and very good jam. We put up pure jam and compound jam. Compound jam we use in apple jelly for filling and it is just as wholesome as the pure jam.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What am I to do when two such eminent authorities differ?

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not know anything about your tenders, but my hon. friend would lead the House to believe that compound jam is injurious. I say it is not. There are two pounds of compound jam used to one of pure. The compound jam is alright, it is perfectly good, I eat it myself. I have been eating it for twenty-four years. The minister is quite right in accepting compound jam, particularly if made by Canadian canners.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. I have no objection to compound jam but the specifications call for pure jam. A grocer who does not know, tenders according to the specifications and loses every time. But some one who does know that the compound will be accepted instead of the pure, that the supply officer does not know pure jam from compound, gets the contract every time.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The word 'compound' must be marked on the package, and if you let a contract for pure jam and get the compound, there is no excuse for accepting it, because the word 'compound' is plainly marked on every case.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister has pointed out that there is an inspection by the officers at the camp but he might go still further. They might inspect the prices as well as the quantities and quality. Take

the camp at Rigaud where 30 cents per pound was charged for butter and 5 cents a pound for potatoes or nearly $3 a bushel. When a tender is so absurdly high, the government should not accept it. Very often there is collusion among the parties who tender, and they agree among themselves which shall get the groceries and which the oats and so on. That might be prevented by the government refusing to accept any tender if the prices were unreasonable.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I was not aware of this particular case of Rigaud and shall look into it. I would be disposed, in such a case, to advertise over again or go into the market and buy at fair market prices.

Mr. FOWLER. Let your comptroller look after the buying.

Immigration—further amount required for immigration general expenses, $125,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the minister makes his explanation, I want to read him a letter that I received from a friend of mine in the west, and I want to ask him if any portion of this amount he is now asking for is to be devoted to the purpose of bringing in more Doukhobors. The letter is from Yorkton and is dated March 18:

George Taylor, M.P., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Inclosed you will find a few facts about the way the Doukhobors live, and if you can do anything that will make the government step in and compel those people to live decent lives, the people of this province will have reason to be thankful.

That is signed by one of the most respectable men in that section of the country. It is not necessary to give his name. Here are the facts he refers to:

Dear sir,—I noticed a statement in the newspapers made by Dr. Cash and the Minister of the Interior. Now Dr. Cash knows perfectly well that the statements made are not correct as to the way the Doukobors live. Every child born in a colony by Doukhobors is illegitimate, and Dr. Cash and the hon. Minister of the Interior knows it. There is no marriage ceremony performed between a Doukhobor man and woman, there is no account of births and deaths, or anything connected with them. It is the darkest blot in Canadian history, and in the years to come the people of Canada will be held responsible if the Dominion government will import such cattle into this country and place them in the heart of this province, and then say it is up to the province to make them obey the law. I say if the government can do that, there is something wrong with the constitution. There are now forty-five villages of Doukhobors scattered over the country, and where every woman is every man's wife, you can imagine what the birth rate is. If this is permitted to continue for a few years more, we will have a pest here that wil be a hundred times worse than the Mormons. I would suggest that the only way to stamp this out is to make Peter Veregin responsible, as he has absolute control over them.

Now there is a statement I received a few days ago from Yorkton, and it is made by one of the most respectable men in that section of the country. He was a resident of my own county, and went out there a few years ago, and he writes these facts. Now I ask the minister if any portion of this vote is to be devoted to importing more Doukhobors, or is it to export them out of the country; if for the latter purpose, we will gladly vote for it. The minister has made a statement and the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Cash) has made a statement, but this gentleman who is on the ground says he knows their staements are incorrect.

Mr. McCRANEY. Has the hon. gentleman any objection to giving the name of the writer?

Mr. TAYLOR. He has written me the letter and I have read it, but he has not authorized me either to give his name or asked me to withhold it. But I will vouch for every word in that statement, and if the House will appoint a committee, I will put this gentleman in the box and he will give evidence on oath that the statements he makes here are correct; or if the government will send a committee out there to investigate, my friend will repeat his statements. I understand my hon. friend has men out there now making these people British subjects so that they will vote for him when the elections come on. And this is the class of cattle the government have imported, and paid this invisible company, the North Atlantic Trading Company, $5 a head for bringing in.

Mr. McCRANEY. I think when the hon. gentleman quotes a letter to contradict a minister and a member of this House, he ought to give the name of the writer.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all; my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) takes the responsibility.

Mr. CASH. I have only come into the House since the letter was read, and did not hear it. I did make a few remarks the other night concerning the Doukhobors, and I am ready to repeat them, I do not care what letter my hon. friends opposite may read to contradict my statements. I have heard things said about the Doukhobors, that they were guilty of immoral conduct. I wish to say that I have lived among the Doukhobors a great deal, I have been with them in a professional capacity, both in the night time and in the day time, and I am free to state that in my own district no exception will be taken to what I have said or am about to say. I have had them working in my house, both male and female, I have been with them in sickness, both in their own homes and in my home, and I have yet to see one immoral act or suggestion on the

part of any of them. I know that the Doukhobors are said to have done certain things, of which I know nothing. I am only judging them from what I have seen and what I know of them. Certain thing are reported in regard to Peter Veregin's conduct. I have met him a number of times, and I have never seen in him anything suggestive of evil. I do not think I need say anything further in regard to the morality of the Doukhobors.

Mr. TAYLOR. The information is now before the government, and it is their duty to investigate it. The government are responsible for bringing these people into the country, and they should be responsible for their conduct while they are here.

Mr. McCRANEY. I come from a riding in which there are over 2,500 Doukhobors. I have heard in this House and out of it, and on a political platform in the city of Ottawa, statements made very derogatory to the Doukhobor people. I agree with what my hon. friend from Mackenzie (Mr. Cash) has said, that these statements apply to only a few of them. I am sure that no one can charge the Duokhobors as a people with immoral conduct because strange acts have been committed by some of them. The town of Rosthern in which I live is but a short distance from a Doukhobor settlement. The reputation which the Doukhobors have with us who live among them, is that they are an honest and moral living people. I noticed that the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) was very brave in making statements with regard to the Doukhobors on a public platform in the city of Ottawa, but when he was out there among them he did not say a word. No one makes that kind of statement in the west where the Doukhobors are living. Unfortunately the Doukhobors seem to have been trained in a narrow way, and there are a number of fanatics among them. An incident occurred in Saskatchewan where it was necessary for the police to take some of them into custody. There was also a number of demented people who travelled to Fort William. But I think I am safe in saying that in the west where they live, we regard these people as a good living people, and as for any scandalous conduct on their part, it is not believed in our country.

Mr. FOSTER. We want an explanation of the vote.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no intention of spending any part of this money in any way connected with the Doukhobors except it might be in connection with those who are now at Fort William, who have left the community and who at one time expressed a desire to return to Russia. The department had some negotiations with these people with a view to securing their return to Russia, and at one time it seemed likely that that would take place; had these negotiations been successful, a small amount of money would have been required, but it was not possible to carry them to a successful conclusion, and, as I have already explained to the House, as this government has no legal control or authority over these people, either to control their actions while in the country or to forcibly send them out of the country, we have to leave the responsibility with others for the present.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has it come to the minister's knowledge that certain immigration agents working for the government in the United States are also in the employ of a land company? I have been informed that there are certain immigration agents working for the government in the United States who are also in the employ of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company and who are directing the attention of immigrants particularly to land owned by that company.

Mr. OLIVER. We have in the United States a certain number of agents who are paid salaries which are supposed to be payment for their full time and ability. I have no knowledge nor has any suggestion been made to me directly or indirectly, nor have I any suspicion that any of these men are engaged in any such transactions as my hon friend has suggested. If he has any information on that point, I would be very glad to have it, and I think I can assure him that if this is found to be the case the usefulness of these agents would not prevent their services being dispensed with. There are, however, subagents who are employed in the United States who receive a small commission on the settlers whom they direct to the Northwest. We pay these people only on results, and, therefore, we can hardly claim and do not pretend to claim control over their other means of livelihood. We pay them for the services they render us and they look elsewhere for the remainder of their income. If it is any of these people whose conduct is in question, I am not aware that there is anything for us to do, but so far as our salaried officials of the kind I have described are concerned, I certainly would not feel warranted in continuing them in our employ if the conduct mentioned by my hon. friend were brought home to them.

Mr. FOSTER. How is this money to be expended?

Mr. OLIVER. The House will be aware that last winter, owing to stress of weather and the extent to which settlement had spread out from the railroad, it was necessary to meet the extreme conditions by relief in the way of fuel and some provisions and seed. A vote was taken for that purpose, but that vote was not quite sufficient and $15,000 is required to complete that service and to pay for some service of the

same character that had to be done in the same country this winter. There are people in the country southwest of Saskatoon who have gone very far from the railroads, pushing settlement. The country is absolutely treeless, there is no fuel and they have gone there expecting railroad construction earlier than it has been given them. It was represented to us this fall that unless we took some means to see that conditions did not become as they were last winter, these people would really have to come out. Therefore we had to incur some expenditure to meet conditions this winter which fortunately did not arise. The weather was so fine that the difficulties we expected did not occur, but we had to incur a certain amount of expenditure so as to be prepared for what might very well have occurred.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that to be repaid or are there any conditions?

Mr. OLIVER. The expenditure of this winter, which is very trifling, is of course simply an expenditure, because we did not go forward out of this vote and provide any seed. Last year where we did supply seed and provisions we took a lien which provided for the repayment of the money.

Further amount required for expenses connectd with park reservations (Governor General's warrant), $75,000.

Mr. OLIVER. This Governor General's warrant was taken last year in order to meet the expenses incurred in bringing the buffalo which we purchased in Montana over to Canada. We made a contract for the purchase of the herd. We understood that there were so many animals in the herd, but it turned out that there was a larger number than we had expected, and our expenses in bringing them over turned out to be larger than we expected. We did not, however, expend the whole of the $75,000.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be a vote in the main estimates for this?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; $25,000 was expended and $50,000 remains to be carried forward into the expenditure of next year for the same purpose.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What is the whole cost of buying and bringing them into Canada? How many were there?

Mr. OLIVER. We have received 410.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. At what cost?

Mr. OLIVER. The purchase price is $200 per head and then there are the freight and general expenses connected with them.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What is the total?

Mr. OLIVER. The contract price is $200 per head and we paid $45 per head for delivery. There were extra expenses connected with the purchase and the bringing of them over.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Who was the agent who made the purchase?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Douglas, superintendent of the Banff park, is the gentleman who made the arrangements and superintended the bringing of them over.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is it not correct that some of the animals escaped on being detrained on their arrival at Edmonton? I happened to be at Edmonton when these animals arrived, and I understand that three or four trainloads came. My information is that some of these animals escaped while they were being taken from the train and up to the time of my leaving there they had not been caught. I would like to know how many escaped, if they succeeded in getting them back and how long they were lost.

Mr. OLIVER. As far as we are aware two escaped, their location was known and many attempts were made to get them into the park. But, I suppose the committee will understand that an aged male buffalo is not a very tractable animal to drive and they were unable to get them into the park. As they were large well grown animals with good fur and would be valuable if properly treated as specimens, one of them was shot, the hide was taken and it is intended to stuff it and keep it as a specimen. The other one which is known to be at large, it is intended to treat in the same manner if it is impossible to get it corralled. Mr. Douglas is, or has been in that district recently with that in view. We only know of two being at large and under the circumstances—my hon. friend was there and I was not—from the reports I heard it is very fortunate that a great many more did not get away because at the time of the arrival of these animals the people had gathered from all over the country to see them, the crowd was not any more controllable than were the buffalo, and between the crowd and the buffalo it is not remarkable that some of the buffalo got away. I think that everybody connected with the matter is entitled to credit because more did not get away.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Did these animals get out of the main inclosure that was made for their reception or did they get out of the kind of lane that was prepared from the train to the inclosure ?

Mr. OLIVER. My information is that they broke away when they were being driven down the temporary lane to the park Five broke away, three were recovered and two others remained out. No others, in so far as we know, have broken out of the inclosure.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The reason I ask that question is that if my information is correct the minister did not build this fence in the first place for inclosing buffalo at

all. I understand that the minister set aside this as an elk preserve, that it was intended for elk and that it was supposed that the fence surrounded a herd of elk when it was built. After great expense had been gone to by the government it was finally found that no elk were in the inclosure and then the minister purchased a herd of buffalo to take the place of the elk that were supposed to be there. I would like to hear from the minister on that point to ascertain if there is any truth in the statement that was going the rounds of the west when I was there.

Mr. OLIVER. It is quite correct that the inclosure was made with the view of preserving a herd of elk which had been roaming in that vicinity for a number of years and which, unless measures of this nature were taken, would certainly all be slaughtered. I cannot say that there were any very strong hopes entertained of actually fencing in the herd of elk, but parties who were concerned in the matter have placed a bond of $5,000 with the government that they will place within the inclosure a certain number of elk in a certain time. It was under that arrangement that the fence was built. After the contract for the erection of the fence for the purpose of providing the elk reserve had been entered into the project of purchasing a herd of buffalo was entered upon, and as it was necessary to control the buffalo when they were purchased it was thought that the existence of this park at no great distance from the railway station offered a ready means for the temporary care of the buffalo. Therefore, the herd being purchased, they were taken into the elk park. An arrangement has been made with the provincial government under which the provincial government, in the interest of the preservation of the elk, are prepared to assume the expense in regard to this park.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. May I ask the minister if there are any elk there now?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say that there are. Some enthusiastic gentleman informed me they were elk in the inclosure, but I did not see them. I did not travel all over the inclosure but I had some doubts of there being any in the inclosure at the time.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Would the minister tell us whether elk and buffalo would get on well together? Are they likely to fight or create trouble one with the other?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot guarantee anything in that connection. The buffalo themselves do not get along very well together, and I presume that elk have trouble between themselves also, but I may inform my hon. friend that in the Banff park there are buffalo and elk occupying the same inclosure with, so far, no injury to either.

Mr. SPROULE. Was anything paid for these elk that you tried to fence in?

Mr. OLIVER. If the people who entered into this agreement succeeded in delivering a certain number of elk in the park they were to be paid a certain amount of money, but of course, not having delivered any elk they were not paid any money.

Mr. SPROULE. They have not been paid any money ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. We have not yet heard the total cost of the buffalo up to date.

Mr. OLIVER. The buffalo we have at present approximately cost $125,000, there are something over 400.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Was not the original contract price $100,000.

Mr. OLIVER. We paid $200 per head and $45 each for transportation for all buffalo delivered in good condition.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Was there any limit on the number to be delivered.

Mr. OLIVER. We were to have the whole herd except 10 which the proprietor was entitled to keep.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Are they all thoroughbred buffalo ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. No black Angus bulls among them ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Who accompanied Mr. Howard Douglas to Montana when the purchase was made. Did a Mr. Ayotte receive any money from the government in connection with the purchase of this herd ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to say who accompanied Mr. Douglas during his negotiations. He was compelled to visit the proprietor of the herds several times. Mr. Ayotte is an immigration agent at Great Falls, Montana, which is not distant from the home of these buffalo, and Mr. Ayotte assisted more or less, I cannot say how much, in the negotiations with the owner of the herd.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Have any moneys been paid to Mr. Ayotte for his services in connection with the purchase of the herd.

Mr. OLIVER. No money has been paid Mr. Ayotte beyond his ordinary salary as immigration agent and his travelling expenses when engaged in going to and from his place of residence.

Mr. HERRON. Are you going to receive the balance of the herd?

Mr. OLIVER. We expect, probably late in the summer, to get the whole herd with the exception of the ten.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Does the total cost given by the minister include the money paid to Mr. Lees, of Fort Saskatchewan. I observe from an answer to a question published in 'Hansard' that Mr. Lees, of Fort Saskatchewan, has been paid $7,000 and $6,800 in connection with some services he has rendered. He may not have been paid that yet, but he has tendered for some work that is to be done in connection with the park in which these buffalo are to be herded, and I wish to know if the amount stated includes the sums which are to be paid or which have ben paid to Mr. Lees.

Mr. OLIVER. The sums mentioned as being due to Mr. Lees are for the erection of a fence around this park and they have nothing to do with the payments for the buffalo.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Were tenders called for ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, tenders were called for.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What is Mr. Lees occupation at Fort Saskatchewan ?

Mr. OLIVER. He is a lawyer.

Mr. BENNETT. How many tenders were received for the fence ?

Mr. OLIVER. The question has been asked and answered in the House already, but it may be interesting to give the information again. Tenders were called for and the following were received :—For contract A, clearing lines for roadway—Geo. A. Cranston, Fort Saskatchewan, $700 ; Wm. A. D. Lees, Fort Saskatchewan, $1,200. For contract B, furnishing and setting posts—Wm. A. D. Lees, Fort Saskatchewan, $7,000 ; For contract C, wire fencing and gates—Wm. A. D. Lees, Fort Saskatchewan, $6,800; Locked Wire Fence Company, Limited, London, Ont., $9,300 ; McGregor Banwell Fence Company, Limited, Walkerville, Ont., $9,355.10 ; J. M. Chisholm, Winnipeg, Man., $14,732. Besides the above, Messrs. Ross & Ross, of Winnipeg, tendered for the whole work at $20,341.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. What is the total cost of the fence as erected up to date ?

Mr. OLIVER. $14,500.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM. What is the area of the inclosure ?

Mr. OLIVER. Sixteen square miles.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is there not some of it that does not require to be fenced.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a fence sixteen miles long.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM. What kind of fence is it, what wire is used, and how high is it?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not absolutely familiar with the different kinds of wire fence. The posts are tamarack posts, the wire is a woven wire, but of course the mesh is very large and the fence has a depth of two webs, and I think the two together make about eight feet as the height of the wire fence.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. How many wires one above the other?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say, but I think there is about eight inches between the main wires.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. What is the gauge of the wire?

Mr. OLIVER. The specifications would tell that, but I have not the information at hand.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It is important to have the fence sufficiently strong to bar these heavy animals. It would be a great pity, if, after all the expense we have gone to, the herd should break away because of the want of a proper fence.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. If the minister had fortified this fence with barbed wire, it would have been effective. It would be a great pity to have these animals scattered over the prairie for the want of a good strong fence.

Mr. OLIVER. The fence is practically the same as the fence inclosing the buffalo at Banff Park, which has been found amply sufficient for the purpose. On the occasion of the animals getting away, a temporary fence had been run for a distance of two miles to guide the herd from the railway station to the entrance of the park. Only one web of wire was stretched on poplar poles. Had there been no crowd, there would have been no accident ; but the crowd started the herd, and several of the animals made a dash, and broke down some of the poplar poles and escaped.

Mr. HERRON. How far are the poles of the fence apart ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give that offhand. Generally speaking, the specifications are based on the fence at Banff.

Mr. STAPLES. Who were the agents of the government to select and purchase the buffalo that were brought to Canada ?

Mr. OLIVER. Howard Douglas, the superintendent of Banff Park, negotiated the purchase.

Mr. STAPLES. I noticed in one of the papers the other day the statement that Mr. Ayotte had acted as agent, and had made considerable money in some way through the purchase of these buffalo. Who is Mr. Ayotte ?

Mr. OLIVER. He is the immigration agent at Great Falls, Montana. I believe it

was he who first drew the attention of Mr. Douglas to the fact that this herd was in existence. Its location was not at a very great distance from Great Falls. The negotiations covered a period of time and required Mr. Douglas to visit the owner of the herd several times, and Mr. Ayotte was employed to communicate with the owner of the herd at other times ; but beyond that he had nothing to do with the purchase.

Mr STAPLES. Is it the policy of the government to have its immigration agents abroad act as purchasing agents ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is not the policy of the government to have their immigration agents act as purchasing agents. Mr. Ayotte was not a purchasing agent in any shape or form. He was information agent, and that was all.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Can the minister tell me the present location of the herd ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give it exactly. I think it is about township 57, range 18.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Does the minister know whether the buffalo ranged in that part of the country when they were plentiful ? I have heard it stated by people who have been there for a great many years that they did not roam that far north.

Mr. OLIVER. I never saw any in that locality, but I have it from the very best authority that they did roam there, and very much farther north than there. But this particular locality is partially wooded, and of course the buffalo prefer the open prairie, and therefore their presence there was occasional rather than continuous.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What were the reasons for selecting that particular locality, and putting the country to so much more expense ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have already explained that the fence was not built for the purpose of inclosing the buffalo, but for the purpose of preserving a herd of elk ; and it was only because the opportunity occurred to get the buffalo and the park was already fenced that this seemed to be a very simple solution of what would otherwise have been a problem of considerable difficulty. It is not the intention to use this park as the permanent home of the herd. We have made a reservation on the Battle river between the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Wetaskawin branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in a piece of country which everybody agrees is a buffalo country. There are four townships which have not been settled on, and which we have decided to set apart as the main range of the buffalo. We propose to ask parliament for money to put a fence around it with the intention of transferring to it the herd which is now in the elk park.



To provide a further amount for Sioux Indians, $2,000.

Mr. OLIVER. This is required to meet the expenses of an outbreak of small-pox $1,300 had to be expended in measures necessary to stamp out the outbreak, and $700 are required to meet the expenses of management.

Indians—to provide a further amount for printing and stationery, $3,000.

Mr. OLIVER. The department has a vote of $3,000 which includes the cost of school books and material for all the industrial day and boarding schools throughout the Dominion. It has proved insufficient this year.

To provide for relief to destitute Indians in remote districts, $10,000.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Are these in provinces or unorganized territories ?

Mr. OLIVER. Nearly all are in northern Ontario.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Has this been expended or is it to be expended ?

Mr. OLIVER. These are the accounts which have come in for services rendered and also to meet accounts which will be incurred in that part of the country. In that northern country we have no agents. The only body doing business there is the Hudson Bay Company. There are occasions when the Indians are in distress, and we are compelled to have an arrangement with the Hudson Bay Company for relieving such distress. These are the accounts sent in by that company and we require a vote in order to meet them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Were they authorized by the department ?

Mr. OLIVER. As we have no agent in that country, the distress must be relieved on the immediate responsibility of the Hudson Bay Company. We can discuss afterwards with that company the propriety of the advance but we cannot possibly authorize it beforehand.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are they only met by the company ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, there is no other mercantile institution doing business there.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the New Brunswick Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Carvell.

## ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved the second reading of Bill (No. 134) respecting the Atlantic Quebec and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Marcil. He said: Mr. Speaker, I am not the promoter of this Bill but, from the point of view of my constituency, I have some interest in the matter. The Bill has come up on several occasions in the House. There was a Bill passed empowering this railway company to construct a railway from Paspebiac to Gaspé Basin and I am pleased to inform the House that the railway is now being constructed and that nearly 25 miles have been completed. Last year the company came to parliament to obtain some amendments in order to facilitate the construction but unfortunately they wiped out a clause which should not have been wiped out and they come now to get this clause reinstated in the Act as it was originally. The Bill has been before the Senate, has been fully explained and has passed unanimously.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has this clause been reinserted ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. We had better look into it then.

Mr. SPROULE. How many miles have been built since last year ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Twenty miles. There is another clause in the Bill. They obtained power last year to purchase the famous Baie des Chaleurs Railway and it was stated they would purchase it directly from the Baie des Chaleurs Company, but the Judge of the Exchequer Court decided that there should be a judicial sale; so that, the company wish to be empowered to purchase from any parties who, outside of the bondholders of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company, might choose to become the owners of the Railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

## SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Ocean and river service—Dominion steamers—further amount required for maintenance and repairs to government steamers and ice-breakers, $85,000.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). This sum is required for certain repairs to Dominion steamers as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 'Montcalm' | $ 61,447 67 |
| 'Druid' | 1,849 79 |
| 'Champlain' | 1,559 03 |
| 'Minto' | 5,091 00 |
| 'Stanley' | 15,000 00 |
| | 84,948 59 |

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. KEMP. What happened to the 'Montcalm' which required such extensive repairs ?

Mr. BRODEUR. An accident happened to the 'Montcalm' last fall when she went down to the Labrador coast. There was a rock which was not shown on the chart. This information was asked when the main estimates were before the House and I have the chart here. This rock was not shown on the chart prepared by the British admiralty and as a result this accident happened.

Mr. HENDERSON. Where was that rock ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was at Pointe au Maurier.

Mr. KEMP. That is north of the Straits of Belle Isle ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, no. It is also known as Whittle Rock. I promised also to bring down a report of the investigation. A report has been made by the Wreck Commissioner to the following effect:

In accordance with instructions, I proceeded to Quebec and held a preliminary investigation, under oath, into the cause which led to the stranding of the Canadian government steamer 'Montcalm' at Pointe au Maurier, on the morning of the 22nd ultimo. I fully inquired into the whole matter and have to report that no blame is attached to the captain or officers of this vessel. The casualty was a fortuitous accident, and the ship struck on an uncharted rock; all precautions were taken, she was going slow at the time, the lead was being used and lookouts were stationed.

In following out the instructions as laid down by the St. Lawrence Pilot, seventh edition, 1906, the course directed to be used in entering Wataghestic sound leads directly over the rock which the 'Montcalm' struck. There is a depth of twelve to fourteen feet on the rock, surrounded by depths varying from twenty to twenty-six fathoms; bearings and distances exactly locating the position of this were taken by the captain and officers, and there is no doubt in my mind that everything was done that possibly could be done for the safe navigation of the vessel.

Captain Belanger and his officers are therefore exonerated from all blame, and a formal investigation into this matter is not necessary.

Mr. KEMP. Was the fact that the rock was there reported to the British admiralty?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How long did it take to repair the vessel ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The greatest part of the winter. The information we have is that she will be out of the dock about April 10.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was this done at Sorel ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, at Levis.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who has the contract or is the work being done by the government ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is done by days labour.

Mr. TAYLOR. No wonder it costs a great deal as everything else in the minister's department. A striking illustration of this is afforded by an answer given yesterday as follows :

1. How many days has the dog-fish reduction plant at Canso, Nova Scotia, operated during the season of 1907?
2. Who is manager of the plant, what is his salary, what are the terms of his engagement, how much did he receive during the year 1907 up to the 31st December last, and how long was he actually employed in the business of the plant during 1907?
3. How many men are employed at the plant besides the manager, what are their respective names and salaries, and how much was each paid in 1907 up to 31st December, for their services?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. From 5th October to 9th November.
2. A. B. Cox, $1,200. He is employed by the year. $1,200. Twelve months.
3. Two. D. S. Hensbee, $700. E. A. Kelly, $675. In addition to these, during the time the works are in active operation labourers are employed, at the rate of $1.50 per day, as required.

Thus, $2,575 were paid to two men for one month's work besides we do not know what number of men who were working at $1.50 a day. If the repairing of the steamer is on the same line as the dog-fish plant, it is no wonder the expenditure of that department has run up into the millions. The item of Dominion steamers, I think, has passed and as there may be further discussion on this matter and it is desired to get all these estimates through now, the right will be reserved to discuss this on the minister's main estimates.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who owns the Lévis dock, the government or private parties ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not very sure, it is not in my department. Docks are under the control of the Public Works Department.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What did it cost to take this boat to the graving dock ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not very much, she came up under her own steam.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What did it cost to send the 'Strathcona' to pull the 'Montcalm' off the rocks, and to bring the boat to the graving dock ?

Mr. BRODEUR. About $3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What did it cost to repair the 'Montcalm' last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $21,447.

Mr. SPROULE. That is $83,000 for the repairs to this boat in two years ? What did it cost for repairs to the other steamers? The boats are scattered under different heads in the Auditor General's Report. For the 'Minto' I see the amount of $5,399 was paid to Stewart, Ross & Co., Charlottetown, for making repairs. For the 'Lansdowne,' I do not see that any expenditures have been made for repairs. I am relying on the Auditor General's Report, which does not give separately the expenditures for repairs. On the 'Lady Laurier' there was spent $16,617. When I speak of repairs, they might not mean more than merely repainting the boat and putting it in proper shape for her voyage.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there any contract now for repairs on the 'Montcalm'?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no contract, because it was impossible to find out before she went into the dock and was overhauled, what work needed to be done. When a ship meets with an accident and goes into the dock it is almost impossible to determine accurately what repairs have to be made. The repairs are being done under contract by George T. Davie & Sons.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the government own the dock?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the deputy that it is the property of the Public Works Department, and we pay that sum to the Public Works Department.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works knows who owns this dry dock at Lévis.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no question about the ownership, it is owned by the government, and is controlled and managed by the Public Works Department.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it rented?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we receive vessels there to be repaired and charge the ordinary fees or tolls therefor.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the minister aware that the 'Montcalm' is there at the present time, and does he know under what terms?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has not been brought to my notice that the 'Montcalm' is there, but I have been informed there is a vessel there. She is there upon the ordinary terms; I presume we charge the Marine Department the same as we charge the owners of private vessels.

Mr. HENDERSON. What are the terms ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give them offhand, but I can easily find out. It depends on the size of the vessel. We have a regular scale of fees.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the 'Montcalm' be used for breaking the ice at Cap Rouge this season ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, because she is at present in dock.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What was the date of the wreck, and when did she go into the dock for repairs?

Mr. BRODEUR. The accident took place on the 22nd November, probably she went into the dock in December.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the 'Montcalm' engaged in delivering supplies to lighthouse keepers along the coast of Labrador?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Was any other vessel employed?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Arranmore,' which belongs to Halliday Brothers, Quebec.

Mr. BENNETT. What are the terms of the contract?

Mr. BRODEUR. $250 a day.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What other vessels are being used to break ice besides the 'Montcalm'?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Montcalm' was the only ice-breaker available this winter. We had the 'Lady Grey,' but she made a trip to the Seven Islands.

Mr. BENNETT. How many days was the 'Arranmore' employed on this work?

Mr. BRODEUR. During the season of navigation, not only for the purpose of delivering supplies, but mostly for construction work. It is a long distance between Quebec and the straits of Belle Isle, and in order to carry on our work in those places we had to have a boat for that purpose.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is not the inability of this boat to break ice going to interfere with navigation?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, as soon as the 'Montcalm' is out of dock we intend to send her to Cabot straits as we did in previous years, to meet sea-going vessels coming to the straits in order to facilitate the pasage of the straits by boats coming up the St. Lawrence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the work been pushed along as expeditiously as possible?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. We have the ship's husband there who has been supervising the work all the time. We have given instructions that the new work shall be prosecuted as quickly as possible in order that when the boat is ready she may be ready to meet the sea-going vessels on their way through the straits.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand that the contractors are receiving whatever price they care to ask for making repairs.

Mr. BRODEUR. The work is being done by day's work and each man is being paid so much per day.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. BENNETT. How many months was the 'Arranmore' employed last season?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed about 100 days.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the length of the 'Arranmore?'

Mr. BRODEUR. 244 feet.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What crew does she carry?

Mr. BRODEUR. The crew and coal are supplied by the owners. We pay $250 a day and they supply everything.

Mr. BENNETT. Was she employed day and night?

Mr. BRODEUR. She is at our disposal night and day.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). It puzzles me to understand how the 'Montcalm' has cost so much for repairs since she was bought by the government. Every year it takes from $25,000 to $30,000 to repair this boat, although she is a new steamer. It would seem as if there must have been something wrong with her original construction. For example, last year to repair this steamer the Drolet firm of Quebec was paid $15,259.62; J. B. Coté, Quebec, was paid $1,864, and George T. Davie & Co., of Lévis, $3,627.34. Besides that other large sums have been paid for repairs. Why, if such expenditures as these had to be made for repairs on vessels owned by private navigation companies there would be no profit left. The same would apply to the steamship 'Lady Grey.' There must be something radically wrong about it, and it is the duty of the minister to inquire into this expenditure.

Mr. BRODEUR. We must not forget that this boat is an ice-breaker——

Mr. BENNETT. She is a heart-breaker for the country.

Mr. BRODEUR. She is exposed to very strong pressure from the ice and in consequence more repairs are required to her than to an ordinary vessel. The first year the 'Montcalm' was in service she was caught in the ice and extensive repairs were needed. Last year she went ashore in a fog on the Cape Breton coast and repairs were needed. These were accidents for which no one was to blame. Then this year she ran ashore at Pointe au Maurier on an uncharted rock, which resulted in a serious accident.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). That is not yet charged in the public accounts.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am citing these cases to show the nature of the accidents to which the 'Montcalm' is exposed in the service she does, and the hon. gentleman will realize that an ice-breaker is more liable to damage than an ordinary boat. The build-

ers are a reputable firm and I have no reason to think the boat was not properly built.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). The 'Minto' was engaged in a much more difficult winter service in the straits of Northumberland than is the 'Montcalm' at Quebec, and yet the repairs to the 'Minto' do not cost so much. The expenditure on the 'Montcalm' does not seem to be for repairing damage caused by ice, but for making good structural defects.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the service done by the 'Montcalm' is much more hazardous than that done by either the 'Stanley' or the 'Minto,' and that she has to contend with stronger ice.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What was the 'Arranmore' doing before she entered the service of the government?

Mr. BRODEUR. She was a passenger steamer running between Quebec and the Labrador coast.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has she not been making these trips since?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. The 'Arranmore' was entirely at our disposal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This boat is owned by Halliday Bros. ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Am I to understand that she did not make any of her regular trips at all during the time she was in the government service?

Mr. BRODEUR. She was entirely at the disposal of the government. Halliday Bros. had a contract with the Department of Trade and Commerce for carrying mails from Quebec to the Labrador coast and that contract was performed by the steamer 'King Edward.' The 'Arranmore' has been used by us for construction work and for the supply of the lights.

Mr. TAYLOR. On Monday last I asked the following question of the minister :

How many trips did Mr. Cowie take on government steamers during the season of navigation in 1907 for the purpose of pleasure or for inspection?

The hon. minister answered that question by saying : '33 ; they were all on trips of inspection.' The second question was : 'On what steamers did he make such trips?' The answer was : 'The "Lady Grey" and the "Frontenac."' The next question was : 'On how many of these trips did Mr. A. Beauchemin, of Sorel, accompany him?' The answer was : 'None.' The next question was: How many other persons did accompany him on those trips and what are the names of such persons?' The answer was : 'From one to twelve ; minister, acting minister, deputy minister, members of shipping federation, board of trade, chamber of commerce, party of English engineers, English journalists, presidents of pilots, members of the engineering staff.' Thirty-three trips on either one or the other of these boats on junketing tours during the season of navigation wasted a lot of money of the people of this country. I have a letter from a gentleman in that part of the country, who has noticed the boats and the parties on board of them, and this is what he writes about Mr. Cowie :

It is customary for this chief engineer to go on a tour of inspection about once a month, with one of the government steamers, and on such occasions he invites a number of his friends, and during these a Mr. Beauchemin, of Sorel, whom he has appointed inspector of machinery, supplies his appetite for wine and other luxuries during the trip. Indeed, I am informed the steamer on these occasions is a veritable floating harem, for all of which the deluded people have to pay. This pampered chief engineer is at present off on a junketing tour through Europe with Mr. George Washington Stephens, president of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners, ostensibly to get information about harbours and aids to navigation, but really to enjoy life at the expense of the poor deluded Canadian taxpayer.

This gentleman says he knows what he is writing about.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Who is he?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will give the information probably in the Public Accounts Committee some day. The minister knows that this is not in accordance with the answers he gave to my questions.

Mr. BRODEUR. On the question of the trips my hon. friend is absolutely mistaken. We are carrying on extensive works in the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec. There are seven or eight dredges working there all the time, besides two of which were working last season at Beaujeu Bank. It is necessary for Mr. Cowie, as superintending engineer of the channel, to visit these places very often; I would say that 33 trips during the season were certainly not too many—quite the reverse. I would be inclined to believe that a trip of that kind should be made at least once a week by the superintending engineer to see that the work was properly done. When I gave my hon. friend the answers to his questions, I gave them from information supplied to me by the officers of the department, and I have no reason to believe that it is not correct. Mr. Beauchemin is not an inspector of machinery; he was supervising the dredging. I saw him thus engaged when I went down with the members of the shipping federation. He had absolutely nothing to do with machinery.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister states that the repairs to the 'Montcalm' were costing about $61,000. The 'Montcalm' was wrecked on the coast of Labrador, but as

she came to Quebec on her own steam in order to go into dry dock, the damage could not have been very serious; her machinery must have been all in order. I do not suppose the Minister of Public Works would charge the Marine Department more than about $150 a day for the use of the dock, and I can hardly imagine that the necessary repairs would have cost this enormous sum of $61,000. Does the minister not think there is something wrong in the calculation he has made?

Mr. BRODEUR. These boats are double-bottomed, and even if the 'Montcalm' was able to go to Quebec on her own steam, she may have suffered very serious damage to her outside plates. These would have to be replaced by new ones. We have an officer in whom we have a great deal of confidence at the dry dock, who supervised the work. I have no information as to what the cost of these repairs should be, but if my hon. friend consulted with some vessel owners he would find that the cost of repairs to vessels is very large.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no knowledge personally of what they cost. My hon. friend in front of me (Mr. Sproule) tells me that the charge for the dock is only $28 a day.

Mr. SPROULE. On page P—23 of the Auditor General's Report I find that Geo. T. Davie & Sons of Levis were paid for laying one dock bed, November 28 to December 3, 1906, four days at $28.64 per day.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not the dry dock. It must be a dock bed which belongs to Mr. Davie.

Mr. HENDERSON. Surely the minister can tell us what he pays a day for the use of the dry dock at Levis.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed it is about $200 a day.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are we to understand that the ministers do not know what the dock costs for each day ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not got the precise information, but the prices are well defined and there cannot be any overcharge.

Mr. BLAIN. Were the supplies to the 'Montcalm' purchased last year after tender ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have a contract with the captain of the 'Montcalm' by which we pay him a fixed price per day for feeding the crew and officers. I have here the charges for the dry dock. 'La Canadienne' was four days in the dry dock and she paid five cents a ton on her tonnage of 372. The 'Galveston,' 1,267 tons, paid four and a half cents per ton per day. The 'Kensington,' 2,000 tons, paid four and a half cents per ton per day. They charge so much for the first day and then so much per subsequent day per ton, according to the size of the vessel.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend says he did not purchase supplies for the 'Montcalm' after asking for tenders. I want to draw his attention to a letter on page P—182 :

Audit Office, Ottawa, March 2, 1907.

Sir,—I find on examination of the vouchers so far sent me in support of expenditure during the fiscal year that the following payments were made in connection with the maintenance of the steamer 'Montcalm':

| | |
|---|---|
| F. X. Drolet.. .. .. .. .. .. | $11,188 49 |
| Adolphe Huot.. .. .. .. .. .. | 4,612 06 |
| Samsan & Filion.. .. .. .. .. | 2,258 55 |

The accounts rendered in each instance are certified 'prices fair and just'; but in view of the amount involved for a period of six months, I should like to know if there was any agreement with the business firms concerned as to the price at which the various articles would be supplied. It would seem from the accounts rendered that tenders had not been called for.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
J. FRASER,
Auditor General.

To Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

I do not find any answer to this letter.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was asked a few minutes ago whether supplies had been purchased after calling for tender and I thought that what was meant was provisions. But these accounts are for repairs. My hon. friend knows that a boat requires repairs constantly and it would not be advisable that we should purchase supplies of that kind in advance. They might be needed to-day and not be needed for a great length of time, so we purchase them as they are required.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much does the hon. gentleman pay per month to the captain of the 'Montcalm' for boarding the men ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Fifty cents a day for the men and sixty cents for the officers.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister ridiculed me when I pointed out that he was paying $25 a month for the board of each man when he was buying provisions, and I said it could be done for $10 to $12 a month. He said it could not and so did the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston). But the minister now says he is doing it at $15 a month for the men. Why not have that system on all the boats instead of paying political friends $25 a month for each man ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It depends on where it is. We were very fortunate in having the captain to do it in this case. We had to press him to accept it.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). Was that last year or the year before ?

Mr. BRODEUR. September, 1906.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I see in the Auditor General's Report, P—21, that there was paid to Buchanan & Co., North Sydney, $983.55 for provisions; to Louis Marois, Quebec, $696.75; to S. Martel, Quebec, $61.55, and to another firm $226.20 If the captains are feeding the crew, why did the government buy these provisions?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was evidently there before the captain took the contract. It may be for accounts which were incurred in the previous fiscal year. When this question came up for the first time I looked into it and found that these accounts of the 'Montcalm' for feeding the men were mostly incurred in the previous year, and we paid for July and August.

Mr. TAYLOR. In reference to the prices charged at the graving dock, I find by the Auditor General's Report, E—10 that Davie & Son charged for docking and undocking 522 tons at 30 cents a ton, which comes to $156. Then she was in the dock from September 30 to November 1, at $15.66 a day.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sure that was not in the dry dock, that may be the dock bed.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the dry dock at Lévis admit of large vessels?

Mr. BRODEUR. Unfortunately the dry dock at Lévis is not long enough for receiving large vessels. The question has been engaging the attention of the department, and it is expected that under the new law about to be enacted some company will take up the construction of a larger dock.

Construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation—further amount required, $117,500.

Mr. KEMP. Are all these lighthouses lighted by acetylene gas?

Mr. BRODEUR. Only twenty or twenty-five are lighted with acetylene gas out of the whole number.

Mr. KEMP. Is it the intention to discard acetylene gas and go back to the old system?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have never abandoned the old system, which has given satisfaction. We use vapour lights, generally speaking; they give about 3,000 candle power.

Mr. SPROULE. What became of the Pintsch gas, that new preparation you were using?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is only used in gas buoys.

Mr. TAYLOR. When we are on the main estimates I want the minister to get me the names of the gentlemen who compose the Canadian Fog Signal Company, from whom were purchased last year $54,000 of supplies; also the name of the gentlemen composing the International Marine Signal Company, Limited, formerly Thomas L. Willson, from whom we purchased last year $238,000. I want the membership of both these firms.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Does this vote include the lighthouse that fell over at Burlington channel last fall?

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to that matter, the information I have is that this lighthouse was built on a pier, the pier sank and of couse the lighthouse went down with it. But it was no fault of the department.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. There has been a large amount of money spent there in the last two or three years re-erecting piers.

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course, many faults are attributed to us, but I would not like the members of this House to charge us with being responsible for lighthouses falling over when they are erected on some other foundation which goes down. The lighthouse was erected lately on a pier, the pier sank, and of course the lighthouse went down with it.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Surely the minister's department is at fault in building a lighthouse on a foundation so weak that the lighthouse fell over in a year or two.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows this pier was carried away in one of the fiercest storms ever known in that section of the country. I do not think the hon. gentleman wanted to be unfair to the department when he says that this lighthouse was erected a short time ago, and went down because the construction was not properly supervised. I have made some inquiries and have ascertained from the chief engineer that this work was supervised by one of his foremen in whom he has absolute confidence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is this work which is done by the Public Works Department if not by the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is an old pier which has been there for several years and was probably built under the old government.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Oh, no. Surely the minister will not contend that a lighthouse should be built on a pier that has not been tested to see if it is strong enough to withstand a storm. He will not contend that a lighthouse should be built only for fair weather and that it should go down with the first storm.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are storms and storms.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice my hon. friend has some trouble with the wharfinger at Sault

Ste. Marie. In what position is that account ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy informs me that there has been some difficulty with the wharfinger and the matter has been settled between the Auditor General and the wharfinger.

Mr. BLAIN. From the correspondence in the Auditor General's report it appears that the wharfinger collects the money and retains his own salary, sending in the course of two or three years the balance to the government ; he practically controls the account himself. While the minister was away the acting minister sent an agent up there to investigate the account. Are the wharfingers throughout the country allowed to collect the money and deduct their own payment ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, that is the way it is done.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that regarded as good policy?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is under the provisions of the law. In the other services, for instance in the Customs Department, the collector is not paid out of the amount collected, but the wharfingers collect the money and keep twenty-five per cent or fifty per cent according to the amount they are entitled to receive.

Mr. BLAIN. The revenue at Sault Ste. Marie is large and according to the correspondence a request was made to the department to send up a special officer to make a report. Who was sent up and was a report put in ?

Mr. BRODEUR. An officer from the Auditor General's Department was sent. A report would be made to the Auditor General.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister would have that report brought down on the main estimates.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I will get it.

Mr. BERGERON. There has been some difficulty between the Dominion authorities and the local authorities in reference to fishing in the river Matane. I have had correspondence on the matter in which it is stated that the federal authorities allowed them to fish for salmon until July 31, and the local authorities until August 15. That is one difficulty, another is that the people claim the right to fish according to an old law of the seigneurs. I would like the minister to explain so that those interested may see his explanation.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows the situation since the Privy Council decided that the proprietary rights in the rivers belong to the provincial authorities and the regulation of the fisheries is under the control of the federal authorities. My hon. friend is probably misinformed as to our regulations concerning the rights of fishing in the river Matane differing from the provincial regulations because the provinces, although they may have proprietary rights in the rivers, have no right to determine the dates at which fishing should take place as that is a part of the regulation of the fisheries, and is consequently under the control of the federal authorities. I have some correspondence from the same gentleman. The matter is entirely under our control. If I remember rightly it is a question of licensing in the Matane river and the question comes up whether it should be under the control of the provincial or the federal authorities. I would be inclined to believe, in view of the judgment rendered by the Privy Council that it would be a question of the proprietary right which would come under the control of the provincial authorities.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it true that the federal authorities allowed them to fish until July 31, and the local authorities until August 15 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, no, that is impossible, because it would be a question of the regulation of the fisheries and this falls without the least doubt under the control of the federal authorities.

Mr. BERGERON. It is represented that this river Matane should not fall under the authority of any government as it is a private river.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is another question.

Mr. BERGERON. As I understand while these people contend that they have complete rights over this river, they are caught between the local and federal authorities and these seem to differ. It is a complicated question and I would be glad to have a full explanation.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have just explained the relations between the provincial and federal authorities. As I mentioned, the federal authorities have the right to regulate the fisheries, to determine the seasons in which it would be permitted to fish, the close and the open seasons.

Mr. SPROULE. The size of the nets.

Mr. BRODEUR. The size of the nets and the seasons at which people would be permitted to fish. The federal authorities have the right to deal with that part of the question—close seasons, open seasons and the apparatus with which they are entitled to fish. The provincial authorities have proprietary rights. For instance, licenses should be issued by the provincial authorities under the decision of the judicial com-

mittee of the Privy Council. It does not mean, however, that the federal authorities would not have the right to impose some tax upon a person who was permitted to fish in that locality. I think there is no doubt that the federal authorities would have the right to levy such a tax. It may be that in this case that my hon. friend refers to, it is a question whether this river should belong to the first concessionnaire or should belong to the province. I think that the proprietary right is vested in the province, although I suppose the correspondent of my hon. friend, if he is the same man who corresponded with me, claims otherwise. But that is a question which does not at all affect the relations existing between the provincial and federal authorities as far as I remember at the moment.

Mr. BERGERON. In the meantime I will examine these papers and I would ask that the minister get from his department all the information so that we can settle the question in a definite way.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose that is the case of Dr. Bouillon?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR. I had some correspondence with him but I will get the information in regard to the matter.

Fisheries—further amount required for salaries and disbursements of fishery inspectors, overseers and guardians, $30,000.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. There was a question on the Order Paper the other day asked by myself, in reference to the dog-fish reduction plant at Canso. The questions and answers are as follows:

DOG-FISH REDUCTION PLANT, CANSO, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked:

1. How many days has the dog-fish reduction plant at Canso, Nova Scotia, operated during the season of 1907?

2. Who is manager of the plant, what is his salary, what are the terms of his engagement, how much did he receive during the year 1907 up to the 31st December last, and how long was he actually employed in the business of the plant during 1907?

3. How many men are employed at the plant besides the manager, what are their respective names and salaries, and how much was each paid in 1907 up to 31st December, for their services?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. From 5th October to 9th November.

2. A. B. Cox, $1,200. He is employed by the year. $1,200. Twelve months.

3. Two. D. S. Hensbee, $700. E. A. Kelly, $675. In addition to these, during the time the works are in active operation labourers are employed, at the rate of $1.50 per day, as required.

Here is an outrageous charge of $1,200 a year for a man who is employed, according to the answer of the hon. minister, from the 5th October to the 9th November, which would be about thirty working days.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is $40 a day.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Forty dollars a day; it is more than was paid to some of those men employed by Falconer. There were other men employed, not experts, labouring men I presume, and they are paid $675 and $700. I think this is a case that should be inquired into and that it deserves a place in the report of the Royal Commission which was suggested to the House yesterday.

I would, however, draw the attention of the minister to another question. A few moments ago he stated that certain regulations can be made by his department in reference to the lobster fisheries and he claimed the Dominion government had the right to regulate the season of fishing, the size of the fish taken and matters of that kind. I conceive that under the decision of the Privy Council he is correct in the contention that the department have authority to adopt regulations as to the size of the lobsters that shall be taken. A few days ago I put a question on the paper in reference to a complaint made by the fishermen in Lunenburg, Shelburne and Yarmouth, Nova Scotia. It seems that a certain number of fishermen there have been fishing undersized lobsters with the knowledge of the overseers and of the men who are employed to guard the interests of the department in reference to the size of the lobsters. My question was: Whether the government had knowledge of illegal fishing and whether they were cognizant of the fact that lobsters were being caught under size. The minister answered:

The department is aware that the regulations respecting the size of lobsters are in some districts not strictly enforced.

If the government are aware of these facts and if the law is to be observed the government should punish these men and the overseers who are permitting this should be removed from office. I am informed from reliable sources that fishermen and packers friendly to the government are allowed these privileges, but that if a Conservative fisherman or packer attempted to evade the law the overseer would be on top of him at once and he would not be permitted to fish undersized lobsters. There is no doubt that the facts as stated are correct and there is no doubt that the minister was aware that this illegal fishing was taking place. The minister, in order to get out of the hole, attempted to give a reason why this illegal fishing was permitted and he said:

The difficulty which usually exists in the administration of the lobster regulations has recently been increased by a change in the American laws, which permit the importation of live lobsters of smaller size than formerly, thus diminishing the supply available for the canneries. It is feared that the rigid enforce-

ment of the size limit would prevent the canners receiving sufficient quantity of fish to carry on their business.

The matter is now engaging the attention of the department, and it is hoped that means may be found to harmonize the conflicting interests.

I do not think that the government had any right, unless with the authority of the law, or of the regulations of the Governor in Council, to permit any overseer to pass lobsters under size as they have been doing in Nova Scotia during the last season. There is no doubt about the fact that they have been doing it because we have the answer of the minister admitting it. Will the minister permit the same infringement of the law to take place in the maritime provinces during the coming season because the Americans put a lower limit on the size of the lobsters admitted to the United States? This fishing goes on during the summer months commencing in April in the straits of Northumberland and along the Cape Breton coast. Will he allow the same infringement of the law to take place that has been permitted in Lunenburg, Shelburne and Yarmouth during the coming season? The overseers have just as much right in these parts of the province to wink at the violation of the law as they have in the counties that I have named. I think it is a dangerous principle for the government to allow an infringement of the law, and the fishermen of these counties who are not so favoured by these government officials think that they are very harshly treated, that no concession should be given to one man and withheld from another and that every man Liberal and Conservative should be treated alike. There is another matter that I wish to bring to the attention of the minister; that is the question of fishing in British Columbia. This is a matter which should receive the serious attention of the government. I am told by a man of high standing in the community that several fishermen in that province have been very unfairly treated by the government.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman has stated that we have paid a man $1,200 for working for one month at the Canso reduction works. That is not a fair interpretation of the answer given to the question. The question was as to what length of time these works had been operating, and I answered for a month and some days, but that does not mean that the man was only employed for that length of time. There are extensive works there and they have to be looked after not only during the dog-fish season, but also when the products are being disposed of, and the building has also to be taken care of. This is an entirely different state of things from that instanced by the hon. gentleman. Now, with regard to the lobster fishery, the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. A. McLean) would like to see the government take action against everybody



who violates the regulations. Does he mean to say that every fisherman should be prosecuted when there is a slight violation of the law?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). The minister himself has stated that he is cognizant of breaches of the regulations and that he permits them to continue. I say that if all the fishermen were treated alike I would not complain, but I do complain that Liberal fishermen are allowed to break the law when the Conservative fishermen are punished if they do so.

Mr. BRODEUR. My information is quite to the contrary, and I have been reproached by political friends because they say Liberals have been prosecuted and Conservatives have been allowed to go free. My answer is that the department has been trying to administer the law impartially and justly. Would my hon. friend ask me to take the responsibility of closing up a large number of canneries, a result which would certainly follow on a strict enforcement of the law. If the law were enforced in Prince Edward Island as rigidly as my hon. friend (Mr. A. A. McLean) suggests most of the canneries would have to be closed and it would be a serious thing for the fishermen.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). I do not think there is any infringement of the law in Prince Edward Island so far as I can understand.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would be extremely surprised if all the lobsters canned in Prince Edward Island are more than eight inches long. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. A. McLean) will find that here and there some lobsters are canned which are a little below the standard. My hon. friend knows that the reduction of the size of the lobster in the American market has seriously affected the lobster trade in some parts of the maritime province, and if we were to enforce the law as the hon. gentleman suggests it would mean a serious blow to the fishermen and to the canneries, most of which would have to be closed. If I were to enforce the law in Prince Edward Island, as the hon. gentleman says I should, he would be the first to enter a complaint.

Mr. TAYLOR. Surely the minister should not place a law on the statute-books if his intention is to allow it to be violated. Why does he not amend the law to suit the conditions?

Mr. FIELDING. That is a pretty way of saying it and one would naturally make that remark, but the trouble is that we have a large territory to deal with and the conditions differ in different portions of it. The law which in some districts seems to give trouble has been administered fairly well in other districts, but how to adjust it to the different sections of the Dominion is a difficult problem. From what I know of

the action of the Minister of Marine I am quite sure that he is doing his utmost to give a reasonable interpretation to the law, although undoubtedly in some cases it is generally known that the law is not rigidly observed. As to the political aspect of the question I can testify that my hon. friend (Mr. A. A. McLean) is entirely mistaken. I heard the complaint from my own section of the country that some officials—gentlemen appointed in bygone years by the Conservatives—have punished the Liberals and let the Conservatives go. I frankly say that I do not attach the utmost importance to that; the man who is fined is always prone to think he is not well treated and that some one else is getting an advantage. But I do know that in portions of the country pronounced Liberals have been fined again and again under the administration of the Marine Department. I have heard it stated that the Conservatives were not fined, but to that I do not attach much importance. The Minister of Marine has an extremely difficult problem to solve in this matter of the lobster regulations, and I believe he is doing his utmost to meet the various interests of the lobster business in the various sections of Canada.

Mr. LALOR. The Minister of Finance has stated that there are constant complaints as to the enforcement of the law, and that those in the business think that some are treated fairly and some unfairly. If that be so, why not change the law and treat every one alike? If the law were thus changed the inspectors would not be in a position to make a law for themselves, but there would be a general law which everybody would be expected to live up to, and the suspicion would be removed that there was partiality shown in the treatment accorded.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend were more familiar with it, he would realize that it is not so easy to make a general law in that matter which would suit all portions of the country.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not think my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. McLean) should make a statement like that without giving some instances. It is very easy to make a general statement that Conservatives are fined and Liberals are allowed to go scot free, but the hon. gentleman ought to be able to give some proof of the statement. Speaking from my own constituency, which is one of the largest fishing districts in Nova Scotia, I wish to say that the statement is not true. Some fines have been levied, but not from Conservatives alone. The officer in charge of that district was once a Conservative member of the local legislature for the constituency, and he is not a man who would be very apt to injure his own friends. In the town of Canso there were some nine convictions for the illegal fishing, and six out of the nine convicted were Liberals. I want to say something about the dog-fish institution, the usefulness of which my hon. friend criticises.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, we did no criticise the usefulness of it at all.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I suppose, then, the reference to the Royal Commission was only a joke.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask how it was, when James Noble, of Killarney, had his nets seized, he was not prosecuted. This seizure was made last fall, and the minister stated yesterday that no prosecution had yet been made.

Mr. BRODEUR. Instructions have been given to the inspector to take proceedings against him before a magistrate.

Mr. BENNETT. This is a most extraordinary case. This man's nets were seized last fall, and there is no question about his guilt. The Nobles are notorious law breakers, and yet they are not prosecuted. The minister was of course rather in a dilemma, because while he had this man's nets under seizure he was paying him as a commissioner to investigate the fishery business.

Mr. BRODEUR. The information which I have from the commissioner of fisheries is that instructions have been given to prosecute him.

Mr. FOWLER. When were they given?

Mr. BRODEUR. About six weeks ago.

Mr. FOWLER. How long since the nets were seized?

Mr. BRODEUR. About six weeks ago.

Mr. BENNETT. My information is that the seizure was made much longer ago than that. I had a letter from a gentleman who resides in that part of the country. The whole travesty of this thing is that this man Noble is employed by this very government to show the people and parliament how the fishing business should be conducted, and is at the same time a law breaker. I hope if the minister continues in his office, he will not become weak kneed, and do with the Nobles what a former minister did. After the law had been administered as it should be, they came here and by political pressure got from the department $16,000 or $18,000.

Marine hospitals—further amount required, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. There is a hospital at the town of Midland, a very good institution, which I think does not receive any grant from the Department of Marine.

Mr. BRODEUR. We do not make any grant to these hospitals. We simply pay

so much a day for the mariners who go to them.

Mr. BENNETT. I thought there was a grant made to a hospital at Collingwood. If so, I would like the minister to make note of the hospital at Midland.

Mr. BRODEUR. We do not make a grant to the hospital at Collingwood. We simply pay so much for the mariners.

Mr. BENNETT. What mariners are they —those employed on government vessels?

Mr. BRODEUR. Any mariners.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total cost to the country of these marine hospitals?

Mr. BRODEUR. They do not cost the country anything. Everything is paid by the vessel owners.

To provide an amount for the payment of losses sustained by the Japanese in the recent riots at Vancouver, British Columbia, and incidental expenses, $10,775.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will this be collected from British Columbia?

Mr. FIELDING. Much might be said in favour of asking for such a refund, but I do not know that we have any machinery for that purpose.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does this cover the whole expense in connection with the riots?

Mr. FIELDING. This is a direct payment to the Japanese authorities.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There will be a further vote for the cost of the investigation.

Amount required to meet expenses connected with the reception and entertainment of His Imperial Highness Prince Fushimi of Japan, during his visit to Canada, $37,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. What was the total cost of this trip ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is the total cost.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is he coming back again?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. Bring down the details.

Mr. FIELDING. I have them here. The Prince landed on June 7 and sailed from Esquimalt on June 27. He was the guest of the government from the time he landed in Canada until he sailed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may say that Prince Fushimi, after he left, sent to this country about $20,000 in presents. Prince Fushimi left in the country about $20,000 in presents, in Montreal, Ottawa, Quebec, Toronto and elsewhere.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. Minister of Finance give the details?

Mr. FIELDING. The details are as follows:

Prince Fushimi while in Canada was the guest of the Dominion government. The principal items in the cost of his entertainment are:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Canadian Pacific Railway.. | $12,000 | |
| Canadian Pacific Railway for illuminations at Quebec and Victoria.. | 3,000 | |
| | | $15,000 |
| Intercolonial Railway.. | $ 3,700 | |
| Grand Trunk.. | 1,300 | |
| | | 5,000 |
| Reception at Quebec, Department of Public Works.. | | 4,000 |
| Militia Department, escorts, guards of honour, &c.. | | 2,500 |
| Telegraphs and telephones.. | | 1,600 |
| Reception, Experimental Farm, Ottawa.. | | 1,500 |
| Flags.. | | 1,100 |
| Richelieu & Ontario Navigation Company.. | | 900 |
| Hotels.. | | 900 |
| Cabs, carriages, and motors.. | | 600 |
| Books, maps, &c., specially bound.. | | 600 |
| Police.. | | 400 |
| | | 34,100 |

To provide an amount in aid of the sufferers by earthquake and fire in the Island of Jamaica—revote of lapsed amount, $7,256.53.

Mr. FIELDING. We did not pay the whole amount voted until we were assured that the conditions were such as to require them. After communicating with the government at Jamaica, we thought it right to pay the whole sum.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the committee rises I want the Minister of Finance to retract a statement he made last night. I did not notice it at the moment or I would have taken exception to it, but I see it on 'Hansard' to-day. At half-past midnight, when I asked the committee to rise, Mr. Fielding objected and wanted us to pass some other estimates. On my stating that I thought that we had done very well and they could wait over until to-day, he said that we were evidently determined to keep the poor militiamen at Halifax out of their pay. I do not think that remark was at all called for and the hon. gentleman ought to withdraw it. These supplementary estimates, amounting to some $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 were only placed in our hands a few days ago, and the hon. gentleman ought to thank the opposition for facilitating their passage instead of making a captious criticism.

Mr. FIELDING. I think that the hon. gentleman who has been leading the opposition to-night has been very fair and I desire to express to him my thanks.

Mr. TAYLOR. Shall we take up the Budget on Tuesday next?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but we shall have previously to take concurrence.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 30, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### PRIVATE BILLS.

### INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Institute of Architects of Canada.—Mr. J. C. Walsh.

Mr. GERVAIS. I beg to call the attention of the Chairman to the fact that the promoter of this Bill, the hon. member for St. Anne, Montreal (Mr. Walsh), is not present. I move therefore that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

### DOMINION ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. COPP moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 50) respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company be read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are they ?

Mr. COPP. The only amendment is in clause 9, changing the date of the annual meeting from the second Tuesday in September to the second Friday in October. It is merely a matter of convenience.

Motion agreed to.

### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to some omissions in the Pringle papers. I now send over to him a memorandum of the omissions.

Mr. BENNETT. I asked for a return of the papers regarding the Office Specialty Company. I do not think they have been brought down yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If they are not, I will see that they are as soon as possible.

### QUESTIONS.

### BAYONET FOR THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Has the government of the Department of Militia and Defence adopted a bayonet for use on the Ross rifle?
2. If so, what is the nature of the bayonet and when was the selection made?
3. By whom will the bayonet be manufactured?
4. Has an order yet been placed for the manufacture of said bayonet?
5. If so, in what quantities and at what price?
6. Will the bayonet be manufactured entirely in Canada?
7. If so, at what factory?
8. Will an advance payment on the purchase price of the bayonets be made by the government to the company manufacturing the same? If so, what percentage of the price will be advanced?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1. Yes.
2. A sword bayonet, approved by the Militia Council on December 17, 1907.

3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. The question of placing an order for the manufacture of the bayonet is receiving the consideration of His Excellency in Council.

### ROSS RIFLES IN USE.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Bennett—asked :

1. How many Ross rifles are now in use by the Canadian Militia Force, including permanent corps, ordinary military regiments and Northwest Mounted Police?
2. How many will be in use by or supplied to the Canadian Militia Force as aforesaid by the end of 1908, 1909 and 1910, respectively?
3. How many bayonets suitable for the Ross rifle will be ready and distributed by the end of 1908, 1909 and 1910, respectively?
4. Who are manufacturing the bayonets?
5. Is the contract by tender or how otherwise?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1. 8,716 rifles.
2. It cannot be estimated.

3, 4 and 5. The question of the placing of an order for the manufacture of bayonets for the Ross rifle is receiving the consideration of His Excellency in Council.

### STONEY LAKE DOCK.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Has the government constructed a dock on island number 19 'a' Stoney lake, Ontario?
2. If so, who is the owner of the island above referred to, and was the part of the island on which the dock is built purchased by the government? If so, what was paid for same?
3. Have any docks been constructed in said lake on the island by the government since 1896?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Railways and Canals). The government have not constructed any docks on any island in Stoney lake. In 1906 it was found, during the summer months, that there was not sufficient water in Stoney lake for navigation purposes, in consequence of which, it was decided to hold the water at Young's Point dam, the outlet of Stoney lake, from eighteen to twenty-four inches higher than formerly; it being estimated that the advantage to navigation, in this respect would be equivalent of $50,000 expended in dredging. In thus raising the water level of Stoney lake, certain damage was done to a number of small docks at the various islands used for summer resorts on this lake. It was, therefore, considered a fair proposition that the level of the docks should be raised proportionately. In all, twenty-two docks were raised, among others those of Dr. S. P. Ford, Mr. H. LeBrun, ex-Alderman Shortly, of Peterborough, J. S. Knapman, J. D. Collins, Hon. J. R. Stratton and a number of others. All the owners of the island whose wharfs were raised have given a full discharge for any damage that was done to their property, in this connection. The government have no information as to the owner of the island 19 'A,' but it is understood that it belongs to Hon. J. R. Stratton.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY—DR. BARLOW.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Cockshutt—asked:

1. Did Dr. A. E. Barlow, while in the service of the Geological Survey Department, investigate a belt in Lake Temagami district, the property of the Honourable Sir William Mulock and Mr. Daniel O'Connor, and run lines and trenches across the property?
2. Did Dr. A. E. Barlow make a report of this investigation or survey?
3. Did he make a map of the property, and is it available?
4. What was the total cost of the work, including Dr. Barlow's salary?
5. Was Dr. Barlow, while engaged in making examination of nickel deposits in Sudbury region for Dr. Mond, paid a salary and allowance for expenses by Dr. Mond, in addition to the salary paid by the government?

Hon. W. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Mines):

1. In 1903 Dr. Barlow made a geological examination of the country to the north of the northeast arm of Lake Temagami, an area of forty square miles, which necessarily included iron formations covered in part by locations held or owned by a company (the Temagami Iron Mining Company).
2. Yes, summary report for 1903.
3. Yes. He made a map, which is available.
4. Cost of season's exploration including Dr. Barlow's salary $2,065.82.
5. The department does not know if Dr. Barlow was paid a salary or allowance by Dr. Mond.

Mr. BENNETT.

SUPPLIES FOR ROYAL CANADIAN DRAGOONS AT ST. JOHNS, QUEBEC.

Mr. MORIN—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Have tenders been advertised of late in connection with supplies for the Royal Canadian Dragoons at St. Johns, Quebec?
2. What are the names of the tenderers for each article, and the prices of each tender?
3. Have contracts been awarded? If so, what are the names in each case, and the prices?
4. (a) Were the contracts awarded to the lowest tenderer at the opening of tenders, (b) or were they offered to former contractors on condition of lowering their prices?
5. If such is the case, is it considered a fair system to the tenderers?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. Tenders for supplies to the permanent force at St. Johns, Quebec, for the year beginning April 1, 1908, were called for by newspaper advertisement.
2. It is suggested that a return be asked for in this case.
3. Contracts have been awarded as follows: L. Papineau, meat; J. R. Labelle & Company, bread; Marsan & Frère, groceries and vegetables; George O'Cain, forage and straw; H. Masse, removal of manure; E. Camaraire, emptying latrines and refuse pits; H. Logier, washing hospital bedding, &c. No contract was made for the supply of groceries and vegetables to the military hospital.
4. (a) The contracts were awarded to the lowest of the tenderers at the opening of the tenders in each case. (b) No.
5. Answered by No. 4.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the unanswered part stand as a notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Question No. 2 stands as a notice of motion.

PASSAGE OF UNITED STATES TRAINING SHIPS THROUGH ST. LAWRENCE CANALS.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. How many United States war ships have passed through the St. Lawrence canals during the past ten years?
2. What is the object of these training ships, and for what purpose are they used?
3. How many of these vessels are now in use or in commission?
4. What is the strength of the United States naval reserves, or the state reserves for which these training ships are required?
5. Has Canada any training ships or naval reserves on any of the great lakes?
6. Has the government recently given its consent for the proposed passage of the gunboat 'Nashville' through the St. Lawrence canals and river?
7. What are the particulars of tonnage, horse-power, armament and crew of the 'Nashville' at present, or as she will be when in commission on the great lakes?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. 12. Four outwards and eight in.
2. Training of state naval militia.
3. No information available.
4. No information available.
5. The 'Vigilant.'
6. Yes, on the 15th February, 1908.
7. Tonnage 1,371 tons; indicated horsepower 2,524; twin screw; number of crew on 1st February, 1907; armed with 8 four inch guns; 4 six pounder quick firers, and 4 machine guns.

## APPLICATIONS FOR COAL AREAS.

Mr. AMES asked:

In respect of each of the undermentioned coal areas, (a) what was the name and address of the party who acted as agent in making application on behalf of the original grantee, and (b) what is the name and address of the present holder?

1. Southwest quarter-section 16, township 19, range 7, west fifth meridian.
2. Whole of section 23, township 23, range 9, west fifth meridian.
3. East half section 14, township 42, range 18, west fifth meridian.
4. West half section 32, township 41, range 17, west fifth meridian.
5. North half section 13, township 42, range 20, west fifth meridian.
6. North half section 33, township 53, range 7, west fifth meridian.
7. East half section 5, township 54, range 7, west fifth meridian.
8. East half section 31, township 9, range 22, west fourth meridian.
9. South half section 33, township 10, range 21, west fourth meridian.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

| Present Holder. | Address. | Agent. | Address. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Patrick Burns | Calgary, Alta | Belcourt & Ritchie | Ottawa, Ont. |
| 2. Geo. B. Latimer (coal lease applied for). | Canmore, Alta | No agent | |
| 3. R. K. Farrow | Care of McGivern & Haydon, Ottawa. | McGivern & Haydon | " |
| 4. F. X. Laderoute | " " | " " | " |
| 5. Jas. A. Murray | 5 Lee Avenue, Toronto | D. W. Alexander | Canada Life Building, Toronto, Ont. |
| 6. Alberta Development Co., Ltd. | Vancouver, B.C. | Frank Oliver | Ottawa, Ont. |
| 7. John E. Burchard | St. Paul, Minn., and care of Latchford & Daly. | P. E. Lessard | Edmonton, Alta. |
| 8. John L. Davis | Care of J. W. Bettes, 413 Main Street, Winnipeg, Man. | J. W. Bettes | 413 Main Street, Winnipeg, Man. |
| 9. Bessie M. Stewart | Care of M. Freeman, Lethbridge, Alta. | M. Freeman | Lethbridge, Alta. |

## HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette)—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has any proposition been made to the government for the construction of a railway to Hudson bay?
2. If so, by whom, and what is the nature of the proposition?
3. Is the land grant formerly voted by parliament for such a road still in force?
4. Has the government decided on any policy for the construction of a road to Hudson bay?

Hon. F. OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Several suggestions regarding the building of a railway to Hudson's bay have been brought to the attention of the government, but no definite proposition.
2. Answered by answer to No. 1.
3. The Act of parliament providing for a land grant in aid of a railway to Hudson's bay is still in force.
4. The question is under consideration.

## REDUCTION WORKS AT CANSO, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. McLENNAN asked:

1. What is the total cost of construction and otherwise of the reduction works established at Canso, Nova Scotia?
2. What is the annual expenditure by government in operating and maintaining these works?
3. What is the annual value of the proceeds of the sale of the product of these works since their inception?
4. Are there railway transportation facilities connecting these works with any market?
5. What is the amount of the government subsidy to the Canso cold storage plant for bait to deep sea fishermen?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. 1905-6 | $25,996 22 |
| 1905-6 | 15,811 64 |
| 1906-7 (shed) | 322 81 |
| Construction | 42,130 67 |

2. 1905-6.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. $18,323 24
1906-7.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 14,859 37
1907-8.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 10,630 25

3. Most of the product manufactured in 1905 and 1906 was not sold until 1907. The net amount realized for the products of 1905 and 1906 was $13,691.78. Those for 1907 have not yet been all disposed of.

4. The nearest railway connection is Mulgrave, between which point and Canso there is daily steamboat communication.

5. $30,000 and a bonus of $4 per ton up to a maximum of five hundred tons of bait frozen during the first three years of the operation of the plant.

## CLAIMS AGAINST DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

Have claims for damages against the Department of Agriculture been made by various persons claiming upwards of $350,000 or more for damage, for losses on shipments of hay to South Africa made through the Department of Agriculture ? If so, what action has been taken by the Department of Agriculture in reference thereto ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Yes, to the extent of twenty-three in number and $258,030 in amount. The Department of Agriculture considering the claims unfounded refused to pay the same and two of the claimants, the firm of Boulay & Lucier, and Mr. A. Poirier, sought to recover the amount of their claims by Petition of Right. The claims were for $20,766.97 and $1,331.75 respectively. The petition of the former suppliant was heard before Mr. Justice Cassels sitting in the Exchequer Court, Montreal, on the 24th and 25th instant, and was dismissed with costs against the suppliant. The petition of the other suppliant has not been brought to trial.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister say what the basis of the claim was?

Mr. FISHER. I do not consider myself that there was any basis, but the petitioners thought they had a claim against the government on two grounds: First, that hay which had been offered to the department to be shipped to South Africa at the time of the South African war had been rejected and they thought it had been improperly rejected; and second, the other claim was for damages because the business ceased.

Mr. FOSTER. The war ceased.

Mr. FISHER. The war ceased.

## TRAINING OF TROOPS AT PETAWAWA CAMP.

Mr. WHITE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What branches of the Permanent Force and Active Militia will encamp for training at Petawawa Camp during the coming season ?

2. When will this camp open, and what will be the duration of same ?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Minister of Militia). No definite arrangements have yet been made regarding the training of troops at Petawawa this summer.

## HARBOUR AT INVERNESS TOWN, C.B.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. Has the government decided to build a harbour at Inverness Town, Cape Breton ?

2. If so, is it proposed to purchase what is known as McIsaac's Pond, or has the government already purchased said McIsaac's Pond as a site for a harbour ?

3. What connection is there between McIsaac's Pond and the gulf, or what breadth and depth of water is there at the present time ?

4. Has the government, during the last year or the year previous, sent an engineer to this locality to ascertain the feasibility of building a harbour ?

5. If so, what is his report as to the advisability of building a harbour and as to the cost?

6. Has the government engineer made a report as to the advisability of building a wharf, or improving or extending the one there at the present time, outside of McIsaac's Pond ?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. and 2. The matter of making certain improvements to the harbour at Inverness is under consideration. The government has not purchased McIsaac's Pond.

3. A channel, 30 feet wide with a depth of 4 to 9 feet at high water.

4. Yes, as to the feasibility of improving the harbour.

5. Estimated cost of works sufficient for fishing vessels, $22,000. Estimated cost of dredging, reconstruction, new channel piers, property, &c., required for a harbour of 10 feet depth to accommodate coasting vessels, $82,000.

6. The plan shows only the channel piers outside of McIsaac's Pond, cost of extension of which is included in the above.

## 5TH REGIMENT, GARRISON ARTILLERY, VICTORIA, B.C.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. Does any trouble or misunderstanding exist, or has any recently existed among the officers, non-commissioned officers or men of the 5th Regiment of Garrison Artillery, of Victoria, British Columbia? If so, what is the nature of the trouble ?

2. Has the government received any information of the same? If so, what is the nature of the information ?

3. Have any of the officers or men resigned or threatened to do so ?

4. Is the pay of this regiment in arrears, or has it recently been in arrears ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Minister of Militia):

1. and 2. There is none as far as the department is aware.

3. No.

4. No.

## CLAIMS AGAINST THE INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. How many claims against the Intercolonial Railway for damages to property or personal injury or loss or damage of any nature were unsettled on January 1, 1908?
2. How many of such claims have since been settled?
3. What was the nature of the claims so settled, the amount of damages claimed in each case, and the settlements arrived at?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let this stand as a notice for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for return.

## INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. What is the number of men taken into the service of the Intercolonial Railway in the province of New Brunswick during the month of January, 1908?
2. What is the number of men taken into the service of the Intercolonial Railway in the province of New Brunswick during the month of February, 1908?
3. What are the names of the persons so taken into the service, where were they employed, and what was the nature of the work assigned to them?
4. Were the positions filled, new positions? If not, by whom had these duties been previously performed?
5. What was the number taken into the service during the corresponding months of 1907?
6. What was the total number of employees on the Moncton pay-roll for the month of January, 1908?
7. What was the total number of employees on the Moncton pay-roll for the month of February, 1908?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let this stand as notice of motion for return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

## QUEBEC BRIDGE—CUSTOMS DUTIES.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the sum of $504,884.76, stated by the Minister of Customs as having been collected in duties upon materials imported from the United States for construction of Quebec bridge, actually entered into the cash receipts of the Customs Department and gone into the consolidated fund?
2. Has any reduction at any time been made in the amount of said duties?
3. Has any refund or reimbursement or diminution of any kind been made in said duties?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. No.



## PROVINCIAL TAX ON COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS.

Mr. GUTHRIE asked :

1. At the time that increased subsidies were granted to the various provinces of Canada, was there any law, agreement, understanding or condition that provinces which were in the habit of imposing a tax upon commercial travellers should abolish such tax?
2. If so, when was such tax to be abolished?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). No such agreement or condition was attached to the increase in the subsidies, but the propriety of repealing the tax referred to was discussed, and expected to be taken into consideration by the various provincial legislatures.

## HONOURABLE W. B. McINNES.

Mr. LENNOX—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Does Hon. W. B. McInnes now ocupy any position in connection with the government of the Yukon, or other position in the service of Canada? If so, what position?
2. During what period or periods did Mr. McInnes serve as commissioner or otherwise in the Yukon, at what salary, at what rate for living allowance, and what sums has he been paid in respect of these items, specifying each payment made?
3. What other sums of money has Mr. McInnes been paid, when and for what causes or purposes, specifying the various payments made?
4. What is the total amount paid Mr. McInnes?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Answers as far as the Department of the Interior is concerned :

1. No.
2. 27th May, 1905 to 31st December, 1906. Salary $6,000 per year ; living allowance, $6,000 per year. List of payments made in respect of these items as follows :

| Date of payments | Salary. | Living allowance. |
|---|---|---|
| June 30, 1905.. .. .. .. .. | $580 65 | $580 64 |
| July 31, 1905.. .. .. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| August 31, 1905.. .. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| September 30, 1905.. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| October 31, 1905.. .. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| November 30, 1905.. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| December 31, 1905.. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| January 31, 1906.. .. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| February 28, 1906.. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| March 31, 1906.. .. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| April 30, 1906.. .. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| May 31, 1906.. .. .. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| June 30, 1906.. .. .. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| July 31, 1906.. .. .. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| August 31, 1906.. .. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| September 30, 1906.. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| October 31, 1906.. .. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| November 30, 1906.. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |
| December 31, 1906.. .. .. | 500 00 | 500 00 |

3.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1904-1905.. | $473 02 | travelling expenses. |
| 1905-1906.. | 813 64 | " " |
| 1906-1907.. | 693 60 | " " |

4. $21,141.55.

POSTMASTER OF ST. IRENEE DES BAINS.

Mr. FORGET—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. Is the Postmaster General aware that Mr. Geo. Girard has been appointed postmaster at St. Irenée des Bains, county of Charlevoix?
2. Is it not true that at the time of his appointment that gentleman was serving a sentence in the Malbaie prison?
3. Is it not true that his commission as postmaster was handed to him in the very prison where he was detained?
4. How often has that officer been found guilty by a court of justice?
5. When and for what was he so found guilty?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Postmaster General):

1. Mr. George Girard has been postmaster of St. Irenée des Bains post office since June, 1902.

2, 3, 4, and 5. The department has no information in regard to these questions, and never had any suggestion concerning such facts as are alleged in these questions.

PURCHASE OF BUFFALO.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. Who purchased on behalf of the government the buffalo that are now located in the Elk park?
2. What amount was paid for his services, and how paid, whether by salary, commission or otherwise?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Howard Douglas, superintendent of Rocky Mountains Park, Banff.

2. Mr. Douglas did not receive any additional remuneration other than his regular salary which is $2,000 per year.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND WINTER SERVICE.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES asked :

1. What progress has been made towards the construction of the new ice-breaking steamer for the winter navigation of the Northumberland straits?
2. Has the contract been let? If so, what shipbuilding firm has received the contract, what is the contract price, and when is she expected to be ready for service?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Tenders for the construction have now been received and are being considered.
2. Answered by No. 1.

DEPORTED IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Who were the immigrants recently deported by the Immigration Department from Chatham, Ontario ?
2. What are their names, occupation, nationality, &c., and the reasons why they were deported in each case ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. There were five families in all; one family (Housden) was brought to Canada by the East End Emigration Society; the other four families (Pierce, Mortimer, Seeney and Young) came to Canada through the Central (Unemployed) body for London.

| Names. | Occupations. | Nationality. | Cause of Deportation. |
|---|---|---|---|
| George Pierce | Fitter | English | Public charge. |
| Susan " | | | |
| Susan " | | | |
| Florence " | | | |
| Eda " | | | |
| Ellis " | | | |
| Ethel " | | | |
| Herbert " | | | |
| John Housden | Railroad laborrer | English | Public charge and undesirable. |
| Ada " | | | |
| Dorothy " | | | |
| Sarah " | | | |
| Elsie " | | | |
| John Mortimer | Bricklayer | English | Public charge, drunkard and very undesirable. |
| Eliza " | | | |
| Eliza " | | | |
| William " | | | |
| John " | | | |
| Edward " | | | |
| Alice " | | | |

| Names. | Occupations. | Nationality. | Cause of Deportation. |
|---|---|---|---|
| John B. Seeney..... | General labourer.... | English..... | Public charge, ill and able to work but 2 weeks out of the 7 months he was in Canada. |
| Marian " ..... | | | |
| Lily " ..... | | | |
| Florence " ..... | | | |
| Ada " ..... | | | |
| Alice " ..... | | | |
| J. W. Young ..... .. | General labourer.... | English..... | Public charge, lazy, shiftless and unreliable |
| Sarah " ..... | | | |
| William " ..... | | | |
| Robert " ..... | | | |
| Florence " .... | | | |

POSTMASTER AT ST. FRANCOIS XAVIER.

Mr. STAPLES asked :

1. Who is the postmaster at St. François Xavier ?
2. When was he appointed ?
3. Was a petition received by the department asking for his appointment ? If so, how many signatures were attached to the petition?
4. Was any petition received by the department asking for the appointment of any other person ? If so, in whose favour, and how many signatures were attached to it ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Postmaster General) :

1. Mrs. Josephine Robidoux is postmistress of St. Francois Xavier.
2. She was appointed on the 30th August, 1907.
3. No petition was received asking for her appointment.
4. A petition in favour of the appointment of Mr. R. P. Precourt was received at the department. There were 106 signatures to this petition.

MR. J. J. COSGRAVE.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL asked :

What was the total cost of the investigation into the case of Mr. J. J. Cosgrave, late of the Inland Revenue department, Toronto, which took place in or about the month of February, 1906 ?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The cost of the investigation into the case of Mr. J. J. Cosgrove was eighty-two dollars ($82).

Mr. JAMES H, MACKENZIE.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL asked :

1. What position does Mr. James M. Mackenzie hold in the Department of Inland Revenue at Toronto, and what is his salary ?
2. Is this Mr. Mackenzie the same person who carries on business as a druggist at 1160 Yonge Street, Toronto, and is he the postmaster at this place, and what is his salary or remuneration therefor ?
3. Is this Mr. Mackenzie the same person who carries on business as a druggist at 253 Avenue Road, Toronto, and is he the postmaster at this place, and what is his salary or remuneration therefor ?
4. If this Mr. Mackenzie is not the postmaster at these two postal stations, who are the postmasters thereat ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Postmaster General) :

1. Mr. James H. Mackenzie is a deputy collector, class 'A,' Toronto; his salary is $1,700 per annum.
2. Mr. James H. Mackenzie is not postmaster at North Toronto sub post office (1160 Yonge street, Toronto).
3. Mr. James H. Mackenzie is not postmaster at sub post office No. 27 (253 Avenue road, Toronto).
4. Miss Annie McCarter is postmistress of North Toronto sub office, and Mr. E. G. Seyler is postmaster of sub post office No. 27.

DAM AT ADAMS LAKE.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Is the government aware that a dam has been constructed at the outlet of Adams Lake, British Columbia, which prevents water from entering the Adams River, a tributary of the South Thompson River ?
2. By whose authority was this dam constructed ?
3. Has the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of the Interior received any complaint from the City of Kamloops that the water supply of the city is threatened by the damming of Adams Lake ? If so, what action is to be taken ?
4. Is it the intention of the government to cause the dam at the foot of Adams Lake to be removed, if it has been constructed without proper authority ?
5. What action will be taken to protect the interests of the City of Kamloops, in view of the low stage of water in the South Thompson River, from which the water supply of the city is obtained, consequent upon the construction of this dam ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The Department of the Interior has received a letter from the city clerk of Kamloops stating that a dam has been constructed at the mouth of Adams lake and suggesting that the low state of the water in

the South Thompson river may be due to this dam.

2. No authority has been given by the government for the construction of a dam at the outlet of Adams lake.

3. Answered by No. 1. A report is being obtained from the Dominion land agent at Kamloops.

4. This question cannot be answered until a proper report has been received.

5. The interests of the city of Kamloops will not be overlooked in the granting of any rights which the Dominion government may have the power to grant.

## MAIL TENDER AT RIMOUSKI.

Mr. COCKSHUTT asked :

1. Is it true that the tender 'Rhoda' had to take the place of the steamer 'Lady Evelyn' last season during rough weather ?

2. If so, what reasons are given for the 'Lady Evelyn' not making the trips?

3. Did the captain of the Canadian Pacific Railway and Allan vessels inform the department that they were afraid of a collision with the big tender?

4. Is the 'Lady Evelyn' a passenger boat ? If so, how many passengers can she accommodate ?

5. What is the estimated cost of running the steamer 'Lady Evelyn' during one full season ?

6. How many of crew are in the employ of the government during winter season, and how are they employed ?

7. Was the service satisfactorily carried on previous to the purchase of the 'Lady Evelyn'? If not, what were the objections ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Postmaster General):

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Not so far as the the Post Office Department is aware.

4. Before being purchased by the department the 'Lady Evelyn' was employed in the conveyance of mails and passengers between Penzance and the Scilly islands. She was authorized to carry 149 first-class passengers and 142 second-class passengers.

5. $18,000.

6. Five. These men have to be engaged by the year to retain their services.

7. Yes, the department received serious complaints from the Allan Line and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as to the unsuitability of the 'Rhoda' for the service owing to the fact that she was a paddle wheel boat and unable to lie close enough to the steamships in rough weather to enable the transfer of the mails to be satisfactorily effected.

A resolution was also adopted by the executive council of the Shipping Federation of Canada, under date the 4th October, 1906, to the effect that :

Whereas the present mail tender that is used for transferring the mails from the royal mail steamers to the Rimouski wharf is old and unsuitable for the work required of her, besides the style of her construction does not adapt her to work safely in an open roadstead, and great inconvenience and delay has been caused by the time taken in transferring the mails.

Therefore be it resolved that the Executive Council of this Federation respectfully petition the government to provide a new approved sea-going tender, with powerful machinery and appliances for the rapid handling of the mails; further such a vessel would be able to proceed down the gulf and transfer of the mails take place en route, thereby effecting a considerable saving of time, besides adding to the safety in handling of such valuable matter.

## MONCTON WORKSHOPS.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. Have tenders been called for leasing car and workshops at Moncton?

2. If so, what tenders have been received, from whom, and for what amount ?

3. Has any tender been accepted ? If so, whose tender, and for what amount ?

Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Railways and Canals). Only one tender was received and no action has as yet been taken thereon; the matter is now under consideration by the department.

## MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all papers and correspondence, &c., in connection with an account of the town of Truro against the Intercolonial Railway for sewerage frontage.—Mr. Stanfield—by Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents relating to an accident which happened at the Intercolonial Railway crossing known as Hanlon's crossing, near Mulgrave, Nova Scotia, on the 3rd of December last, whereby Captain James Forrestall lost his life; and also, the evidence taken at the investigation subsequently held by officers of the department and the report made thereon. —Mr. Sinclair.

For a return, so far as not already furnished, showing, except in so far as the same has already been brought down, what amount has been expended on wharfs, piers and harbours each year since 1895, and the amount expended in each province.—Mr. Blain.

For a copy of all orders in council, reports, documents, correspondence and papers from the 1st of January, 1907, to the present time, relating to the passage of United States war ships or training ships through the St. Lawrence canals and great lakes, including a statement showing the number of United States war ships or training ships which have passed through the St. Lawrence canals during that period, and a statement of all such war ships or training ships now on the great lakes, and particulars of the tonnage, horsepower, armament and crew of such war ship or training ship, and of the naval reserves or other naval forces of the United States government, or of any state government upon the great lakes; also, all correspondence respecting the proposed passage of the gunboat

'Nashville' through the St. Lawrence canals and river on her way to the great lakes next summer.—Mr. Taylor—by Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all orders in council, reports, correspondence, documents and papers relating to the appointment of Mr. W. H. P. Clement as legal adviser to the council of the Yukon Territory, or as public administrator in the Yukon Territory, or to any other office of emolument in the Yukon Territory, or relating to the resignation of the said W. H. P. Clement from any such office, or relating to the circumstances under which and reasons for which the said W. H. P. Clement ceased to act as such legal adviser, public administrator or in any other such capacity.—Mr. Sproule.

For a copy of all memorials, documents, telegrams and correspondence between the government of Prince Edward Island and the government of Canada since 30th June, 1904, with respect to the nonfulfilment of the terms of union and for claims for damages in respect thereof.—Mr. A. A. McLean (Queens, Prince Edward Island).

1. For a return showing how many tenders the Public Works Department received in 1904 for the construction of the wharf at Deschambault, in the county of Portneuf.

2. The name of each tenderer and the amount asked by each of them.

3. To whom the contract was awarded.

4. Any extras paid to the contractor, and the amounts.

5. Apart from the amount expended on the construction of the wharf, what amount the Public Works Department spent at Deschambault, county of Portneuf, from the 1st of May, 1904, to the present date, and the nature of the works it had done in that locality.

6. The names and residences of the engineer and the inspector or inspectors who had the superintendence of such work.—Mr. Monk—by Mr. W. J. Roche (Marquette).

For a return showing all the lands granted to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company under their contract of May, 1902, specifying those which are patented as well as those unpatented, to date.—Mr. W. J. Roche (Marquette).

For a copy as it appeared printed in the 'Yukon World and Official Gazette' for nine months of the financial year 1906-7, of a synopsis of mining regulations referred to in the Auditor General's Report, 1906-7, at page L—37, and also setting forth the number of times the said advertisement appeared in the newspaper referred to in the time stated.—Mr. Lennox—by Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a return showing: 1. what leases or licenses, other than gill-net licenses, have been granted to capture salmon in the waters of British Columbia, when, to whom, and for what term of years?

2. What proportion of said leases or licenses purport to grant exclusive privileges, for what waters, to whom granted, and for what term of years.

3. What undertaking the granters were or are responsible for in view of the special privileges granted, and what steps the government has taken to ascertain that conditions have been carried out.

4. The penalty provided for not making use of the privileges granted, and what steps the government has taken to ascertain if the conditions have been complied with.

5. What licenses can be cancelled in case of non-user.—Mr. J. D. Reid—by Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of specifications, tenders, contracts, orders in council, extension or renewal of contracts, in connection with Quebec harbour improvements in 1903 and subsequently; and of all letters, correspondence and memoranda in connection therewith; and also, a statement of the sums of money paid on account of the work in and subsequent to 1903.—Mr. Lennox—by Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a return showing: 1. The names and places of birth and domicile of all civil engineers and engineers' assistants, employed on the field or office staff of the National Transcontinental Railway at any time or times during the years 1905, 1906, 1907 and 1908.

2. The date of each such engineer's first employment on such staff, his age, the period or periods of his service during such years, and in what capacity or duty so employed from time to time.

3. Their salaries and allowances from time to time.

4. The suspensions or termination of service, the periods and dates thereof, and the reasons thereof.

5. Whether such engineers were or were not members of any Canadian society or institute of Civil Engineers, or other such foreign society or institute.

6. And also for a return covering the same information under the above several heads, as to all civil engineers, and engineers' assistants employed upon the fields or office staff of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway during the aforesaid years or portions thereof.

7. And for a copy of all papers, reports and correspondence of and with the Department of Labour, or with or by any department of the government, or between the departments, relating to the employment and matters above detailed, and not already brought down.—Mr. W. J. Roche (Marquette).

For a return, so far as not already furnished, showing what amount has been expended on wharfs, piers and harbours each year since 1895, and the amount expended in each province.—Mr. Blain.

## PURCHASE OF GOVERNMENT SUPPLIES.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved:

That all the supplies purchased for the use of the various departments of the government should be procured on the basis of public tender and contract, under the direction of a competent purchasing commission, and with regard primarily to quality and price.

He said: Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the session I gave notice of three resolutions which have been delayed, and the reason for the delay was in part the desire which I had to have the report of the Civil Service Commission brought down before they

were taken up. It is a little remarkable that the propositions involved in the three resolutions have all been treated more or less fully by the Civil Service Commission, and that the report of that commission has been in favour of the principle of all three —the first one being a non-partisan civil service commission, which is a plank in the platform of the Liberal-Conservative party, and the other two being cognate resolutions.

It would almost seem superfluous to spend very much time in discussing the principles upon which the expenditure of public money should be conducted in a country like this, and yet it may not be inopportune to briefly state them. In the first place I suppose we will all agree that the money to be expended is the people's money, that it does not belong to the individual minister who may have a portion of it placed at his disposal, nor is it the property of the party upon which the government depends for support. It is the money of the state paid by and to be expended for the benefit of the public. I suppose we also will agree that this public money ought to be expended simply and only for the public good, that it ought not to be diverted to private uses in any shape or form, that it ought not to be expended for the sake of strengthening the minister or the government beyond what strength legitimately comes to every government from wise and proper expenditures as authorized by parliament.

I suppose we will also agree that the government are the trustees of the public. Parliament is elected to do the business of the public and the government is surely a committee of parliament. The oath a member takes when he enters parliament and the obligation he assumes when he enters the cabinet and is sworn in as a member of the Privy Council, show that ministers or governments are simply representative trustees acting for the public.

But having said so much on that point, it may not be out of the way to observe that there exists a continual centrifugal tendency, or a tendency to fly off from the central theory and prnciple; and an essential to good government is the existence of a strenuous opposition ever on the alert to check that tendency and hold the government down to the true position. In the old idyllic times when the republic was small and thoroughly honest, everybody worked for the good, and solely for the good, of the state; but if you take from the middle ages on to the present, the history of parliamentary government has been rather that of a contest to work back to this central idea of trusteeship from a practice which was totally different. We find the king possessed of the public domain and in control of the army, and considering himself justified in using both for his own personal advantage, to intrench himself in power, and in expending what tribute he can levy or revenue he can raise on his personal favourites or in the prosecution of his favourite projects; and a most interesting study it is to take up the history of the evolution of parliament and free government and follow the successive stages by which the people have vindicated the idea of trusteeship against the theory of one man power. So far as observation goes, it is a tendency of the party in our time to rather put itself in the place of the king of those days, and to consider itself the owner of the public moneys and entitled to dispose of them, not merely with reference to the public good, but conjoined more or less—and when more always detrimental—with the idea of a certain right, as the common saying goes, to distribute the spoil to the victors for the time being. And I think it is essential to good government that there should be a strong and successful movement against any such tendency and towards the primary idea of which I spoke at first.

In a young country like Canada there is another reason which strengthens the proper theory and practice of the expenditure of public money. Canada is a young and comparatively a poor country. That is, it is comparatively poor, as regards its ability to contribute to the great works it requires, and comparatively poor also, taking into account its slender capital resources for the work it has to do. So that in Canada there has been a continual strain and desire, and I may say a generous acquiescence in the payment of contributions to the utmost extent of the ability of the country in order to overtake, as far as possible, the immense demands for development and the progress which can only be had by development. Therefore in a country like ours any waste of public money comes to be almost in the nature of a crime. Where money is so hard to get, where the demands are so extensive and varied, where it is impossible, either by contribution or by borrowing, to meet all the demands that the country makes, it becomes of the utmost importance and no doubt it ought to be the stern and stubborn resolve of every administrator to make the hardly earned and hardly paid contributions of the country go directly and without waste to the effective point, that is to the service and the successful completion of the service.

In forty years this Canadian people, at first about four millions, and now a little over six millions, have paid in taxation the immense sum of $1,217,000,000. In 1867-8 the taxation amounted to $12,000,000, and in 1907-8 to about $73,000,000. Thus it will be seen that the total amount raised is not at all a measure of these later years, in which the amount of taxation has been doubled, trebled and is now six times as great as in the early years of the confederacy. It is also to be taken into account,

and, I think, ought to be kept in mind by every one of us, that the drain of taxation is less obvious because of the mode we have of levying our taxes. But, though it is less obvious, and therefore is more easily acquiesced in, it is still, of course, altogether true that the burden is exactly the same, the drain is exactly the same,—if, indeed, it is not arguable that both the cost and the burden are increased by the indirect method.

Now, it would seem that two points might be easily agreed upon by all. The first is that the public moneys should only go to necessary objects, and, should go to these necessary objects in the order of their necessity. There are a great many things that are necessary in this country, but they are not all possible, and the administrator has to select that which stands nearest in the point of necessity and go ahead, as far as the country can consistent with its ability to contribute towards great works of public development. And the second is that the money which is appropriated for every service should go directly to that service and reach its objective with as little deviation from the direct line and with as little waste as possible. For, therein is, of course, very great saving. The electric current, when it was first sent along the wire, went at a leakage of fifty or sixty per cent, the electric current to-day goes at a leakage brought down to ten, or seven or even five per cent. This great saving has been effected by improved methods of insulation, so that nearly all the power that is produced reaches the objective point. The same should be true with reference to the expenditures of the country. If every dollar appropriated, could go straight and without leakage or loss to the objective point the country would gain by having so much more devoted to the real work of the public service.

Now, it would seem that, with these two principles laid down, the first thing to do would be to apply modern business methods to the expenditures of the government—You will see, Mr. Speaker, that I am arguing this question simply on the general and non-partisan ground, and I intend to do so until the end of the remarks I have to make.—Is not this true, Mr. Speaker?—that the method most difficult to improve, the method least appreciative of proposals for change is the bureaucratic method. Business men have the strain of competition, and the keen mind is always on the alert to find methods better than those employed by a rival, so that expenditures may be lessened, waste saved and the effect made more perfect. Thus, business methods within the last ten or twelve years have had an immense movement forward. Have government methods had anything like a proportionate movement forward. Or is it not true that the staid, conservative, and sometimes lazy, bureaucratic methods have lagged behind the business methods and consequently are not up to date? Another thing I think is true as well: Hardly any of us have taken sufficient account of the immense strides forward both as to extent and variety in the business of this country within the last fifteen or twenty years—though, it may be that our administrators under the present regime have been in a better position than others in that respect. Take almost any department, and whilst the old bureaucratic method could have—to use the phrase—'collared' the workings of that department twenty-five years ago, that method would be absolutely a child in arms in attempting to deal with the extended business and diversified ramifications of that business at the present time. And so, if any department of the government is not keenly alive to these two facts—first that it is of the essence of the bureaus to go slow and make a few improvements, and that business is continually increasing and widening and under competitive methods grows sharper every year—is it not true that we are liable to waken any day, unless extreme vigilance be used, and find that our methods are far behind the times and that our business is at loose ends because of that fact?

Now, as soon as you make the plea to apply modern business methods to government—that is, let us say, to the expenditures of the government—you meet with the old-time objections. One of these is that a government cannot do business like a business man. Well, I do not take any stock in that objection at all. That objection, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred comes from the incapable man or the unwilling man. But if you take these two classes out, I think you will find a response from every intelligent administrator that the government, just the same as the individual or corporation, must have a mind upon improved business methods and improved business systems. Another objection is that you cannot do as an individual does but that you have your dignity to keep up, you have your position to look after. I have as little sympathy with that objection. I think the minister's dignity, the administrator's dignity, anybody's dignity, is better conserved by his character and his ability, and I may say, by a simple, plain, good, Canadian scale of living. I think that ministers—although, perhaps I ought not to give the advice—I think that men high in authority ought to set an example of plain, straight and simple Canadian living to the great Canadian people over whose fortunes and destinies for the time being they preside. So I have no sympathy at all, quite the contrary, with that idea that nothing but lavish expenditure can keep up the dignity and the position of a representative of Canada. I have read that at the Hague conference there were some of the inferior powers, and very inferior powers, that spent, I was going to say, almost millions of money in lavish

entertainments at the Hague, under the mistaken idea that in so doing they were keeping up the dignity of their country and of their position. Instead of that, they have been laughed at at every court in Europe, and all over the world where the information has gone.

There is really no good reason, when we come down to be honest with each other, why we should not apply modern business methods to the administration of a government; and if it be necessary in order to do that, let traditions crumble and let them pass. The business man who has been brought up in a certain school and suddenly wakes up to the knowledge that his neighbour is getting ahead of him because he has thrown off old cloaks and has got a brand new set of business methods, mighty soon breaks with the traditions and theories of the past—if he has an active mind and is competent for his business. So there may be many old traditions which are good, and there may be many old traditions which are hanging around the departments of government that are bad; and if, in order to bring in modern business methods, and buy what you want direct, it is necessary to rend these old garments, then let them be rent in twain and thrown aside.

Now, suppose you take a live business man, or a corporation, and put him in the atmosphere of the government and ask him to construct and carry out his business as the government does its business, in the way of expenditures, would he do it? Why, Mr. Speaker, there would be no reason to ask him the question twice, he would simply say, No, Sir, I do not propose to hazard my capital and to commit business suicide, I could not carry on my business the way you carry on yours. For instance, he has a million dollars of capital that goes into an expensive construction. He does not go to Tom, Dick and Harry, who may have some claim of relationship, or some claim of friendship, or some ulterior object to serve, and buy from them his lumber, and supplies, and everything the like of that, in the way that a government, in 99 cases out of 100, buys its supplies. And all through, to make a long story short, in his equipment, in his labour, in the purchase of his material, in working it up to the point of completion, and in its distribution, if he were guided by these practices which prevail with a government—not necessarily, although they often do it—why, as I have said before, it would be absolutely impossible for a modern business man to conduct his business successfully.

Now in the present system of government expenditures, particularly the buying of supplies, and that is what my resolution deals with, we find in the first place that there is no uniformity at all. Here you have in the first place, the good old system of buying upon well considered tender and contract; but you find that system falling

Mr. FOSTER.

into swift desuetude. In some departments it exists, in perhaps one or two, almost wholly; in some, in small part. But so far as supplies are concerned, in nine-tenths of the whole expenditure, that system has gone out of date entirely. I believe that the Minister of Militia in regard to his supplies for camps and the like of that, adheres to the old system of purchasing on genuine public tender. I think that claim has been made, and I am not ready to dispute it at this moment. I think in the penitentiaries branch of the Justice Department something of the same is carried out; and I believe that in the Northwest Mounted Police supplies, for the most part, that system is carried out. My right hon. friend would be able to say whether that is so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Seventy-five per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. But when you pass out of those departments, so far as supplies are concerned, you have retrograded from that principle and from that method through several distinct grades. First, there was this kind of public tender and contract by circulars addressed to party friends. That is spurious. That is better than individual buying just from one person, although, as all administrators know, where these circulars go around to different friends, it is very easy for them to divide up different kinds of articles that are required, and for each to tender for his own particular part. That may be done. But suppose it is not done, that is but a mere make-shift, and departs entirely from the principle of genuine tender and public contract. Then there comes the vicious system of purchase through middlemen. There lies an article in the shop where it was made, or in the shop where it is sold at first hand; but the government does not go there and get, by means of proper purchase, the article at its lowest. It employs the middleman, and the middleman makes his profit of ten, or twenty, or fifty, or a hundred, or a hundred and eighty, or two hundred per cent, as the case may be. Now that is a wide departure from the old system of tender and contract, and it is a most vicious, and wasteful, and indefensible method of buying. That method of buying is all too common, as has been proved in actual transactions that have been brought to light.

Then there is the list purchase, that you call the patronage list. You want to buy goods for the public departments in Ottawa, you want to buy furniture, you want to buy carpets, you want to buy a hundred and one different things. Certain friends are put upon the patronage list; when something is required, an officer looks over the list, takes one of the names, goes down and orders what is required for the department. Then there is the personal buying where the minister, or officer of the department, tells the man who has to buy: Go to such a person

and buy that from him, and see that the prices are fair and just. Appended to all these, before they go to the Auditor General, is the simple phrase, the now almost absolutely meaningless phrase, 'Certified to, that the qualities are as required, and that the prices are fair and just.' When a boiler was bought and there was paid three times the price it was worth, that certificate of good quality and fair and reasonable value was appended to the bill. So it runs through the list until it comes to be nothing but a meaningless phrase which is attached as a matter of course and with very little else in the way of conscience or of carefulness being exercised in the matter. These are the methods and they run through all the departments. In some departments all phases of this are to be found—in some departments fewer or more according as the department is managed. But there is no uniformity; it is confusion worse confounded. Fancy an up-to-date business corporation making its purchases in that kind of slip-shod, expensive and careless way; no business could prosper and no up-to-date business methods could be said to be in operation if such were in vogue. Then, as to prices, what do you find? You find that the very same department, buying in the same region of country where there ought not to be and is not in reality any variation in price, pays all kinds of prices for the very same material. What else do you find? You find that there are departments buying, in Kingston or at other points, and are paying for exactly the same staple, different prices. And so, as there is no uniformity in methods there is no uniformity in prices. It depends upon a multitude of things; but in no case does it seem to depend upon the quality of goods that are required and for which a fair price ought to be paid and nothing more.

Mr. PATERSON. Could not that happen under tender ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, anything can happen anywhere except in heaven.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. And in heaven some things cannot happen, but the last resource of the objector is, with respect to any good method, cannot some way be found of beating the method? It can, but it does not require anybody to find a way of beating these methods. The very best means the beating of the government.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not objecting, but I want to see where the hon. gentleman's contentions lead.

Mr. FOSTER. It happened the other day ; the Minister of Militia was defending some of his estimates and there was a tender down at Rigaud for potatoes and the like of that. Rigaud is not very far from Montreal and yet it turned out that under tender the most extravagant prices were paid. The minister agreed that they were extravagant. You are not obliged to take any man's tender. Under any proper supervision the moment that tender would have come in they would have said to the contractor at Rigaud : No, Sir, we do not pay that much per pound for potatoes at Rigaud; we will send potatoes from Montreal where we can get them at a fair market price. It is always, by proper supervision, possible to mitigate wrongs that may come up under the tender system and in the end you are not obliged to accept any tender, you can throw it aside, call again for other tenders and, through your purchasing department, or in some way, you can see that you were getting these articles at a fair price. Then, there is no proper check upon the quality. In some of the departments I know by my own experience and observation that they have trained men to look after the quality. In some cases, I think, it is well done, but as a rule, it is not. But, there is not a bit of use in amplifying it. We can find that that is going on everywhere and that there is a laxness in the system of inspection. The very fact that when you call for pure jams for a military camp, you find that all kinds of jams come in shows that. I am not saying that these are adulterated jams. My hon. friend (Mr. Marshall) who spoke the other day, said that all cheaper jams were not adulterated and they are not if they are not mixed with bad things, but if you pay the price of pure jam and then find that it is compound, while you are getting a healthy article, you are not getting what you ought to get and you are not doing what you ought to do with the people's money. There is not the keenness and thoroughness about the inspection as to quality that there ought to be. Then, as to the quantities, there is no standard. There is one point that ought to be taken into account. Go through all these different departments. Just as different individuals have their different scales of living, one man wasteful and extravagant in his family and the other man frugal and plain living, so you find it in connection with these different services. One man is very extravagant in his prices and another one looks after exactly the same kind of service, and does it, I am bound to say, quite as well, and his prices are away below those of the other man. Now, the government ought to have some equalizing power or hand somewhere so that when it is fairly established what ought to be a fair provision to be made, we will say, for workingmen, they should make that a uniform standard as far as possible and see that it is carried out through all branches of the service. Why should a sailor who happens to have the good fortune to live on a River St. Lawrence steamer live like a fighting-cock when a sailor who has the misfortune to live down by Prince Edward Island has to be content with plain, good food and

plenty of it? It is not for the benefit of the service of the country. To illustrate that let me read a table that I have prepared from the returns brought down. It is not a full table but it shows exactly what might be found by further research. Here is the cost of provisioning men in the Militia Department:

COST OF PROVISIONS—MILITIA DEPARTMENT.

| — | Days. | Number rationed. | Total Cost. | Cost per man per day. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | $ | Cts. |
| Royal Military College..... | 192 | 90 | 8,640 | 50 |
| Halifax Garrison | 274 | 1,080 | 64,109 | 21½ |
| Quebec Military School..... | 274 | 189 | 11,400 | 21 9/10 |

Why should not soldiers in a garrison be fed as well as the men are on board our steamers? I say they ought to be. I believe they are. They are given good, healthy, plain, satisfying fare and that is all that ought to be given anywhere. If they are ill then I think that medical comforts should be given to them.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the men in the garrison buy a part of their supplies in addition to what is given them?

Mr. FOSTER. Not unless they wish. I do not think there is any law in this country which prevents a man, be he a soldier, a sailor or any one else, from buying anything he wants outside of that which is furnished to him. The country surely attends to the bodily wants of the men wherever they are and attends to them well. Here is the cost per man of provisioning the government steamers and note how it reads:

Cost of provisions—government steamers.

| | Daily cost per man. 1904-5. | 1905-6. | 1906-7. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 'Aberdeen' .. .. .. .. | $0 53 | ..... | $0 72 |
| 'Lady Laurier'.. .. .. | 0 78 | 0 82 | 0 67 |
| 'Lansdowne'.. .. .. .. | 0 62 | 0 68 | 0 49 |
| 'Quadra'.. .. .. .. .. | 0 79 | 0 83 | 0 78 |
| 'Montcalm' .. .. .. .. | 0 57 | 0 66 | 0 70 |
| 'Druid' (contract) .. .. | 0 50 | 0 50 | 0 50 |
| 'Canada'.. .. .. .. .. | 0 55 | 0 58 | 0 81 |
| 'Constance' (customs) .. | 0 56 | 0 58 | 0 47 |
| 'Curlew'.. .. .. .. .. | 0 27 | 0 36 | 0 42 |
| 'Petrel' .. .. .. .. .. | 0 43 | 0 50 | 0 66 |
| 'Kestrel'.. .. .. .. .. | 1 06 | 1 03 | 0 92 |
| 'Vigilant'.. .. .. .. .. | 0 53 | 0 62 | 0 66 |
| 'Frontenac' .. .. .. .. | 0 72 | 0 83 | 0 58 |
| 'Jas. Howden' .. .. .. | 0 50 | 0 70 | 0 53 |
| 'Princess'.. .. .. .. .. | .... | .... | 0 70 |
| 'La Canadienne'.. .. .. | 0 36 | 0 48 | .... |

Mr. FOSTER.

You will notice in the first place from these figures that in some cases the cost is 400 per cent greater than it takes the military establishment to look after its men. I omitted to say that the military camps are composed of good, strong hearty eaters; the men are brought from the rural districts, kept in the open air and have good appetites, and yet the Minister of Militia stated in the House, I think, that the cost of rationing a man was somewhere about 20 cents per day. We also notice that in the case of these steamers there is a great deal of difference as between themselves; here is one running from 55 cents up to 81 cents, almost doubling itself in two years; here is another one which costs on an average over $1 per man per day for the three years under review. The cost on the different vessels seems to run up and down with no conceivable regularity. But speaking generally, any of them are from 40 per cent to 60 per cent greater than the cost in the Militia Department, and some of them are from 300 to 400 per cent greater in cost. That arises from lack of system, lack of supervision and extravagance in purchase. It may arise in some part from extravagance in living, though I think the main difference will be found in extravagance of purchase.

Now, Sir, in conclusion let me say that buying is an expert business in this age, and that it can be made into a perfect system by the proper men taking it in hand and working it out, but that the clerks in the different offices can never reduce it to a perfect system. It implies in the first place knowledge of the current prices of the country from one end to the other, and it implies also a constant watchfulness upon the part of the body in charge of it as to the variation of these prices, and it involves as well constant and unremitting supervision and watchfulness and care.

What to my mind would be the remedy would be the appointment of a purchasing commission whose business and whose sole business would be to do the purchasing. They would be expert men and business men who would be capable in the first place, and having it as their whole business and devoting their whole time and attention to it could introduce that regularity, that uniformity and that ceaseless supervision from one central power which to my mind would bring the matter as near to a science as it possibly could. But if you have that purchasing commission you must have a commission of independent men; it must be absolutely free from solicitations of patronage; it must be absolutely independent in that respect keeping in view simply the quality of the goods, the quantity that is purchased and the price paid as being a fair and reasonable price, thus buying at the very best advantage for the country's good. It would give every citizen in the country the same chance to furnish supplies for the country's use, without fear on the one hand and without

favour on the other. If my personal views were carried out I would ask that the members of this commission should be appointed for life and removable only for cause, much in the same way as the Auditor General is removable, and not by the government itself. In no other way can I see how it is possible to put new business methods into operation under a proper commission unless you guard strenuously and carefully and perfectly with regard to these things. With that machinery in operation, with men keenly alive to their work, always ready to take advantage of the newest and best systems, always ready by their knowledge to take advantage of the best sources from which to buy, always careful that the current prices are known to them, always careful that the quality of the goods is there, that the quantity purchased is delivered, and that when it is delivered it shall properly be issued out again; with that system in proper working order, it would render the very best service to the country, and I would have that commission and all its purchases under audit by the Audit Department; under severe and perfect audit. With some such system as that it appears to me that we could do a great thing for our country. I have said that the taxpayers contribute a large amount of money for the services of the country. From 1867-68 until 1908 the expenditures of this country have run up to the enormous sum of $1,879,000,000; beginning, of course, with a very moderate expenditure and ending in the year 1908 with an expenditure of $110,000,000. What proportion of that large expenditure goes for supplies I cannot tell, nor have I the time nor the means to get at the figures, but I know the amount expended for supplies must be very large indeed. Now, suppose the supplies bought in the present haphazard way cost us $5,000,000 a year, by a system such as I have outlined we could save from 20 per cent to 30 per cent in the cost, so that taking the calculation in this rather loose way, if we save 25 per cent a year on the $5,000,000 purchases there you have a cool $1,000,000 every year which is saved and which ought to be saved because it is the people's money, and which would be there to go into the improvements that the people demand and that our country is starving for. Is it not a process worth putting into operation? Waste begets waste, and there is no administration under the sun which tolerates wasteful methods in its departments which will not feel the reflex of that all through the departments in the lowering of their general tone. It works out from the lowest to the highest, and is a deleterious influence in the department and in the service of the country generally. These things come to be seen and known, and, worse than that, little by little distil into the public mind until every day you will meet men who think the government is fair game, who say if they can get a larger price from the government than they can get from their private business sources, that is so much gain for them, and is perfectly right. The citizens there who pays taxes and the citizen here who dispenses them should have the same high sense of the expenditure of public moneys by trustees for the people's benefit.

Lastly, if we can get some such system as this, it would be one of the most important saving and elevating influences in the public life of the country. See how it works; see how reciprocal it is. Your steward goes off from a government vessel; he wants to spend a hundred dollars or so. He goes up to a party man and says, 'I want so-and-so from you'; he gets it; 'what are the prices?' These seem a little too high. 'But,' the party man says, 'you know I have to help the party, and I cannot be so close about my prices; they are all right; take them along.' And in nine cases out of ten they are taken along; you cannot run through a single page of the Auditor General's Report without seeing it. What else happens? When the time for contributions comes along, the party worker goes to the man who has had the patronage and says: 'I want a contribution from you.' 'Why do you come to me?' 'Oh, you have been getting the government patronage, you make a good thing out of it, and you have to help the party.' As candid men, sitting face to face with each other, is not that the way the thing goes? Don't we all know it is? Is that the best thing for the public life of this country? We all know that it is not. Do away with this bad purchasing system, substitute the proper business method in its place, and you do away with one of the causes that are deteriorating and corrupting public life, and you introduce with the new system a method for elevating and heightening the tone of public life in the country which would be of incalculable value.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not gone extensively into history; and I have not cited examples from other countries. This is a simple, plain business matter, which we in Canada ought to be able to settle in the best way for ourselves. It does not make much difference what the United States or Great Britain or any other country does, although, if I did bring examples, they would show, so far as my reading goes, that Canada is lagging away behind the United States and Great Britain and every other progressive country in the way its supplies are bought. Examine the processes in Great Britain and see with what exceedingly great care these are carried on. The Minister of Customs may say: But breaks take place—so they do—and accidents will happen in the best regulated families. But nobody in Great Britain thinks for a single moment, because these do take place now and again, of sweeping away that fine strong system and reverting to the

old idea of patronage and plunder. Then while we in Canada have been sleeping on our oars in regard to the public service and in regard to our public expenditures, the United States has been going forward by leaps and bounds. The old motto, to the victors belong the spoils, was taken down by President Cleveland, and it has not waved on a flag pole of the United States from that time to this; and under President Roosevelt to-day both the civil service and all these great activities of government in expenditure and purchase are immeasurably higher than they ever were before in any part of the United States. Would I surprise you if I told you that ninety per cent or thereabouts of all the public offices in the United States to-day, are filled on competition and merit. Day by day, month by month, now one and now another proclamation is issued by the president, under the powers that he possesses, bringing another section of the civil service under the civil service requirements. And so the United States has immeasurably distanced us.

Now, it is time for Canada to sit up and think. We are throwing off the short clothes of childhood; we are putting on the raiment of dignity that becomes a nation; we are laying the foundations for tremendous activities, and there will be immense expenditures and immense purchases; and it becomes us as prudent men to lay the foundations clean and straight and solid. A civil service is one of the finest corps that does battle for the standards and for the permanence of a nation. You may laud your soldiers that fight the outside battles as much as you like; but the civil service of the country is doing its work of conquest and of homekeeping. Britain owes more of her territory than we think of to her trained civil service, and the matter I speak of is fundamental in connection with the general civil service of the country. A nation is made permanent and strong, and its finances are kept in order by the work of a trained and competent and faithful civil service; and you cannot have such a service unless these matters of every day occurrence of expenditure and purchase, are pitched on as high a plane as you want to pitch the service of the body itself.

Hon. WM. PATERSON. I would like to ask my hon. friend a question. It is a practical question that he is dealing with, and my previous remark was made not by way of criticism or opposition at all; but when he was just now giving the illustration of the steamboat, it occurred to me—not by way of trying to weaken what he said at all—whether his scheme contemplated the purchase of large quantities and the keeping of general stores; that is to say, would you have a large stores department, in which you would keep large quantities of goods and give them out as wanted, or would you continue to buy, as is done now, when the ship touches a certain port? Has the hon. gentleman thought on that matter?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The way it used to be done in Halifax by the imperial government was to call for tenders for the supply of all goods that might be required for the troops during a fixed period. They would see that there was a principal contractor, who was able to carry out the contract, and he would fix his prices; and they would accept the lowest tender.

Mr. FOSTER. The same thing is done in Great Britain to-day. But my general answer to that is that once you establish the system there will be no difficulty in working out the details satisfactorily. In a country like this, there will be exceptions to every rule. There will be some things we cannot get by contract, but they will be few compared with the mass. There are cases in which stock articles should be bought and kept in store, but there are some others in which waste would result if that was done. The details however could be worked out if the system were once established, and competent men put in charge.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, to be able to say, at the outset, that in a great many of the observations of my hon. friend I fully agree, and it is with some regret that I have to take exceptions to some of his remarks. I do so all the more reluctantly, that I wish to offer my congratulations to the hon. gentleman, if he will accept them—my sincere congratulations—for the manner in which he has presented his views to the House. He has presented them in such a way as to invite a frank and free discussion of this whole matter, and I shall endeavour to follow him in giving my views. At the outset he stated that it ought to be the object of a government to carry on the business of the country in the same manner as a business man carries on his own private business. For my part I would be quite willing to agree with that doctrine, if it were possible to carry it out. But does my hon. friend believe it possible, from his own experience, to carry out such a principle to its logical consequence? Take the very first proposition of my hon. friend, because there are two involved in his motion:

> That all the supplies purchased for the use of the various departments of the government should be procured on the basis of public tender and contract.

To this no objection can be taken. It ought to be the rule which should guide every government, and it has been found the only method by which a government can safely do business. But is this a rule which is observed by business men? When a business man wants to put up a public

building, does he confine himself to this one rule? Everybody knows he does not. Sometimes he will call for tenders and sometimes he will give the contract without doing so. Sometimes he may select a contractor, who may charge him from 10 per cent to 15 per cent more than he could get the work done for by another man, and he does this because he thinks he will get better value from the higher priced contractor. But no government could exercise that discretion. We know that there are contractors who are absolutely unimpeachable, who would give greater satisfaction than others, but if we were to limit our choice to those and not give the public a chance to tender, we would be immediately assailed with the charge of favouritism. A government is bound, under the circumstances, to call for tenders. So that it is impossible for a government to conduct the business of the country exactly as a business man would conduct his own affairs. The safest rule is that which has been laid down by my hon. friend, and that is that in the expenditure of all public moneys, contracts should be given and only given after tenders are invited and then given to the lowest tenderer. But that is a rule which no business man would consider himself bound by in his own private affairs. To that rule, as applicable to a government, there can be no objection. But I must call my hon. friend's attention to a qualification. It is not possible, as he knows, in every instance, to have the expenditure of the government carried out by contract and tender. My hon. friend referred to the Mounted Police, the department with which I am connected. I think I can say that that is a fairly well administered department. I am not taking the credit to myself but give it altogether to the able and diligent deputy who has been in charge of the force ever since its initiation. Under all administrations, that force has given pretty general satisfaction. 75 per cent of the money voted for it by parliament is expended under contract, but the minor expenditures, amounting to 25 per cent—the purchase of a few bushels of potatoes, for instance, the provisioning of the men here and there throughout the provinces—these it is impossible to do by contract. These have to be purchased on the judgment of the minister, and if he is blessed with a good deputy, the matter runs very smoothly, and since I have been connected with the department, I am not aware that it has been subjected to any severe criticism on that score. On the whole therefore it is not possible to lay down the hard and fast rule that every expenditure should be by contract, for there must be a small margin which has to be left to the judgment of the minister. We have a standing rule governing the expenditure of public money on public works, and that is that all contracts involving over $5,000 should only be given after public competition and tender, but any lesser contracts can be given on the judgment of the minister. So with regard to the purchase of supplies, the principle of tender and contract should prevail, as a general rule, leaving a small latitude for minor expenditures, which must be left of necessity to the judgment of the men entrusted with the administration of the department. But I now come to what is really the crucial point of the motion to which he asks the House to commit itself. The resolution goes on to say:

—under the direction of a competent purchasing commission, and with regard primarily to quality and price.

As to these qualifying words 'with regard primarily to quality and price,' I have no observation to offer except that I agree with them. But I would call my hon. friend's attention to the words 'under the direction of a competent purchasing commission.' He has outlined here a plan, which, I think, he himself will revise before he can expect it to be accepted even by his own friends. To many of his preliminary observations, no one can take exception. He outlined the history of the development of government, showing that at first the sovereign was a despot responsible to nobody; he showed the efforts made from time to time to have the money which the sovereign collected from the people expended in a manner upon which the people could have a word to say—they, after all, being the parties chiefly interested. But I have this to observe to my hon. friend—and I think he will agree with me upon reflection—that in these contests which have taken place in all parts of the world between the sovereign and the people, between despotic power and the spirit of liberty, the one method which has been most successful (certainly the one which seems to me must commend itself to his judgment as it does to mine) is the British method, the one by according to which expenditures are to be made by the sovereign but under ministerial responsibility. I do not know that any principle more calculated to do justice to all parties has ever been adopted in any country than that under which we carry on our own government and on which our system of ministerial responsibility is based. At the present time, in England and in this country, this is the principle under which expenditure is carried on. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster), if I correctly understood him, now proposes a complete departure from that system. If I understood him, he proposes that all the expenditure in connection with the purchase of supplies shall be made, not under ministerial responsibility but by commission—he went so far as to say, by a commission appointed for life. In other words, if I understood him aright, henceforth, if his voice prevails, two or three commissioners appointed for life, and therefore not responsible to any person, will manage these expenditures;—they may do

well, or they may do wrong; if they do well, well and good, but, if they do wrong, there would be no remedy except, I suppose, impeachment or something of that kind, a remedy which would be difficult to apply and, which, to my mind, is not to be compared to the remedy we have under our present system. Moreover, if such a commission were appointed, I ask my hon. friend what would be their work?—what would they do in reality? Admitting the proposition laid down by my hon. friend, that supplies should be purchased under contract, after public tender and the lowest tender accepted, except where good cause is shown for not doing so, the work of the commission would be restricted within very narrow limits, and I do not see how such a commission would be an improvement upon our present system. But, apart from that, I revert to the first point, and to which I invite my hon. friend's attention—that the remedy he suggests cannot be compared in efficacy with the remedy we have under our present system.

Mr. FOSTER—Will the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) allow me a moment ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman is basing an argument against the resolution upon an idea. I suggested as to how the purchasing commission should be appointed. I said that if my own sentiments should prevail, I would have such a purchasing commission as I described. But the right hon. gentleman will see that my resolution has two parts to it: first, that supplies should be procured on the basis of public tender and contract—to which the right hon. gentleman agreed—and, second 'under the direction of a competent purchasing commission.' We may have differing ideas as to how the commission should be appointed and what status it should have. I gave my ideas, but these are not read into the resolution, though, I must say, I would try to have them carried into the reality if I could.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I interpreted the resolution in the light of the remarks with which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) supported it. And in those remarks I understood him to say that the commission he wants to have appointed would be appointed for life, and therefore, I understood, quite independent of parliamentary control.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be my idea, personally.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say that I believe—I sincerely believe—that on reflection, my hon. friend will agree with me that this idea is not one which ought to be adopted. It would not be conducive to the good effect we all have in mind. Everybody agrees with my hon. friend that the people's money ought to be economically expended. Taxation is a burden, it takes money from the hard earnings of the people, and therefore it is right and proper that every cent should be so expended as to give the greatest amount of benefit to the people. But it is not in the experience of mankind—and I call my hon. friend's attention particularly to this—that men absolutely irresponsible have proved beneficial to administration. On the contrary, I think that if there is a principle that is more true than another, it is that all men in authority should be subjected to some responsibility. That is, at all events, the principle of our constitution, and I do not think it would be advisable to depart from it. But now, perhaps my hon. friend will agree with me that, on the whole, he has carried his ideas too far. Let us say, then, that we should take a modified form of his idea and should have a commission appointed, not for life, but during good behaviour and responsible to parliament. Does my hon. friend believe that such a commission would discharge this duty more effectively than it is now discharged? If we maintain the principle—and I think it is a principle which every government should be tied to—that all important expenditures should be made under contract and after tender, I do not think that there is any necessity for any departure from the present system. At all events, that is the way the matter strikes me ; and, as I said a moment ago, I offer these remarks in the same spirit in which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) offered his, in order to invite discussion, in order to provoke a frank expression of opinion from all sides upon this very important topic. I repeat what I have said that, as to the first part of the resolution, the government is disposed to accept it and to have it apply to them. But as to the appointment of a commission, I would invite a reconsideration by my hon. friend of this new departure in our political system.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). It seems to me that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) practically agrees with the words of the resolution, but does not agree altogether with the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) who proposed it. There is nothing in the resolution which calls for the appointment of a commission which would hold office otherwise than during pleasure. The right hon. gentleman may say: What is the advantage of a purchasing agent or commission which should hold office only during pleasure? Well, he seems to have forgotten one illustration which his own government have given. He suggests that the proposal of the hon. member from North Toronto is a departure from the principle of responsible government. Does he not recollect that the commission appointed by the present government, the National Transcontinental Railway Commis-

sion, is disbursing ten, twenty or thirty millions of dollars yearly at the present time, under that system which he regards as inconsistent with the principles of constitutional government? It seems to me that is a sufficient answer to the argument which the right hon. gentleman has addressed to the House. He must have forgotten the action of this government in 1903 and 1904, when he took that exception to the remarks of my hon. friend from North Toronto. I think that even if you appointed a purchasing agent, or a purchasing commission, and made the person or persons holding those offices removable at pleasure, you would still have a certain safeguard which is not provided under the present system.

The right hon. gentleman says that the present system is a good one. Well, I do not know that the present system is a good one, and I am bound to say that I think very legitimate criticism may be passed upon the present practice. This is not an opportune time to discuss the report which has been lately laid upon the table of the House. Surely the right hon. gentleman, looking over that report, will come to the conclusion that whatever he may say about the merits of the present system, the merits of the present system have not made themselves very manifest in certain departments of the government. Therefore, it seems to me absolutely important and even necessary that some change in method should be brought about. The right hon. gentleman concedes that the system of public tender and contract is a good one. My hon. friend from North Toronto desires not only that, but he desires something more; he desires that when, for exceptional reasons, in certain cases, that system cannot be carried out, then you should have supplies bought by an agent who will apply a uniform system to the methods which he adopts in every case. The Minister of Customs a little while ago asked for some details of the methods by which the system of tender and contract could be carried out. I pointed out to him that the Imperial government at Halifax, whose methods I have observed pretty carefully, ask for contracts, by which some responsible person or corporation undertakes to supply during the coming year all the beef, all the bread and all other supplies which are required by the troops on that station during the twelve months. They require certain securities to be put up, and they require a certain status and responsibility on the part of the contractors. But when these were obtained, then they had a contract which guaranteed to the Imperial government supplies of those various kinds during the year for the use of their troops. Is there any reason why we in Canada, a country where large supplies of various commodities are required for the public service, should not adopt a system of that kind? I am sure the right hon. gentleman, whatever he may say about the merits of the present system, cannot for a moment suggest to the House that any such method as that has been carried out on a large scale in this country. The difficulty of the present situation is that one department may have a very capable deputy minister, very careful and painstaking, and in that department things may be done in order, perhaps as well as they could be done, but in the adjoining department different conditions may prevail, conditions which may deserve criticism. I do not see any thing in the motion of my hon. friend from North Toronto which should call for any dissent from the government. His motion is this:

> That all the supplies purchased for the use of the various departments of the government should be procured on the basis of public tender and contract, under the direction of a competent purchasing commission, and with regard primarily to quality and price.

Now, the only objection taken to that was the one I mentioned a moment ago, the objection taken by the Prime Minister, to the effect that this does away with the principle of ministerial responsibility. Let me point out to the right hon. gentleman that it would do away less with the principle of ministerial responsibility than that system which he himself has created for building the National Transcontinental Railway, and I will tell him why. On the National Transcontinental Railway you have handed over the whole business, the letting of contracts, the provision of supplies, everything which is necessary for building nearly 1,900 miles of road—you have handed all that over to a commission, which I think holds office during pleasure, so far as I remember. That is the case, is it not? Suppose you appoint a commission, or a purchasing agent, such as my hon. friend has suggested, what would be the result? That purchasing agent or that commission would not have carte blanche to buy all the supplies that they might see fit. It would simply exist for the purpose of providing such supplies for the public service as might be requisitioned from time to time by any department of the government. That is what it would mean, and that is what it would stand for. It would stand there as a safeguard to the public that middlemen would not be employed, that enormous profits would not be paid to these middlemen, that the purchase of supplies would be made from wholesale dealers and from manufacturers, and in that way the public interest would be served. I trust that the right hon. gentleman will, upon reflection, come to the conclusion that there is not one word in this resolution which merits his dissent, and that he will agree to the adoption of the principle which I am sure will work out in the interests of the people of this country.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The main purpose of the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is so com-

mendable, and it has already been so well approved by the observations of the Prime Minister, that I do not wish to say a single word in a contrary sense. At the same time I think some portion of the resolution is open to the objection that has been taken by my right hon. friend, and the reasons advanced in support of the resolution seem to me not to be quite so conclusive as the hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken would imagine. My hon. friend from North Toronto says we should apply business methods to these things. Well, now let us think for a moment. Do we conduct our individual affairs according to these business methods, do we ask for tender and contract for all our personal supplies? I have no means of knowing what is the practice of my neighbours, but I think the average citizen does not resort to tenders and contracts to obtain his supplies. He goes to some reputable business establishments, some persons whom he can trust, and he purchases his goods from them on what he believes to be fair and reasonable terms. And yet he does his business in a business-like way. Of course the purchase may not be very large, but the individual is very anxious as a rule to apply business methods to his own affairs, and my observation is that he does not apply the methods which are proposed for our adoption by our hon. friends. Then passing away from the individual whose affairs may be small, let us take the action of the great corporations of the country. Do they adopt the methods proposed by my hon. friend ? To the best of my knowledge and belief they do not. I am a fairly attentive reader of the newspapers, but I have no recollection of ever seeing an advertisement in the newspapers from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company asking for supplies. I should not be rash enough to state that there is no such advertisement, but my impression is that it is not their practice to purchase supplies by tender and contract. My impression is that they have a list of persons whom they believe to be capable and competent to supply the goods, persons who have an established reputation, and they purchase supplies from these people without public tender and contract. In other words, what they regard as business methods are not the methods which my hon. friends refer to as the only business methods. The leader of the opposition has referred to the practice at Halifax in connection with the imperial service. He has seen the advertisements, I have seen them too, asking for tenders for supplies there. To that extent his argument is correct. But to give it full force he should have been able to show that the British government have a purchasing commission appointed for that purpose, as is proposed in the second part of this resolution. Now, to the best of my knowledge and belief, no such purchasing commission exists, or did exist, when the British government maintained troops at Halifax. A responsible officer, responsible to his superior officer in England, who was in turn responsible to parliament, purchased the supplies. If an excessive price was paid the only remedy was the complaint that could be made to the superior officer and ultimately to the tribunal of parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That may not be technically what one would call a purchasing commission but they have a commissariat department which fulfils the very same purpose.

Mr. FIELDING. So has every department of the government of Canada. As to how well or how poorly it may be worked out is a question for debate. I am free to say that in some respects it has not been as well done as it might have been, and that there is room for reform. But, we were talking of the proposal for the establishment of a purchasing commission. Wherever you have responsible work to be done you must have men of the right kind to do it, and much will depend on the character, ability and integrity of the men who are employed for the purpose. No purchasing agents or commission will serve the purpose unless you can secure men who are capable who are at the same time alive to the performance of their duty, and who are men of the highest integrity. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has said that the position of my right hon. friend the leader of the government is inconsistent because we have appointed a national transcontinental railway commission which has power to spend untold millions. My hon. friend omitted to mention the very important point that that commission cannot spend a dollar till they get the approval of the government which is responsible to this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Neither can this commission.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the motion as proposed by the hon. member for North Toronto gives them full power to deal with the matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not so understand it.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member for North Toronto said that was what he wanted and we are perfectly justified in taking it as the hon. member for North Toronto stated it himself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not so understand it.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will not say otherwise. The hon. gentleman said that what he desired to bring about was the appointment of a commission of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must have misunderstood me. A purchasing commission, in the first place, is not an appropriat-

ing body. It cannot buy a dollar's worth unless it is requisitioned to do it. The primary responsibility is with each department; it appropriates the money, says how much it wants, the kind of goods it wants and the purchasing commission is the machinery through which they are bought.

Mr. FIELDING. But suppose that a department wanted a certain quantity of provisions, if the purchasing agent or purchasing commission had the absolute power, having first taken tenders and awarded the contract to pay whatever price they pleased, there would be no remedy in this parliament. If the price was excessive the minister would say: I am very sorry; in the good old days I was liable to be called to account here, if a mistake was made I had to bear the responsibility, but I am no longer responsible; this work has been handed over to a purchasing commission; they have the power to do the purchasing; they are responsible and the government are not. Therefore, that is the conclusion to which I think the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto would lead. I do not think he dissents from that. He said frankly that that was the result he wanted to bring about. The main object of the resolution, which is the bringing about of some reformation in this matter of purchasing supplies is commendable and I should be sorry in any way to detract from that. Nevertheless, I think that the plan proposed by the hon. member for North Toronto is unworkable and I should hesitate to have the House commit itself to the exact form of his resolution. I would therefore propose to amend his resolution by striking out all the words after the word 'contract' in the third line and by adding others. If you will permit me I will read the resolution as it would then read:

That all the supplies purchased for the use of the various departments of the government should be purchased on the basis of public tender and contract——

So far we will take the words of the hon. gentleman's resolution, and add:

so far as practicable, where especially large quantities of goods are required.

I would like also to take his words there:

with regard primarily to quality and price.

And add:

And that all such purchases should be made under the authority and direction of ministers responsible to parliament.

It seems to me that we cannot and should not wish to get away from this principle of parliamentary responsibility. Wherever you create a body which is absolutely independent of parliament it is a moral certainty that the operation of that body will not be satisfactory to the people. Those who compose it will have their own views and whims and fads, and if it is not to be responsible to parliament I am afraid it will not give satisfaction. We could have a purchasing agent, or whatever you care to call him, in each of the larger departments of the government. There is nothing in the name by which you call him; he might be the deputy minister of one department, or a chief clerk or a special purchasing agent. I think that the scheme of the hon. member for North Toronto to have a purchasing commission for the whole public service is hardly workable. Each department would have to become responsible as it now is for its own administration, and if in any case it desires large quantities of supplies I think they should be taken by tender and contract. I do not think the rule should be rigidly laid down that everything must be done by tender and contract. I have already pointed out that amongst some of our great corporations the tender and contract system is not relied upon as being in every instance the best. I could name a case where one of our great corporations wanted to have a large building constructed in one of the cities of Canada and they did not even take tenders for it. They selected a contractor and asked him his price to put up the building. They gave him the contract, he went to work and did a good job and nobody complained. I think it would be a mistake to be too rigid and to say that in every instance the tender and contract system should be applied. I think that the principle is right and that in most cases it will accomplish the purpose. The words which I suggest by way of amendment to the resolution would recognize that as a general principle tender and contract is desirable, especially where large quantities of goods are required. I would retain the principle of parliamentary responsibility which, it seems to me, is the only way in which we can carry on satisfactorily the affairs of the people. I therefore beg to move in amendment:

That all the words after the word 'contract' in the third line be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

so far as practicable, especially where large quantities of goods are required, with regard primarily to quality and price, and that all purchases should be made under the authority and direction of ministers responsible to parliament.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my approval of the principle laid down by my hon. friend from North Toronto in his resolution that goods should be purchased by public tender. I have tried to follow the proposed amendment of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and as I read it I think it is the reaffirming of the principle that has been applied by this government to the purchasing of goods. I cannot see that the proposed amendment suggests any alteration of the system that has been laid down and is

being carried out by this government at the present time. The system that this government has adopted and which is in operation at the present time permits a minister of the Crown to go to a merchant in the city of Montreal and give him a verbal order for the supply of goods. I dissent entirely from any such practice on the part of any representative of the Crown. I have before me the evidence which was taken with respect to that case and it will be found at page 591 of the report of the evidence taken by the Public Accounts Committee in the session of 1906. This has reference to what took place between Mr. Préfontaine then Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Mr. B. J. Coghlin. Mr. Coghlin, who had an order from Mr. Prefontaine, was being examined:

Q. What was said between you?—A. There was no price nor any terms.

Q. No terms at all?—A. No terms at all.

Q. That is between you and him as to what you were to be paid?—A. None.

Q. That is quite clear? When Mr. Préfontaine left your store you had a blank order?—A. A blank order.

Q. To furnish what you thought and at what price you thought and no arrangement as to your remuneration.

As I understand it, the policy laid down by the Prime Minister this afternoon and endorsed by the Minister of Finance in his proposed amendment is, that this system shall be permitted to go on. For myself, I disagree entirely from the proposition that a minister of the Crown, without any request from his department, without any written order whatever can go to a leading political supporter and give that man a blank order to go to the old country and purchase goods without any prior agreement as to prices. Well, this gentleman went to the old country with the blank order in his pocket and not only did he purchase a class of goods which he ordinarily sold at home but he purchased goods which were not in his line at all and of which it is to be presumed he knew nothing as to the price or the quality. I read from the evidence of Mr. Coghlin:

Q. Have you china in your store?—A. No.

Q. Glassware?—A. No.

Here he stated in his sworn evidence that he did not sell china or glassware, and yet the minister gave him a blank order to go to the old country and purchase a large quantity of these goods at his own price. The evidence shows that Mr. Coghlin went to the old country, purchased $3,000 worth of goods and sent in his bill to the government. Then, as regards one item of this bill objection was taken by the Auditor General and Mr. Coghlin refunded $166.32. This is the letter:

Mr. BLAIN.

Colonel Gourdeau, Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Dear Sir,—Confirming our letter of the 10th instant we herewith inclose you a cheque in favour of the Receiver General for $166.32 refund of commission charged your department for purchases made for you last year which we hope will be satisfactory to you. This is in accordance with the interview the writer had with you lately. Kindly acknowledge receipt and oblige.

Yours truly,
B. J. COGHLIN.

This is one refund in connection with the purchase of these goods under the blank order given by the minister, and here is another:

March 29, 1906.

Colonel Gourdeau, Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Dear Sir,—Herewith we hand you our cheque for $1,171.87 in settlement of disputed account.

And this was in connection with the $3,000 worth of goods purchased for the government. Here we have this gentleman purchasing $3,000 worth of goods in the old country under a blank order given by the minister, and when the Auditor General raised a question the purchaser refunds $166.32 in one cheque and $1,171.87 by another cheque, and this occurred under the policy that the Minister of Finance to-day says should be continued by the government. I dissent from that contention of the Minister of Finance, and I say that the government should adopt the principle of purchasing their goods by public tender. The correspondence here proves that goods are purchased without tender by the Marine and Fisheries Department, that the goods are sent to the stores, that no inventory is taken of them at all and that no record is taken of these goods by the officers of the government when they are sent out of the stores. That is the condition in the Marine Department at the present time under the policy which the Minister of Finance wishes to perpetuate. Even with respect to the new accounting system in the Marine Department what do we find? We find the minister himself giving a blank order to a political friend of his, without tender, to supply the very books that are to be put into the Marine Department under the new policy which is said to be in the interest of the people. There are in this country several establishments that could supply these books. One of the largest manufacturing establishments in Canada, yes, the largest establishment of the kind in Canada is in my own constituency, the Copeland Chatterson people, and they supply what is called loose leaf ledgers. Not only has this firm an extensive establishment in Canada but they have also a large one in England which supplies the home and foreign trade. Why did not the Minister of Marine and Fisheries invite

tenders from these people and from another large institution which is in the city of Ottawa and other places. But, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says in the correspondence with Mr. Falconer : You may buy the books from this friend, Mr. Beauchemin, in Montreal, without tender.

Mr. BRODEUR. By what authority does the hon. gentleman say that Mr. Beauchemin is a political friend of the government ?

Mr. BLAIN. I will answer that by saying that in looking over the correspondence I asked my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier who this gentleman was and he said : He is an active supporter of the government in the city of Montreal. Does the Minister of Marine and Fisheries deny that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I deny that Mr. Beauchemin, who I suppose is largely interested in this business, is.

Mr. BLAIN. Is he a Liberal ?

Mr. BRODEUR. He is a Conservative.

Mr. BERGERON. Which Beauchemin is it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. L. J. O. Beauchemin. I ask my hon. friend from Beauharnois if Mr. Beauchemin is not a Conservative ?

Mr. BERGERON. If he is the Mr. Beauchemin from Sorel he is a Liberal.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is the one in Montreal not a Conservative ?

Mr. BERGERON. The one in Montreal I do not know, but I know the one in Sorel is a strong Liberal.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am speaking of the bookseller in Montreal, L. J. O. Beauchemin, and I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) if L. J. O. Beauchemin is not a Conservative ?

Mr. BERGERON. I cannot tell.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows Mr. Beauchemin.

Mr. BERGERON. I know Mr. Beauchemin, but I cannot tell his politics.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is he not a friend of my hon. friend.

Mr. BERGERON. There are a great many friends of mine who are Liberals.

Mr. BRODEUR. I mean a political friend.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know his politics.

Mr. BLAIN. If the Minister of Marine states that this gentleman to whom he instructed Falconer to go for the books is a Liberal-Conservative I will accept that explanation. For myself I do not know and I asked a gentleman living in Montreal whom I thought did know, and he informed me that he was a supporter of the government. Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) is suggesting that at one time this gentleman was a Liberal-Conservative.

Mr. BRODEUR. No. Mr. Beauchemin, of Montreal, keeps one of the largest and best bookstores in that city and Mr. Beauchemin has always been and is still a Conservative.

Mr. BLAIN. I accept for the moment the statement of the Minister of Marine and I will put it against the statement of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier and they can discuss it when the hon. member Mr. Monk) is present. But that is not the point. The point is this, that when this gentleman, Mr. Falconer and his associates, came in to instruct the government how to correct their system, he pointed out that the condition of this department was so bad that a gentleman who went to the city of Halifax could not make out from the books a correct statement of the assets and liabilities of the office. My hon. friend will not deny this.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to prevent my hon. friend from continuing, but this is a matter of sufficient importance to be preceded with regularly. I object, as I did on a former occasion, to this matter being brought up in such a way that no person on this side of the House can controvert any proposition set up by the hon. member for Peel. The subject is now before the Public Accounts Committee and should not be discussed in this House until such time as that committee reports upon it to this House. I think my hon. friend will see the fairness of that proposition.

Mr. BLAIN. I can only say that I am quoting not from any document now in the hands of the Public Accounts Committee, but from a return to an order of this House, which has been laid on the table and which my hon. friend might have studied for the last three or four weeks if he had desired to inform himself on the question.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If you, Mr. Speaker, rule that my hon. friend is in order in discussing a matter that is a subject of inquiry in the Public Accounts Committee, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, the principle is well understood and no reference can be made to a matter which is before a committee of the House for investigation until the matter has been reported upon by the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not permissible to quote from a return which has been brought down and is in the possession of this House?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is quite so.

Mr. BLAIN. Then having the decision of the Chair, I wish now to quote——

Mr. JOHNSTON. While not dissenting from the rule, I wish once for all to have a clear and distinct ruling whether questions that are inquired into before a committee of the House can be discussed here?

Mr. SPEAKER. The ruling is that if a matter has been referred to the Public Accounts Committee for inquiry no reference can be made to it until the committee has made a report upon it. But, apart from that, if a return has been laid before the House, even while the matter is pending, I can see no reason why such a return should not be made a subject of quotation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, the rule is exactly as you have stated it. A member cannot refer to the proceedings of the committee until they have reported to the House, but he can deal with a matter of information already laid before the House and not referred to the committee.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, I quote from a letter of January 30, 1907, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries from Mr. Kenneth Falconer:

The first forms to be ordered are loose sheets, with some binders therefor, and I understand your instructions are that these goods shall be procured from Beauchemin, of Montreal.

Whether this gentleman is a Liberal-Conservative or a Reformer I will not stop to ask, but when this large order for books was to be given and my hon. friend the minister knew that there were large manufacturing establishments in this country prepared to tender for the supply of this kind of goods, my hon. friend was setting aside the policy of his government in directing that the first order for these goods should be given to a friend in Montreal, which meant that he would probably have the opportunity of supplying all subsequent orders. I am informed that this man does not manufacture these goods at all. I would like to ask the minister whether that is correct or not?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend asked the same question the other day. This matter is being investigated, and why does he not wait until the investigation is over?

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman acknowledges that the system in vogue in his department and in some others is not up to date, and when he commences a large expenditure for books which are manufactured by large manufacturing concerns in Canada, he gives the order to a friend of his in Montreal who does not manufacture them and without any competition whatever. Now, I want to point out how these goods are purchased, and I have a charge to make against two ministers of the Crown, one of whom is present. Mr. Merwin supplied a large quantity of goods to this government without any tender. One item was a Sturtevant engine, which he bought from the manufacturer for $335 and sold to the government without tender for $960, gaining a profit for himself of $625, or 187 per cent. I have a large list under my hand of goods which were purchased from this man who was not in business at all, but was simply a middleman. He got orders for tens of thousands of dollars worth of goods from this government without any public competition at all. When we were attempting before the Public Accounts Committee to find out whether the public were receiving full value for the money they were expending or not and when we desired to call on Mr. Merwin to tell the committee what he had paid the manufacturers for these goods, objection was taken at once by a minister of the Crown.

When the question was put to the committee as to whether the public had the right to know what these goods cost, what was the attitude of the government? The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was present. What did that hon. gentleman, whose special duty it is to see that the public money is expended in the public interest and not in the interest of the grafter or middleman, do? What did the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) do? They both recorded their votes against this man being ordered to state what he had paid the manufacturer. The question being put. The ruling of the chair was sustained, and those who were in favour of the middleman not being obliged to tell what he had paid for the goods were:

Messieurs

Aylesworth,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Costigan,
Fielding,
Gervais,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Jackson (Selkirk),
Knowles,
Lapointe,
Law,
Leblanc,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Pardee,
Piché,
Reid (Restigouche),
Savoie,
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Stewart.

The nays were:

Messieurs

Barker,
Bennett,
Cockshutt,
Daniel,
Foster,
Kemp,
Lennox,
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.,
Northrup,
Roche (Marquette),
Sproule,
Stockton,
Taylor.

Mr. FIELDING. An unlucky number.

Mr. BLAIN. Is my hon. friend very much in love with the vote he gave?

Mr. FIELDING. I took the view—and I think it is the right view—that we have no right to inquire into the prices paid by the purchaser. There were other means of ascertaining the value of these goods, and it was ascertained that the department had paid excessive prices, but we were voting on a principle, and one of the Conservative members, not now here—whose name I need not mention—told me afterwards that, as a principle, he did not think it wise to ask any man to declare his purchase price, that it was not fair.

Mr. BLAIN. All I can say is that I differ entirely with the policy laid down by the hon. gentleman. While I do not think it fair to investigate the private business of members on either side, when an agent supplies goods to a department, and that agent is neither a manufacturer nor a merchant, and when he puts in a bill to the government charging the government $960 for an article that cost him $335, thus making a profit of $625 or 187 per cent, I think it is the duty, especially of the Minister of Finance, to stand up and see that this man shall not be shielded by any technicality from telling the price he paid.

Mr. FIELDING. It did not matter what price he paid for the goods, the evidence showed he charged the government too much, and it was not necessary at all to ascertain what price he paid.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend says the evidence showed he charged too much. But where had we that evidence and when did it come out?

Mr. FIELDING. My recollection is that prices were obtained and brought before the committee from other parties in the same line of trade.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Merwin gave way when we brought the manufacturers from whom he purchased the goods. He had to give evidence then and the facts came out.

Mr. FIELDING. That may be but my point was that a man should not be obliged to tell the price at which he purchased the goods. We can see very strong reasons why he should not be obliged.

Mr. BLAIN. I differ entirely with my hon. friend, and the policy of the opposition, although we were voted down by a majority of 22 against 13, seemed to prevail when the next meeting of the committee was called. Mr. Merwin then went into the box and told us what he paid, and the charge I have brought against the government in respect of this matter and against the Minister of Finance is that after Mr. Merwin having admitted that he had charged too much for the goods, this same gentleman has been supplying goods to the government without tender ever since and goods are bought by the same minister. How then can my hon. friend expect the opposition to vote for an amendment which purports to continue the policy that has brought about this condition? And this policy has brought about such a condition in the department in question that men had to be brought in from the city of New York to look into its accounts and these men were brought in at enormous prices. I propose putting on record what these men have been charging for their services. Mr. Richards from the city of New York charged $75 a day with expenses from New York, and $5 per day for living allowance in addition.

Mr. FOSTER. You might ask the Minister of Inland Revenue if he thinks that is too much.

Mr. BLAIN. It is reported that my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue dismissed Mr. Richards. I have a letter in my hand in which that hon. minister, then acting as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, suggested that this man's services would be no longer required. He did not even give him time to finish his work. If this man's work was so important, why did the acting minister write him this letter? Will that hon. gentleman tell us why? I pause for a reply. My hon. friend knows full well that in writing this letter he condemned the policy of the government on this point. He thought that Mr. Richards was getting too much. Was that the reason, I would ask my hon. friend? Then we had Mr. Gunn at the same price, $75 a day, and Mr. Falconer at $40 per day. We have a long list of these men who were imported from New York to revise the accounting system and to audit the books of the Marine and Fisheries Department at these enormous prices. But why go to New York for these men when in every city of Canada we have a number of accountants who have graduated at our high schools and business colleges and universities and who are specially fitted for this kind of work. Yet my hon. friend, for some unexplained reason, sent to New York for these men.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Would you put that work up to tender and contract?

Mr. BLAIN. I will tell my hon. friend what I would not do. I would not go to the city of New York and hire men at $75 a day to come to Canada and do work when we had better men in our own country to do it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Allow me to say that he could not find men in Canada to do it.

Mr. BLAIN. Another thing I may say to my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean)—and I ask him whether he approves of it—is that the minister gave to the representative of this book-keeping company carte blanche, not stipulating how

much per day he should charge, not saying whether he would be allowed expenses, what his hotel fare should be, or anything of that kind, he practically signed a blank order to this gentleman and his friends from New York to come in and audit the accounts of the department. My hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) shakes his head, but he can hardly mean that I am unfair in what I say, particularly in the face of that fact that, year after year, the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) and his predecessor have stood up in this House and told the people of Canada that this department was well equipped, that the public interest was well taken care of, that the money was well expended, that the book-keeping system was modern in every particular, and that the administration of the minister was pure and not corrupt as we have found it to be.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BLAIN. At six o'oclock I was pointing out to the House that we would expect better things from the Finance Minister, he, a defender in the Public Accounts Committee of the middleman, he, as a representative of the government on that committee saying to Mr. Merwin by this vote: You may charge whatever prices you wish to the government, and when your case comes up for investigation in the Public Accounts Committee I am there as a representative of the government, and will record my vote that you should not be compelled to tell the committee the prices you have been paying for these goods, notwithstanding the fact that you have charged enormous prices for them which enabled you to reap a profit of 187 per cent. I am sure that when the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the government reviews this investigation, he will call his Finance Minister to account; and I am sure that when he realizes that not only the Finance Minister, but the Minister of Justice and several of his leading supporters recorded their votes to say that Mr. Merwin should go on, that he should not be compelled to divulge the facts with reference to the way he bought these goods, and what prices he paid to the manufacturer. I was much interested in a remark of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean). I referred to the fact that this government, when it was proved that the Department of Marine and Fisheries was in such a condition that no man could make anything out of it, not even the accountant himself, and I suggested that this government were responsible to the people of Canada because they had overlooked every bookkeeper in Canada, men who had devoted their lives to the profession, who had been employed by large commercial institutions, men who had received a university education, the government of this country thought it better to ignore them and to go to New York.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. What would you say about your friend Mr. Whitney, the premier of Ontario, doing the same thing?

Mr. BLAIN. I may tell my hon. friend that Mr. Whitney is quite able to take care of himself, and does not require any defence at my hands. I am directing the attention of the House to the fact that we are investigating the public accounts of this government of which the hon. gentleman is a prominent supporter, and the hon. gentleman himself before six o'clock, said that the government had brought in these New York gentlemen for the reason that no man in Canada could be found to do this work. Canada, with its six millions of people, with accountants in every city and town all over the country, with many able gentlemen of that profession in the great centres of Montreal and Toronto—yet my hon. friend stands up, a Canadian himself, and says that all these men must be ignored, that the government does not think them competent to make this investigation.

I differ with the government, because I strongly disapprove of the system now in operation under which the government has bought goods in the way they have been doing during the last few years. Finally the Minister of Marine and Fisheries decided not of his own motion, but on the suggestion of the book-keeper who came up and interviewed him, that perhaps it would be better to look into the affairs of the department. So my hon. friend was taken in by this book-keeper, the door was opened to these gentlemen, but with one restriction. My hon. friend is brought face to face with the condition of affairs in his department. He is trying to make the people believe that we had a business government, that everything was being transacted up to date, that no goods were bought or paid for except on business principles; and when it was proven in the Public Accounts Committee and on the floor of this House from time to time that this department was unworthy of any government, my hon. friend did not say to the accountant: Go on and make a thorough examination of the accounts. Oh no, he said, I will restrict you, and you must not go beyond the years 1905 and 1906. If my hon. friend had been anxious to find out how the public money had been frittered away in that department, he would have said to these gentlemen, I find the condition of my department is bad, the methods that have brought about this wrong-doing have been exposed to the public view in the Public Accounts Committee during the last year or two; and if

my hon. friend had wished to do his whole duty to the public he would have said to these gentlemen, investigate all these accounts for years back and tell the people the enormous sums of money that have been frittered away by this government, particularly in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has a record for some years in this House. May I be permitted to say that he occupied the honourable position of Speaker of this House for some time, during which period he bought goods largely.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am inclined to think this is wandering somewhat from the motion before the House.

Mr. BLAIN. I am pointing out my hon. friend's position as a minister of the Crown and as a member of this House, and the manner in which he has been purchasing goods. I know of no other financial business confided to the Speaker, outside of the functions of that office, except the purchase of supplies for the Speaker's department. I find that when Mr. Ouimet was Speaker of the House, for nine months and twenty-eight days——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think this is not at all pertinent to the question before the House.

Mr. BLAIN. I was only going to make a reference to the goods that had been purchased for the Speaker's department without tender.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. Do you not consider that in order to show that the methods which have been adopted and carried out in the past are not satisfactory, my hon. friend is justified in making this departure for the purpose of advocating the adoption of a new and better system ? I would imagine that it was only dealing with the history of what has been so unsatisfactory and that it is necessary for my hon. friend to give these examples to show the urgent need there is for another system.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the discussion as to the form in which these articles have been purchased by tender or otherwise, and a comparison as it affects them in that way would be in order, but I do not think the comparison between the expenditures of one Speaker or another could be held to be pertinent to the motion.

Mr. BLAIN. Then I will take another opportunity.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you so decided the point of order or is it debatable ?

Mr. SPEAKER. It has been debated, I ruled upon it and that is my ruling.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it is not open then to discuss the point of order ? I should like very much to say a word with regard to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not disposed to close the matter up if the hon. gentleman desires to discuss it.

Mr. FOSTER. The question involved has reference to the purchase of supplies, and the expenditure of the people's money therefor. The resolution proposes to substitute a different system from the one that has already prevailed. We are bound to show, in order to make the motion prevail, that the previous system has been lacking in certain essentials and that this would supply the lack and would serve a better purpose. It seems to me that we are perfectly right in bringing up any example of the expenditure of public money for the purchase of supplies at any time during the history of the government, by any minister, or any official, or any Speaker, so long as the fundamental idea is underlying it that it is public money and that it is expended for supplies. I do not see how you can allow me, for instance, to canvass as I did this afternoon, the difference between the Minister of Militia's purchases of supplies and the Minister of Marine's purchases of supplies if you do not allow me to carry it into any department in so far as any officer or any person who is in charge of public money and is expending it for that purpose is concerned. Therefore, it seems to me that we have a perfect right to contrast the expenditures of the different Speakers. They are purchasing supplies, not with their own money but with the people's money. One man seems to be provident and his supplies are carefully got and are not too extensive, as we think, and at a fair price ; another Speaker is of quite a different class, purchases, as we consider, very extravagantly and he pays, as we think, high prices. Hence, we think we have the right to deduce these as examples to show that instead of having a state of things like that, instead of having this lack of uniformity and this absence of general check it will be better to have a uniform system so that we could get a check. I cannot see how that can possibly be out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may or I may not have allowed the hon. gentleman who has last spoken to have exceeded the lattitude in which he was entitled to the discussion of the matter. Anything which is pertinent to the question whether purchases should be made by tender or otherwise is quite relevant to the motion before the House. A comparison as to whether one Speaker purchased more than another or one minister more than another in a particular department is not, in my judgment, pertinent to the motion and as such I propose to rule it

out of order unless the House otherwise decide.

Mr. BLAIN. I accept, of course, the ruling of the chair. What I want to direct the attention of the House to is the fact that I have before me a list of goods that were purchased by the different Speakers of the House without tender. I take it to be quite in keeping with the decision of the Speaker to-night that I should give a list of the articles purchased by the hon. gentleman when he was Speaker, and which were purchased without tender. The list is as follows :

| | |
|---|---|
| The Cuddy & Brodeur Company.. .. .. | $ 15 00 |
| William Howe.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 89 00 |
| William Howe.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 6 00 |
| Bryson, Graham & Company.. .. .. .. | 5 75 |
| Thos. Liggett.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 349 43 |

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman proposes to show that these were purchased with or without tender and that by reason of the fact that they were purchased with or without tender they were purchased at too high a price that would be quite pertinent.

Mr. BLAIN. That is my point.

Mr. SPEAKER. The reading of a list of names and the prices of these articles does not furnish the House with any indication of the hon. gentleman's intention to show that they were purchased at too high a price ; nor, is it relevant to the question of whether the articles were purchased with or without tenders.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not reading the list for the sake of taking up time. I have either one purpose in view or no purpose. I am on my feet for the express purpose of pointing out that this government have purchased for different departments goods without tender, and I am reading a list of goods that were purchased by the hon. minister when he was Speaker of this House without tender and at what I regard as high prices. Surely, I am clearly within my right in doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman states that it is his intention to show that the articles were purchased at too high a price he may proceed. To make the matter relevant I think that statement should precede the reading of the articles.

Mr. BLAIN (reading)—

| | |
|---|---|
| H. F. Poggy.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $ 17 50 |
| Spence & Company.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 5 00 |
| Mrs. W. C. Ami.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 53 80 |
| John L. Cassidy Company.. .. .. .. | 204 87 |
| The Cuddy & Brodeur Company.. .. | 9 00 |
| Bryson, Graham & Company.. .. .. .. | 55 25 |
| Harris, Campbell and Boyden Company.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 11 25 |
| George R. Blyth & Sons.. .. .. .. .. | 9 00 |
| The C. Ross Company.. .. .. .. .. | 77 10 |
| A. J. Lawrence.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 372 75 |
| A. J. Lawrence.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $ 17 05 |
| Miss Armstrong.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 25 25 |
| Mrs. W. C. Ami.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 66 26 |
| Robert Magee.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 14 75 |
| John Murphy & Company.. .. .. .. | 50 00 |
| A. Rosenthal.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 40 75 |
| A. J. Lawrence.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 15 88 |
| Bryson & Graham.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 28 04 |
| David Goyer.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 6 00 |
| James Wilson & Company.. .. .. .. | 210 50 |
| J. L. Orme & Sons.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 73 00 |
| Graves Brothers.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 39 75 |
| McKinley & Northwood.. .. .. .. .. | 41 00 |
| Bate & Company.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 49 87 |
| H. & H. E. Hamilton.. .. .. .. .. .. | 888 62 |
| The C. Ross Company.. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,462 71 |
| A. J. Lawrence.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 270 25 |
| | $4,580 38 |

I will not continue the list further, and I will only point out that Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, when goods are being purchased, for example, from the C. Ross Company, to the extent of $1,462.71 at what I regard as high prices, by the Speaker's department or any other department, they should be purchased by public tender. My point is that the excessive cost of the Speaker's apartments, while these goods were being purchased at these prices, tells the country something about the system that hon. gentlemen are proposing to continue rather than to adopt the public tender system in accordance with the resolution which is now before the House. I want to give the cost to the country of the American book-keepers who were introduced in the month of February, 1907 : W. B. Richards, 29¼ hours at $75 per day, $346.54 ; Kenneth Falconer, 39 hours at $40 a day, $267.14 ;——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Would you put that up to tender ?

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend asks if I would put that up to tender. I would have sufficient faith in my own country and in my own people that I would employ some honest straightforward Canadians, and there are dozens of them to be found in every part of this country, to do this work rather than to employ Americans.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I rise to a point of order. My point is that this is surely not relevant to the resolution before the House. The question of the rates paid to a firm of accountants——

Mr. BLAIN. I do not propose to allow my hon. friend to interrupt me.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has a perfect right to state his point of order.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. My point of order is that this discussion on the motion before the House relates to the question whether it is advisable or not advisable to have a system of tendering for goods purchased by the government or services secured by the government. I simply asked

the hon. gentleman if he thinks that in this case tenders should have been asked, and if he thinks that his discussion as to the book-keeping system and the accountants is relevant to the resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. As I understand it the Minister of Finance moved an amendment which is practically an endorsement of the present system of the responsibility of the minister, and therefore the resolution and the amendment cover the whole ground as to whether it is best to have tenders, or to follow the system which has obtained for several years past.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I have no great objection to the thing; I only point out that this is a matter which must come up before the House at a later date, and I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) is using testimony which was given before the Public Accounts Committee and which is not yet reported to the House. It does not advance the matter any to anticipate discussion——

Mr. BLAIN. Is this speaking to a point of order, or is it discussion?

Mr. SPEAKER. The point of order taken is that a discussion as to whether these auditors are Canadians or not is not relevant to the question before the House, and I am inclined to think that the point is well taken.

Mr. BLAIN. Would my hon. friend permit me to explain on the point of order; I am pointing out that the system of purchasing goods——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I will have to stand by my ruling until it is disposed of by the House. I yielded a moment ago on that question to the member for North Toronto who apparently thought he had something to say on the matter, but I have ruled on this point now and the hon. member can either adopt the ruling or appeal to the House.

Mr. BLAIN. I at once bow to the decision of the chair. I should have hoped I would have had an opportunity to state my reasons. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has suggested that I am using documents that are before the Public Accounts Committee, but I wish to say that I am using a return to an order of this House and that it is from that document I am quoting. I am pointing out to the House that because of the system that this government has adopted and has in operation at this moment and proposes to continue according to the amendment moved by the Minister of Finance; I am pointing out that that system of purchasing goods since 1896 under this government has brought about such a condition of affairs in the Marine and Fisheries Department that expert accountants at $75 per day were brought in from the United States to straighten it up. What I say is that if the resolution moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is adopted and put in force and if goods are purchased by public tender then there will be no necessity for subjecting the departments of the government to the scrutiny of American accountants at the rate of $75 a day. Now let us see for a moment how this system is working out. In the Auditor General's Report for 1905, page 163 Mr. Strubbe, a middleman, got an order without tender to purchase hardware and files, which he purchased for $2,315.45 and sent them to the government and an invoice for $4,786.45 and made a profit of $2,470 or 107 per cent on this small transaction. That is an example of how the policy of the government is working out; buying goods from middlemen, from political supporters, without asking those who are engaged in the business for tenders to supply these goods. And besides that, as my hon. friend here points out, there were dozens upon dozens of files purchased that could not be used for many years to come. The policy of allowing middlemen to control the affairs of this government is further shown in the Moncton land deal where a middleman bought the land for $5,075 and sold it to the government for $13,880, making a profit of $8,805 or 167 per cent. The Railway Department said in that matter to a political friend: Go down and buy this land, and it cost the people of this country the enormous overcharge I have mentioned, whereas the government should have sent one of its officials down to Moncton to buy that land, and that official is just as well able to do it as Mr. Lodge, and the government could have had it at a fair price and without the enormous profit of the middleman. I say that the middleman should be done away with in these transactions and that the public money should be profitably and wisely expended. Now, to show the condition of the Marine and Fisheries department under this system I wish to read the following letter:

Ottawa, April 3, 1907.

Hon. L. P. Brodeur,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Brodeur,—To properly safeguard the large expenditure of your department I beg to advise you personally that a complete and thorough reorganization of your present methods of purchasing and of keeping record of contracts is absolutely necessary.

Statements submitted to you from time to time showing 'balance available' on account of various votes represent balances on those votes unexpended which you will readily see in view of contracts entered into by your department is very different from 'balances available.'

I had not wished to take this matter up with you until I had in my possession records as to the exact status of all contracts entered into by the department and not completed at the end of the fiscal period. In view, how-

ever, of your departure from Ottawa for some time, I beg to advise that dating from April 1, I propose keeping close and accurate record of transactions between your department and vendors, affecting contracts. On your return I will be in a position to outline plans for the reorganization of this branch of your department, and the carrying on of its work on a business basis.

As an indication of the necessity of taking up this matter I have in front of me a list of some twenty vouchers for coal paid but not initialed by Mr. Stumbles, who, I understand, has special charge of vouchers for goods received on account of contracts. These twenty vouchers amount to something over $13,000. This for coal alone; there are other vouchers amounting in the aggregate to large sums and bearing on their face a notation that the prices are according to contract, have apparently gone through and been paid without any evidence that the prices and terms were compared with those of the contract.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) K. FALCONER.

That is the condition of the department after an examination, although we have been told that all these matters have been carried on by this government in a business way. While this investigation by Mr. Falconer was going on, the minister had business in Europe, and the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) took his place for a short time, and I want to read a letter addressed to Kenneth Falconer, accountant, by F. Gourdeau, deputy minister of Marine and Fisheries, under instructions of the acting minister. It is dated May 15, 1907, and is as follows :

Sir,—I am to inform you that the hon. the Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries has instructed me to acquaint you that the services of yourself and staff reorganizing the system of book-keeping in the department will terminate on Saturday, the 18th instant, and from that day your engagement with the department will cease.

We are informed that the hon. gentleman looked into the accounts and found that they were charging $75 a day for the work, and that right in the midst of the work, after thousands of dollars of public money had been expended in putting the department to right, the acting minister stepped in and informed this gentleman that his services would no longer be required.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is still not relevant to the motion. The hon. member seems to think that it is, but I rule that it is not.

Mr. BLAIN. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to conform to your ruling. Surely I can point out to the House——

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member can point out how a letter written by the Minister of Inland Revenue or by his deputy to the accountant telling him to discontinue his work is relevant to the question whether supplies should be purchased with or without tender, I am not able to appreciate it, and I rule accordingly.

Mr. BLAIN. Would I be permitted to state what I am trying to show?

Mr. SPEAKER. The proper course in discussion is for a member to state what he is proposing to do, and then give his evidence —not to read something utterly irrelevant to the question before the House, assuming that I or the House must understand that there is something behind that which he is seeking to bring out. The Chair can only deal with a matter as it comes up, and if the suggestion is, as it appears to be that this letter which has been read is relevant to the motion, I fail to appreciate the relevancy, and must rule accordingly.

Mr. BLAIN. Have I the privilege of saying what my opinion of it is?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. I am pointing out—and I did not think that I would have had to preface my remarks each time with this statement—that the policy of this government which has been in operation for a number of years, of purchasing goods without public tender, has placed the Department of Marine and Fisheries in such a condition that it was necessary to bring American accountants here at a cost of $75 a day to put it right.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Will my hon. friend pardon me?—just to have the record accurate and truthful.

Mr. BLAIN. I am quite willing, but I am supposing I have some rights myself.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I simply rise to ask the hon. gentleman why he persists in talking about men having been paid $75 a day when he knows perfectly well that the total amount paid to that grade of men who received $75 a day amounted to only $2,000.

Mr. BLAIN. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend. I supposed I would have a right to put in the facts of the case, and place on 'Hansard' a list of the American bookkeepers and the prices paid them but I was not allowed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. That is what I want the hon. member to do, and not deal so much in fiction.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has devoted himself more to fiction than facts in the investigation before the Public Accounts Committee. However, I do not propose to take up the time of the House longer, although I could go on and point out if necessary that a large amount of money has been paid to these gentlemen, some at the rate of $75, some at $40, some at $30 and some at $15 a day.

Now, the Militia Department has been purchasing some goods without tender, and I am going to quote something to prove that statement. A brand new company suggested that they had obtained in the United States the patent of a sub-target gun—a company composed of political supporters of the government, and I was informed that there were in it some supporters of the Conservative party—in days gone by, I suppose. The Militia Department without tender let a contract to this new company, which had no manufacturing establishment in Canada, and had no business whatever except the business of middlemen, for 250 sub-target guns at $250 apiece. What did these gentlemen do with the contract? Did they put up a manuafcturing establishment and invest their money? Oh, no. They took the contract to the city of Sherbrooke in the province of Quebec and sub-let it to a firm there which agreed to supply the guns for $64 apiece. Then they sent these guns to the government and put in their bill for $250 apiece, and were thus able to make a profit of $186 apiece on each gun for themselves. That is what is going on under this government. When I brought this matter up the other evening I was interrupted, as the hon. member for Lunenburg interrupted me tonight, with the statement that Mr. Whitney's government had been purchasing similar guns at the same price. I have before me now the answer to that, and if my hon. friend were in his place I would point out to him that Mr. Whitney's government did not make any contract to supply sub-target guns at $250 apiece. I have a copy of the contract under my hand. It was made by the Ross government and signed by Mr. Harcourt, Minister of Education and that contract tied up the Ontario government for two years from its date, November 9, 1904, and bound the government to buy all the sub-target guns it required at the rate of $250 each.

I shall not continue this discussion longer. I only wish to express my own opinion, and I have no hesitation in saying that I approve of the principle of buying goods after public competition. But when this government want a large supply of goods, such as groceries or hardware, how do they buy it? The other evening the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau), when asked if he were buying these goods after public competition, replied: Oh, yes. When questioned further, he said that what he meant by public competition was sending around notices to a few of the friends of the government and these favoured few would send in their tenders. When asked again what were the necessary qualifications in order to be put on the favoured list, my hon. friend said: you must belong to the faith. He meant, of course, the political faith. That is the kind of public competition that this government calls for. They ask a few of their friends, who are on the political patronage list, to send in a tender, and they accept the lowest when it suits their purpose. But why should not the government, when buying a large quantity of goods such as groceries or hardware, advertise for public tenders in a journal that reaches all the traders in these goods, such as the hardware journal and the grocers' journal. The newspapers in which you will find a government advertisement is the partisan press. Conservative newspapers no matter how large a circulation, no matter how many homes they reach, are rarely given a government advertisement. It would never do for the government, according to their policy, to give patronage to any but their political supporters. And when we on this side endeavour, in the mildest manner possible, to assist the government in bringing about a change in this condition, when my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) presents a resolution to that effect and in the mildest way possible points out the evils which have grown up under the present policy, and when the right hon. gentleman who leads this House is forced to compliment my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on the moderation of his statement, we find the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) jumping to the rescue of the middleman and exciting a political discussion. Only for the amendment proposed by the Finance Minister I would not have had anything to say on the question. No matter how careful my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has been to avoid any political rancour, and notwithstanding the admission by the right hon. gentleman of my hon. friend's moderation, we find the Finance Minister moving an amendment with the object of perpetuating the policy of purchasing goods without competition from political partisans. Why, there is hardly a municipal council in Canada which does not, when it has any public work to give out, advertise for tenders and advertise in papers irrespective of their political views, but when we come to the federal government—this government which is supposed to administer the public affairs on business principles and set the example to smaller bodies—we are told by the Finance Minister that while the policy of purchasing goods after public competition may be all right in a municipal council or a provincial government, it would never do for this government. I want, Sir, to point out that the people of Canada are aroused. The commission appointed by the government to look into this matter has published broadcast to the people that these departments are corrupt and not conducted on business principles, and the people look to the right hon. gentleman to see that these middlemen will be put out of business and a more modern method of purchasing goods be adopted, and that after public competition so far as is practicable.

With that object in view, I beg to move the following amendment to the amendment:

That all the words after the word 'therefor' in the said amendment be left out and the following words inserted instead thereof: Except in cases of unforeseen emergency and necessity, and should be purchased with regard primarily to quality and price; that the present system of purchasing from middlemen and at excessive prices should be immediately discontinued.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). I gave my best attention this afternoon to the very mild exposition given by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) of the abstract principles contained in his second resolution. Without his accustomed partisanship and vehemency, he conveyed the idea, or sought to convey the idea, that during the regime of the present government a new system had been adopted and put in force under which the people of this country were compelled to pay larger sums for the articles supplied them than under the system which prevailed when he held office.

His resolution was one of three, and, to make out the points of that resolution in any logical sequence, it was necessary to establish the first one. I once had a copy of the celebrated picture of the Witch of Endor, painted by Salvator Rosa. In that picture, in the foreground, there was the prophet who had risen from the earth with his white mantle over him; before him were the prostrate forms of Saul and his armour-bearer, and in the background was the witch with some goblins that the painter had invented and introduced for artistic effect. But the back of the cavern was not painted in but was left to the imagination of the spectator. It is a melancholy fact that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I believe there is no record that during his incumbency of office he introduced this reform upon the system that then existed. It is a melancholy fact also that it is only when my hon. friend has ceased to have the power of carrying these reforms into practical effect that he is a reformer. At the beginning of the administration of the Dominion in 1867, Hon. Peter Mitchell was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and his deputy was Mr. Wm. Smith, a gentleman, I believe, who was brought from New Brunswick and who had had considerable experience in that office. On the advent of the Mackenzie government in 1872, Hon. Albert Smith became Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the same Mr. Wm. Smith was deputy minister. I believe that under Hon. Albert Smith's administration of the department, the system of tender and contract was introduced and that it was to a greater or less extent, in evidence during the whole period of the Mackenzie regime. Whether that was of great advantage to the administration and to the people, I do not know, but, very certainly, in 1878, the people put an end to that administration and the system of contracts also. In 1878, when the administration of Sir John Macdonald returned to power, Hon. J. C. Pope became Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Wm. Smith, I believe, being still in office as deputy minister. I did not hear anything about the system of tender and contract during Mr. Pope's administration. It may have existed in some lines and particulars, but I do not think it was a distinguishing part of his administration. The next Minister of Marine and Fisheries was Mr. McLellan, and, following Mr. McLellan in 1885 was my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I do not know that my hon. friend's administration was particularly distinguished by the carrying into effect the doctrine of tender and contract, nor do I think that his administration was so very creditable to himself and his party, for, I believe, one of the things on which his successor, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, prided himself, and one of the subjects on which his friends and supporters congratulated him, was that he had corrected the abuses and remedied the disorders existing in the Marine and Fisheries Department—which may not have arisen under the management of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) but which certainly were perpetuated by him. From 1894, Hon. John Costigan was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Now, this afternoon, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) took up the abstruse principles involved in this motion; and, though I admit I did not hear him perfectly, and perhaps may omit something or make some slight verbal mistake, I think he announced these principles in a sort of sorites. First of all, the money is the people's money, we grant that; second (the negative of the first) it is not the money of a committee—we grant that; third, it is to be expended for the benefit of the people—we grant that; fourth, it is to be expended for the public good—we grant that; fifth, it ought not to be expended to strengthen the government. Why should it not strengthen a government if wisely and properly administered? Have the people no interest in wise expenditure of their own funds? Are they so oblivious to the their own interest that they will give no credit to a government that acts conscientiously, prudently and energetically in the expenditure of their funds? But, last of all was a proposition from which we dissent—that the money should not be spent for the friends of the government. How is this committee, as he calls them, to discriminate? Are the members of that committee better acquainted with their enemies than they are with their friends? Have they a better

knowledge of the Liberal-Cnservative party than of their own and the people who compose it ? When tenders are called and it is a matter of indifference to whom the contracts are to be given, would this be a wise and patriotic government, would it be expending public revenues for the benefit of the people, if it did not consider the half of the people—at least half—and allow them to have some benefit from the expenditures of the government ? Why should not their friends be chosen, other things being equal, instead of those who oppose their policy and who endeavoured to prevent them from coming into power? Sir, my hon. friend said that the money should be expended for the benefit of the people. How is this money to percolate through all strata ? How is it to reach the greatest number in being expended for the various interests of the country ? Remember that, for eighteen years, the present government supporters were kicking their heels outside the halls of patronage and under the cold frowns of hon gentlemen opposite. Ought we not then, on the hon. gentleman's own principle, to make a fair distribution of the revenue of the people and allow the faithful friends of the people, who were out of power and out of the enjoyment of patronage for eighteen long weary years to enjoy it for ten years and ten longer ? Does the hon. gentleman doubt that friends of the present government were left in the cold shades of the eighteen years of their opponents' term of office ? Will he tell me the name of the Liberal newspaper which ever received the faintest smile of recognition from my hon. friend or any of his friends ? Will he give me the name of any wholesale or retail Liberal merchants who ever enjoyed their smile ? Will he tell of anybody that ever received the faintest amount of patronage from this government, or any department of this government, during those eighteen years, except they were choice friends and vigorous supporters of the then government ; people who did the work that he denounces sometimes as dirty work ?

Now my hon friend is a good deal of a sceptic at times. Let me give him a few facts. In 1893, lest the system then in vogue should get into disrepute, lest the patronage of the government should not reach the proper hands, a letter was written by Messrs. Kenny & Stairs, representatives of Halifax in that parliament, and good supporters of my hon. friend, sending the Minister of Marine a list of the individuals—my hon. friend would call them middlemen, in all his innocence he called them middlemen—a list of middlemen who were to receive the patronage of the government. Now I will read the list. First of all are the parties that are denounced in connection with the purchase of lands at the new railway roundhouse, Henderson & Potts. The next firm is Grant, Oxley & Co. Now Grant, Oxley & Co. may not be well known to my hon. friend from North Toronto, but they are well known to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. In fact I believe that Mr. Grant lives in his own house. Mr. Grant is leader of the Liberal-Conservative party in Halifax, and I believe that Mr. Grant was the treasurer of the funds of the Liberal-Conservative party in 1894. Now my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) would call Mr. Grant a middleman. But he is an insurance broker, he was in the insurance business. Now why did my hon. friend and his successors in office call on Grant, Oxley & Co., insurance brokers, to furnish supplies of ironware, hardware and other articles of that kind ? The next firm is C. E. Smith & Co., who were hardware men ; A. J. Grant, another hardware man, and an emissary of the hon. gentleman in the constituency of Halifax, and who was supplied by the party with ammunition both of a literary and of a pecuniary kind. Then there was Mr. M. O. Crowell, a very reputable gentleman, and at the same time a very earnest worker on behalf of my hon. friend. Then there was John Starr & Co., gentlemen who are dyed with the same stain ; J. P. Mott, who disbursed liberally when they were in difficulty ; G. Thompson, a gentleman who makes brooms ; and last and least of all, that much tried, that much reviled and objurgated company, the Imperial Oil Company. There were these and others. This is not a solitary document, there were others in other departments, all good supporters of the Liberal Conservative party from whom the supplies of this government were to be obtained, to the exclusion of all Liberals, who would have liked to furnish supplies.

Mr. NORTHRUP. All purchased by tender.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Not at all. Now I wish to take up some of the observations of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), and also the observations of the leader of the opposition. The leader of the opposition has been in Halifax during its occupancy by the British troops, and he is familiar, so he informs us, with the methods of contracting by the British government in various departments I presume both naval and military. Now some contractors may have large supplies of goods and if it be the benevolent design of my hon. friend from Toronto to allow all classes of producers, all classes of merchants, to participate in government benefits, would not the large holders of goods be able to undersell the small dealers, and would not the supplies of these goods be concentrated in large localities like Montreal, and thus various parties who were benefited by the government expenditure would be concentrated in large cities ?

Now this is a cardinal objection to a centralizing system, that it is contrary to the accepted axiom of political economy that money should be returned to the source from which it was drawn, thus allowing all classes in the community to participate in the disbursements of the government, since everybody is called upon to contribute to the expenses of government. Now I do not know that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is thoroughly conversant with the minutiae of the system adopted by the British government and which he eulogized. The British government in Halifax had under its control from 1,500 to 3,000 men. There was a large staff of officers, naval as well as military. When the authorities made a contract they could make a large one, and for a long time ahead. They compelled the contractors for meat, for instance, to keep a supply of sixty days on hand, and it was to be available from time to time. They purchased large quantities of flour, and they employed bakers to make bread. So there is no analogy whatever between the system adopted by the British government and that which is in vogue in the Department of Marine and other departments. The British government had from 2,000 to 3,000 troops under military discipline, whereas in the Marine Department you have a crew of perhaps ten or twenty men, scattered all along our frontiers, on the lakes, and on the St. Lawrence river, in the various harbours and along the maritime coast. You see there was no analogy between the money per head expended for the support of men in the Marine Department on those little vessels, and a large number of 2,000 or 3,000 military men collected in one place, where the stores were at the disposal of the government, and where were kept, under surveillance of a very large staff of trained officials, five times as many men in proportion, as the number paid under the Marine and Fisheries Department. There was a redundancy of detail in the military establishment which was exasperating, even which sometimes had to be condemned by experts of the British government; the details were excessive and were an encumbrance to the discharge of public business, and increased the expenses of the supplies which were bought for the troops and the navy. The hon. member for Toronto produced statistics showing that some years ago the amount per head on these little vessels was $25, rising to $50. and even as high as $80.

Is there any comparison between the vessels that there were at one time and that there are now? Is there any comparison between the status of the sailors? Sailors will not live now upon what they would accept ten or fifteen years ago. Their wages have been largely increased and in proportion their diet has had to be improved and increased. In many particulars the expenditures upon sailors per capita has very much increased. Sailors now are very much more select. It is difficult now to secure crews. Apparently the navigating interests have gone out of fashion, people have gone into other employments and there is a scarcity of seamen along our maritime coast. They cannot be treated with indifference, they cannot be starved and they cannot be put upon a per capita, artificial and arithmetical basis. They must be treated like men and not like dogs. Men have their rights, they assert them, and if a vessel does not treat her seamen as they ought to be treated they go ashore and leave her. That is not a condition in which the government should have their vessels; they should be ready for any emergency. My hon. friend also adduces a comparison between the cost of feeding soldiers and the cost of feeding sailors. Soldiers are in a very different position from sailors. They are all there together in the barracks. A sailor's work is never done. After a soldier's work is done all he has to do is to curl his hair, put on his uniform, go and see the girls, go to the theatre and then go back to the barracks. But the sailor has to be up day and night in cloud and sunshine, rain and storm, and in all other vicissitudes of the weather and to put him down to the level of the small per capita expenditure on a soldier is to make an unfair comparison. Again, soldiers have their canteen and they can exchange their provisions. they need not take any of them. A sailor must take what is provided for him. There is no shop or canteen to go and buy from. The cost of the sailor has all to be put down while perhaps only a fraction of the cost of the soldier is charged against the account.

I would inquire of the hon. member for North Toronto why should a purchasing board be better than a board composed of the minister, his deputy, his officials and expert advisers? These gentlemen—the purchasing board—it is true, might take tenders. They might see that one article amongst those which are the subject of tender is lower in price than another. Can they send these articles from the centre store all over the country and can they make certain that every article is delivered precisely in accordance with the sample and that the quantity is right? Can any board, sitting in a separate place—I presume they will sit in Ottawa—determine that problem of honesty of distribution, honesty of reception and honesty of expenditure with regard to these stores bought and distributed in every little place where they are consumed? It is true that a system of tender and contract may exist for perhaps certain articles and large supplies of articles, but for small supplies to be delivered at different places it is better to buy them on the spot, because they are fresher and they suit better the needs of the special occasion than would be the case with goods

collected in large depots, liable to fire, liable to damage, liable to deterioration, liable to other vicissitudes. It is better to purchase such articles on the spot at the time and just as much as is required, and to have a good system of surveillance to ensure that every article purchased for the government service suits its purpose and goes to the end for which it is designed. The evils that the hon. member for Peel took the trouble to dilate upon this evening would occur under any system, or under the system proposed by the hon. member for North Toronto, because this board could not be on the spot to see to the carrying out of that which they had prescribed and that which they had contracted for. Here, the claim of the hon. member for North Toronto falls absolutely to the ground.

Again, I say that the appointment of a procuring board of this kind is the worst form of corruption which could exist. It leads to the construction of rings and of a bureaucracy with all its satellites. In the personal supervision of a board of that kind there would grow up a power of the most dangerous character in this country, because if purchases were being made for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for instance, it would be a rival department and it would not be in the minister's control, there would be no person responsible and it leads up to and opens an avenue to the worst form of corruption that could exist in any country. It is an independent board, liable to no authority, appointed for life, but with no responsibility to the people through their committee. The Minister of Marine is held responsible to the government and the government is held responsible to the people. If the people are instructed in their own interest they will be jealous to see that the ministers carry out their trust, but to whom is the board responsible? Who appoints it? The government appoints it. Are they going to appoint Tories? Are they supposed to appoint people friendly to them? Are they supposed to appoint independent men? Would they select a board of lawyers to purchase these supplies? Who are these men? I will put it to my hon. friend and I hope he will give me a candid answer. Does he think that the politicians, the ministers in this country are so fallen below the level of the ordinary occupants of the country that they cannot and ought not to be trusted with the administration of a system if that system be adaptable to the interests of the country? Does he think that the politicians and ministers who are on this side or on that side cannot be trusted by the people? Does he really believe it? I do not believe it of hon. gentlemen opposite, although I think some of them ought not to be put in any position of trust; but, I will not admit that any of them should be regarded, in the discussion of a resolution of this kind, as being of a class so dishonourable, so unjust, so corrupt that they could not be trusted with the ordinary disbursements of government and with the execution and carrying out of the contracts of these different departments. My hon. friend tells us that he has a check on this board? What is the check? If there is any irregularity it can be reported to the Auditor General. The government has no authority over it. The government has no power to dismiss or censure it. The members are appointed for life and without any check upon their actions. The hon. gentleman proposes the appointment of a board with such extensive powers as this and all the check that he has upon them is that the Auditor General can talk to them, but he can exercise no control over them. Lastly, the hon. gentleman quoted the example of the United States government? Well, the United States government send out bids extensively to their own supporters. They send out bids to the producers of various articles and they advertise in the press when certain things are required; but for great contracts they adopt precisely the same system which has been in vogue under this government. How do the British government act? Do they take tenders and award contracts? They do in some instances, but under their systems there are colonels and people in authority in connection with every large firm who see that their influence personally and in other ways is brought to bear upon the government and the purchase board with the result that their articles are supplied to the government. The man who has no patronage and no influence gets no contract. Do my hon. friends forget the 'Brummagen bayonets' that were served to the troops on serivce in the Soudan? That was under the system of tender and contract, and the whole army was imperilled by the fact that when the British troops came to a hand and hand conflict with the Arabs of the desert the Brummagen bayonets turned round on the stock. A gentleman told me he was on the board of ordnance in England that condemned £30,000 worth of Armstrong ordnance and within one week that very ordnance was carted into the yard and paid for by the British government although it was condemned by that board.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). As I listened to the motion made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the answer thereto by the Prime Minister, and the amendment moved by the Minister of Finance, I was very much impressed with the idea that after all it does not make so much difference what you decide in words, for there is a great factor in the equation ever so much larger than any language we may use, and that is the man who is charged with the duty of giving effect to it. It is all very well for us to look at it from one standpoint and to say: It is better that goods should be advertised for and purchased only by public tender; it is all very

well for other gentlemen to say: You will have greater security if the minister who is responsible to parliament is the one to whom the country must look rather than an irresponsible board; it is all very well to say that, but I venture to think there is not a man in this House—including the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine—who is not prepared to admit frankly that after all the man is a far bigger factor than all the rules that can be laid down for the regulation of any department. The hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Roche) thought he had made a triumphant attack on the motion of the hon. member for North Toronto when he asked: What was done in the olden days when the Conservative administration was in power, and when he stated that in those days the government purchased from the middlemen in Halifax. I would ask the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Roche) does he think the Conservative government in the days they were in power did wrong in buying from these middlemen?

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). No.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Then, if that be the hon. gentleman's idea of public morality I would like to know why it was he dragged the matter up before the House? He certainly did not drag it up to commend the Conservative government for it, even though he now frankly admits that he thinks what the Conservatives did was perfectly right. I venture to tell the hon. gentleman that there is no man in this country—outside of the supporters of the right hon. gentleman and the individuals who immediately benefit by the contracts—there is no man in this country who would dare to stand up and say he believes in the system of the middlemen.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Permit me to explain. I said that for 18 years we found no fault with the Conservative government patronizing their friends, and these men who are now called middlemen were the men who supplied the government during these 18 years.

Mr. NORTHRUP. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) said he had no fault to find with that system. I differ from the hon. gentleman. I do not know whether the Conservative government did that or not, but I say that if they did do it, it was nothing to their credit. I can tell the hon. gentleman something more—I am sorry my leader is not in the House at the moment because I am sure he would endorse what I say—I will tell the hon. gentleman that when the Conservative party is returned to power after the next general election we will not only do better than the Liberal government have done, but we will do better than our predecessors did before 1896 if their practice was as the member for Halifax states. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) commends the practice of buying from the middlemen; I am not surprised that a man who has not a word of condemnation against the nefarious practice of buying from the middlemen would present to the House such an argument as he has presented in favour of the present system. He said: Why find fault with the present system; is it not known that the British troops in the Soudan were supplied with bayonets that were utterly unfit, and that under the English system. I can hardly imagine that an hon. gentleman who supports the Minister of Militia would dare stand up in this House and advance such an argument as proving the advantage of the Canadian system over the British system, when under the Canadian system we found our troops in South Africa supplied with decayed hay and rotten dog biscuits under the name of emergency rations. If we are to judge of a system merely by solitary fruits, then if the hon. gentleman is entitled to condemn the British system on account of one instance of rascality, surely we would be equally entitled to condemn the present administration on account of the equally great or even greater instances of rascality under its regime. My own opinion is, and I give it with all deference to the House, that it is a matter of comparatively small importance whether a minister is honest, or a deputy minister is honest, or a middleman robs the country, for while such a thing should be punished most rigorously, yet, in my humble judgment, it is a thousand times more serious that when we have had proof after proof advanced to this House and proof after proof given in the Public Accounts Committee of infamous wrong-doings by gentlemen opposite and their subordinates, to this day not one man has been punished for these wrong-doings. It will not do to make a scapegoat of the Minister of Marine, or of the Minister of Militia and Defence, for while I might defend them in one sense, I am not prepared to defend the outrageous state of their departments. I do not believe there is a single man opposite to-night—if we could take a fair vote apart from party prejudices, apart from what the consequences of a vote against the government would be—I do not believe there is one man on the opposite benches to-night, knowing that he must face his constituents in a short time who would be prepared to vote in favour of any motion stating that the Minister of Marine or the Minister of Militia and Defence had properly and honestly and intelligently managed their departments. When the Minister of Marine was confronted with the fact that this middleman Merwin had been the recipient of thousands and thousands of dollars from his department, he could only say: That was before my time; that was in the days of the

late Hon. Mr. Préfontaine. But the gentleman's record was known to the right hon. gentleman, and if it was not known to him he was told of it by his own leading newspaper in the city of Montreal and yet Mr. Préfontaine was placed in power by the Prime Minister, and he lived his time in office, and after he is dead the first to throw stones at him and deride his memory are the hon. gentlemen of his own party. The Minister of Marine said: I am not guilty, because I was simply the legatee of my predecessor, but yet in the current accounts, pages 95 and 98, we find that Brooks received $56,679 and Merwin received $50,641, and yet the present Minister of Marine went into office on the 5th of February, 1906. How dare he say that he is responsible only in the constitutional sense because these contracts were made by his predecessor, when despite the fact that the whole dealings of the department with Merwin were shown in the Public Accounts Committee we find Merwin just as firmly ensconced in the pages of the Auditor General's Report in connection with the Marine Department as J. W. Woods is in the Militia and Defence Department under the regime of the Minister of Militia.

The great objection I have to the suggestion of the Premier and the Minister of Finance is that while I admit that it is a matter of very little importance whether these goods are bought by tender by the minister and his deputy—and that to my mind would be the preferable way—or by a commission, the important thing is that we should have honest men buying the goods and an honest supervision over this buying. But when the opposition attempted to bring before the Public Accounts Committee the most indubitable proofs of wrongdoing on the part of ministers and their deputies, we found the Minister of Finance, who should be the guardian of the public purse, not only not assisting us in bringing out the facts, but backing up Merwin in his refusal to tell the committee where he purchased the goods. The Minister of Finance said there were other ways of getting the information ; but he did not suggest what any of these other ways were, but left us to find them out for ourselves with a great deal of difficulty and expense. When we were doing our best, in face of the opposition of the majority of the committee, to discover how much wrong had been done with the view of putting an end to it for the future, and the Minister of Finance not only refused to assist us or to punish those who had been guilty of wrong-doing, but put obstacles in the way of our getting proof of it, I think we are justified in objecting to have the full control of all expenditure left in the hands of a ministry whose Finance Minister exercises so little supervision over it. I need not deal with case after case that has come before the House. The expenditure in connection with the 'Arctic' expedition has been referred to again and again. I am not going into details, but I would like to ask who has ever been punished in connection with that infamous carnival of public expenditure ? Why was it, when the minister, the Deputy Minister and Captain Bernier were all out, north, east and west, purchasing goods, the only man who exercised any supervision was a man who had been dismissed from a banking institution because he had made a large loan which resulted in heavy loss to the bank and a rake-off to the manager who had made the loan ? Not a word in condemnation of any official connected with that famous transaction have we ever heard from that day to this. We have also discussed the furnishing of the 'Montcalm' and the 'Champlain.' We paid as high as $1.04 apiece for cups and saucers for the icebreaker crossing the St. Lawrence ; $118 for six dish covers, ice pitchers for from $20 to $30 a dozen, five o'clock tea sets, silverware, champagne, port and other wine glasses ; and no man in the country believes that these were for the sailors. Yet nobody has been punished for these expenditures. If somebody had been punished a few years ago for these things, does any one suppose that this year we would have had the exposé of the 'Speedy,' a little tug used to tow scows carrying mud taken out of the mouth of a river, which had an electric light appliance put in at a cost of $3,000 ? Then, because the fittings in the cabin were not sufficiently superb, $397 were spent to fit it up ; in order that the cook should not catch cold $197 was paid for an interlocked Maltese cross framework covering for the floor of the kitchen ; and in order that the sailors should not be jealous of the cook, a rug costing $32.50 was put down on the floor of the cabin, a mahogany table costing $100 was put on the rug, and eleven chairs at $10 apiece were ranged around the cabin. It was one piece of economy that they only purchased eleven chairs instead of twelve ; but we found that the other chair was a lounge chair over in the corner, for which they paid $16. So I say that if the wrongdoing had been put an end to a few years ago, we probably would not have had this year the scandal of the tug 'Speedy.' I only mention these cases to illustrate the necessity that exists for applying the proper remedy. It seems to me that the right hon. leader of the House is really obliged to accept the amendment to the amendment or else to vote directly in favour of the middlemen. The original motion stands thus :

That all the supplies purchased for the use of the various departments of the government should be procured on the basis of public tender and contract——

The right hon. gentleman approves of that in so far as it is practicable, but he is not prepared to accept the full proposition of

the motion, because he says that it is not practicable in all cases, though in his own department it is the practice in 75 per cent of the cases. Then the Minister of Finance moves in amendment that all the words after contract be struck out and the following substituted :—

So far as practicable, especially where large quantities of goods are required, with regard primarily to quality and price, and that all purchases should be made under the authority and direction of ministers responsible to parliament.

Then the hon. member for Peel moves his amendment to the amendment, that after the original words, which are not objected to, the motion read :

Except in cases of unforeseen emergency and necessity——

That is, to meet the views of the Premier——

—and should be purchased with regard primarily to quality and price——

And then comes the sting :

—that the present system of purchasing from middlemen and at excessive prices should be immediately discontinued.

So that we have the government committed unreservedly to the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain)—committed unreservedly to every word of that amendment with the exception of the last two lines. If the government supporters vote against this amendment, as they have adopted the rest of it, they put on record their opinion that it is proper that the present system of purchasing through middlemen at excessive prices should not be discontinued. All those who have any knowledge of what has taken place in the Public Accounts Committee can recall the names of Merwin and Wallberg down on the Intercolonial Railway, Strubb at Montreal and Coughlin and a dozen others, who had not a dollar of goods to sell of their own, but who nevertheless raked in hundreds of thousands of dollars a year out of government contracts, and when we have been able to raise the curtain a little, as we have been at times, we found that profits of from 50 per cent to 100 per cent were made by these middlemen on the sale of goods to the government, although they had nothing to sell themselves and purchased from the manufacturers from whom the government might just as well have purchased directly. We find in the case of Merwin that he not only had nothing to sell but did not himself pay anything for the goods delivered. He simply received an order from the department, sent it on to the manufacturer, the manufacturer delivered the goods at Prescott, the payments were made by the government to Merwin, and out of these payments Merwin paid the manufacturer his pittance and kept the balance.

Mr. J. D. REID. No, he divided it up.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Well, it is hardly fair to make a charge of that kind because the government refused to allow the committee to investigate and find out what Merwin really did with the balance over and above what he paid the manufacturer. But we have it admitted that goods which Strubbe bought at $2,200, he sold within twenty-four hours to the government for some $4,700. He took his cheque from the western block, walked over to the Ontario Bank, purchased a draft of $2,500 and put $2,200 to his credit in that bank. And we only found that out because the teller had put on the back of the cheque the denominations of the bills. And in this case the witness had so poor a memory that he could not say whether a dollar of this money went to his credit in the bank and had not the faintest recollection what he did with the $2,200 which he made that day. And the Minister of Finance had not a word to say, and we know that this man has been selling goods to the department ever since. Surely if there was ever a case for investigation, it was this. Yet neither the Finance Minister nor the right hon. the First Minister thought it his duty to investigate, and this man, having shown his fitness to be considered and favoured by a patriotic government, has been selling larger quantities of goods to the government ever since.

With these object lessons before us, we are justified in supporting the amendment, but at the same time we think it will go a very short distance towards securing an honest, economical and just administration of public affairs unless the men who are to carry into effect the wishes of the House supervise more scrupulously than they have been doing the transactions of their departments.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). When the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) delivered his speech, I hoped that we might have a fair and unpartisan discussion of a very important question of public administration. The right hon. the leader of the House followed in his footsteps and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, although he allowed the cloven foot of partisanship to show itself occasionally, still fairly followed the example set him by his colleague and desk mate. My hon. colleague the Finance Minister took the same course, but unfortunately the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) showed clearly that he wanted to make this purely a party question and moved an amendment to the amendment which can be taken in no other sense. My hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) who followed made

some references to old matters which have been threshed out in this House time and again and which do not properly come within the scope of this discussion. But his object was quite evident. It was simply to discredit the government without regard to any principle. Well, if these tactics do no more damage to the government than did the so-called exposures we have had exploited by hon. gentlemen opposite the past two or three years, I do not think the government have much to fear. I propose therefore to leave these matters entirely aside and discuss the subject before us in an impartial, non-partisan manner. As far as the original motion is concerned, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance accepted the principle that government supplies should be procured on the basis of public tender and contract. That is in fact the present law, so that the proposal of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is simply a reiteration of the present law which is being carried out by this government. But the latter portion of the motion of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was struck out by the amendment of the Minister of Finance. Why? Because we do not believe in a purchasing commission which shall have no minister to represent it through whom it shall be amenable to parliament. The hon. gentleman proposed the creation of a purchasing commission, which, as I gathered from his remarks, would be akin to the Auditor General and be directly responsible to parliament and not to the government or the minister. I believe myself that such a commission would not work effectively. I believe that the purchasing of supplies should be made on the responsibility of a minister answerable to parliament, who would have to explain these expenditures to the House.

Now, the difference between the original motion and the amendment of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is that, while the original motion proposes an independent commission, the amendment of the Minister of Finance declares that supplies should be purchased on the authority and under the administration of a responsible minister. The amendment says, 'bought as far as practicable, where large quantities of goods are required, with regard primarily to quality and price'—the same words as are used in the original motion—'and that all purchases should be made under the authority and direction of ministers responsible to parliament.' I wish to emphasize and make clear this difference, and I may tell my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) that I am quite ready, and I am sure all the ministers are ready, to join issue with him before the electors, to meet face to face this supposedly outraged public opinion; and I am satisfied that public opinion will smile upon us and not feel outraged except by the very extravagant language of hon. gentlemen opposite, their supporters and their press.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) spoke about the civil service and mentioned some slight indications in that service of a bureaucratic tendency. I quite agree that these tendencies are but slight. I believe that the civil service in Canada, under responsible ministers, has been checked from having too great bureaucratic tendencies. I appreciate that the civil service, without responsible ministers at the head of it, might easily become bureaucratic and a direct menace to the interests of the people. But my hon. friend from North Toronto proposes to create a special commission for the purchase of supplies independent of any minister, thus containing in itself all the worst elements of bureaucracy and having a strong tendency in that direction. I do not think that would be reasonable or in the public interest. At present we have, under the various responsible ministers, purchasing agents who are working in their several departments under the direct and close supervision of the deputy ministers and ministers and, in most instances, purchasing by tender and contract—I will allude to that in a little while—purchasing according to the same principles that the hon. member from North Toronto proposes this bureaucratic commission shall observe. But, in one case we have an irresponsible body of two, three, four or five men and in the other case, under our present system, we have ten or a dozen such men under constant and responsible supervision. I venture to think it much less likely that these ten or a dozen men will individually or unitedly do what is inimical to the interests of the country than a small commission not under close supervision, and not controlled by any one responsible to parliament. I believe that commission would be open to the worst tendencies of bureaucracy, and open also to the worst tendencies of malfeasance in office, for they would not have the same investigation into their work and would not be able to resist temptation as well as the men scattered all through the service now.

Now, a word or two with regard to the system of tender and contract: I have already shown that the amendment does not shut that out. I venture to say, though without having gone into the subject in figures, that fully three-quarters, if not nine-tenths in value of all the supplies bought for the government to-day, are bought by tender and contract. I know from hearsay that the supplies of the Department of Militia for the camps are all bought under tender and contract, the supplies for the Mounted Police, the coal and the great mass of other supplies for the Intercolonial are bought under this system. There are, no doubt a considerable number of small items, in the aggregate a small proportion of the value of the supplies bought by government, that are not bought by tender and contract for the simple reason that the circumstances

and conditions practically prevent this from being done. And a purchasing commission, such as is proposed, if brought into existence, could not buy by tender and contract the supplies of this kind bought for all parts of the country. Such a commission would buy as large a proportion of supplies outside of this system of tender and contract as the government does through its present officers.

Mr. BLAIN. If tender and contract be the principle of the Marine and Fisheries Department, why were not the goods purchased from Merwin purchased in that way?

Mr. FISHER. I am not going to deal with these instances——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FISHER. I am trying to deal with this question without partisan bias. I have not gone into the details of the public accounts investigation, and do not intend to discuss them here. When the reports of the public accounts investigation come before this House will be prepared to discuss them.

Mr. BLAIN. May I remind the minister that this was in 1905?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and it was discussed here and disposed of by this House. If I remember well it was disposed of by a vote of the House, and I am prepared to leave it there.

Mr. HENDERSON. Where it was voted down.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, by the people who understood the question and who heard the discussion? And, as the Minister of Finance has remarked to me, it was voted down since by the people.

Mr. BOYCE. Where, in Stanstead?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, in Stanstead, in Centre York, in South Huron and some forty other constituencies.

Mr. BOYCE. And in Colchester?

Mr. FISHER. No, other things were discussed in Colchester. I know why hon. gentlemen opposite refer to Colchester; it is because it is the one little thing in which they can find comfort.

Mr. BOYCE. How about New Brunswick?

Mr. FISHER. New Brunswick did not deal with these matters. But when New Brunswick did discuss the question of electing a gentleman to the federal government, St. John elected him by acclamation. When they were dealing with provincial matters, it went the other way, I grant you.

Mr. BLAIN. What about London?

Mr. FISHER. The Conservatives worked against the labour man and defeated him.



Now, I am rather surprised that the hon. member for North Toronto should have waited until this late day to take up this question. He knows, as we all do, that there was a report on the civil service in 1892, four years before he and his colleagues went out of power. In that report there are several references to matters of this kind, and I wonder that the member for North Toronto did not propose then what he proposes now, if he thought it was a wise thing to do. Now, in regard to purchasing, I find the report says this:

A still further subject your commissioners deem worthy of note, before treating of the expenditures themselves, is that relating to the purchase of supplies, and the prices paid for articles purchased by the several departments. In his evidence before the commissioner the Auditor General stated most distinctly that when goods were purchased without tender——

They seem then to have purchased goods without tender.

—such as furniture and other supplies for the public buildings, as a rule, retail prices were paid for the same when wholesale prices should have prevailed. It happens too that in places where two or three departments are expending money, as for instance in Kingston, where the Militia Department is answerable for the expenditure for the maintenance of the Royal Military College and barracks of the permanent force, the Department of Justice for the expenditure on account of the penitentiaries, and the Public Works Department for the care, maintenance and repair of customs houses and other public buildings, different prices are paid for sundry supplies procured for each department. In the matter of coal alone the prices varied to a great extent.

I find something here also with regard to purchasing departments:

This is fully treated of in the separate report on revenue and expenditure, but generally it may be stated that there has been a tendency in some cases to purchase in such a manner that the government pays retail prices for wholesale quantities.

Now, I do not want to dwell on that, I am not objecting to what the former government did; but I wish to observe that the hon. member for North Toronto had the same kind of thing in existence when the was minister, and that for four years after that report was made and his attention had been drawn to these things, he did not appoint a purchasing commission; in other words, he and his colleagues believed what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has proposed by his amendment. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues thought that was the correct method of administration, they accepted ministerial responsibility, and had purchasing agents for the different departments. I think they were right. The hon. member for North Toronto has changed his mind, he comes here now and proposes some-

thing different. It is very well for him when he has no responsibility, when he is not called upon to administer the purchasing of supplies, to say that we ought to do differently. But when he and his colleagues were called upon to carry on this same work they did it just as we are doing it, and just as we propose to do it, accepting full ministerial responsibility for the approval by the people. I think they are right, and I think we are right now. We are following their example. It might be said perhaps by some hardened partisans that it is always dangerous for us to follow the example of our predecessors. I am not prepared to say that. Where they did right we have followed them, and where they did wrong we have changed their policy, and I think all changes we have made have been beneficial to the country, and have been approved by the people. I think these are sufficient reasons why we should vote down the amendment and support the amendment of the Minister of Finance. Why should we vote it down? In the first place, because it says what I do not believe to be true, it says:

That the present system of purchasing from middlemen and at excessive prices should be immediately discontinued.

I maintain that we do not, in a general way, purchase from middlemen; and that we do not pay excessive prices as a general rule. Whatever prices we pay we pay by contract and tender, just as our predecessors did, just as the law requires that we should do, and as it required them to do. Now, my hon. friend talked about middlemen. Would purchasing by contract and tender eliminate the middleman? I do not think it would. Moreover, I see no reason why the middleman should not tender just as well as the original manufacturer. As a matter of fact we know that middlemen, jobbers and wholesalers do tender in a great many cases. Commercial arrangements are such that frequently middlemen and jobbers are able to tender at lower prices than the original producers, and when the tenders of middlemen are lower, it is our duty to accept them instead of tenders of the original producer. The fact that we buy by contract and tender eliminates the question of the middleman, because the contract goes to the lowest tender whether he is an original producer or a middleman. I think, therefore, we have no reason to vote for the amendment to the amendment, but we have every reason to vote for the amendment proposd by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Fisher) I expected would resort to the usual device of moving the adjournment of the debate. He admits that the motion of my hon. friends from North Toronto contains a great deal that he can agree with, that it was supported in a moderate way; but he says that the amendment to the amendment makes this a party question. What did he say that the amendment of my hon. friend from Peel was? That purchasing by midddlemen was improper. That was all, and that makes it a party question. Then by that admission he accepts full responsibility for the principle of purchasing by middlemen. On this side of the House we say that in view of what has been brought to light, in view of the abuses that have crept in through purchasing by middlemen, that system is wrong, vicious and improper, and should not be continued. The government, through their mouthpiece, the Minister of Agriculture, says that this is the dividing line between the two parties. The Minister of Agriculture says: Why didn't the hon. member for North Toronto, when he was in power for 18 years, adopt this system? I say that had he found creeping into it abuses, and extravagance, and dishonesty, and corruption, and improper expenditure of public money, he certainly would have made some change. But it is because he did not find it to the extent that it is now apparent to our friends that there was no urgent necessity for departing from the system which he had been administering in a different way from that in which the present government are administering it.

Mr. FISHER. The Civil Service Commission of 1892 drew his attention in this very fact.

Mr. SPROULE. That it was what?

Mr. FISHER. Just what you said.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all. I have not seen any such statement in the report of that commission. The hon. gentleman says we must vote this amendment down. It says the purchasing from middlemen is improper and it results in compelling us to pay exorbitant prices and he says we must vote it down because it does not bring about that result. We have shown in case after case, that it does bring about that result and it is because of that fact that we think it is necessary to adopt some other system. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture said that they accepted what is the present law, the principle of purchasing supplies by tender and contract, enunciated in the motion moved by my hon. friend from North Toronto and that they intend to support that. We intend to stand by that. If it is the present law and if the present law is correct in principle how is it in carrying out that law these abuses have crept in? How is it that we have demonstrated over and over again that hundreds of thousands of dollars of the public money have been spent for nothing. have been given away to political favourites and for which we have got nothing in return? How is it that the money which we have

voted year after year has not been properly spent if it is spent under the present law and if the present method is a proper one ? For three years we have been bringing to the attention of the House and the country through the Public Accounts Committee and in this House by returns examples where, in carrying out the present law and the principle which the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Finance declare to be the proper principle, abuses and dishonesty which have crept in and it has been shown that in the public expenditure the country has been robbed of hundreds of thousands of dollars and has got no return ? How is it, in carrying out the present law these practices have brought about the results that have been referred to ? In view of that fact is it not time that we suggested some board or some other device which would result in bringing about honesty instead of dishonesty, bringing about economy in the interest of the country instead of the system that at present exists. The Minister of Agriculture said that a certain percentage of all the supplies that were purchased were purchased under the principle of tender and contract. Would he be good enough to inform me what he said was the percentage of transactions that were carried out under the principle of tender and contract ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Ninety per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) says 90 per cent. Am I correct in accepting that ?

Mr. FISHER. I said certainly three quarters; probably it might be 90 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be that from 75 to 90 per cent of the transactions of the government are carried out under the principle of tender and contract. I would like to ask him whether the purchases from Merwin and Brooks were made under tender and contract? Were they ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know.

Mr. SPROULE. And yet we purchased, inside of two years, from these two firms, or one firm—because I believe that they are one and the same firm,—no less than $404,308 worth, not a dollar of which, as far as I can see, but was purchased without tender or contract,—half a million dollars in one department, the Department of Marine and Fisheries in two years without tender or public competition and purchased from one firm and yet the Minister of Agriculture says that from 75 to 90 per cent of the supplies purchased are purchased under the principle of tender and contract. I would ask him whether the purchases that were made from the International Marine Signal Supply Company, to be found at page 97—P of the Auditor General's Report, and amounting to $237,-162, and whether the purchases from the Canadian Fog Signal Company, amounting to $54,720, and which were purchased inside of a little over a year, were purchased by tender and contract.

Mr. TAYLOR. And Merwin is in that company.

Mr. SPROULE. And Merwin is in the same company. Were these purchases made by tender and contract ? Not a dollar of them. Here we have nearly a million dollars purchased in one department and not a dollar's worth purchased by tender and contract. In view of that showing how can the Minister of Agriculture stand up and say to this House that from 75 to 90 per cent of the public money that has been spent for the purchase of supplies has been spent in accordance with the principle of tender and contract ?

Now, I will come down to the supplies of the Intercolonial Railway and I ask if they are purchased by tender and contract. After looking at the public accounts, I think I am within the mark when I say that not over 50 per cent have been purchased by contract. I doubt if there were 30 per cent purchased by tender and contract and yet the purchases are made to the tune of hundreds of thousands of dollars from the friends of the government, purchases without tender or contract, and at prices which are in many cases exorbitant. How much of the supplies for the speaker's chamber are purchased by tender and contract ? We were shown only a few hours ago that $4,000 worth were purchased in a short time and that not a tender was asked for a single dollar's worth of these goods. A thousand dollar's worth in one lump sum was purchased from one firm—no tender, no competition. They were purchased at the invoice price and from political friends of the government. How much of the supplies for the House of Commons and for the Senate have been purchased by tender and contract—only a very small proportion, I am told. How much of the supplies for the government steamers were purchased by tender and contract ? I do not know but I do know from inquiries we have made that only a very small percentage have been purchased by tender and contract. Take for instance the purchase of supplies for the ice breaker 'Montcalm;' were the prices paid for these goods fair and reasonable and purchased by tender and contract ? Not by any means, because the figures that were paid were extravagant and I think I would be within the mark if I said dishonest, and that the figures that were paid were three times the value of the goods. There was no semblance of receiving value for them. Take the supplies for Government House, situated in a sub-

urb of Ottawa: how much of the supplies for Government House was purchased by tender and contract? Were there any at all? In so far as I know not a dollar's worth has been purchased by tender and contract. Then I come to the purchase of supplies for the Printing Bureau. How much has been purchased by tender and contract? I believe a very small proportion of them. It is a fair presumption that not more than 50 per cent have been purchased by tender and contract. I could go over all these disclosures which month after month we have brought out in the Public Accounts Committee showing that supplies have been purchased at extravagant and exorbitant prices without competition, and in the face of all this will the Minister of Agriculture still adhere to his statement that about 90 per cent of all supplies are purchased on the principle of tender and contract. The Minister of Agriculture is dealing largely in fiction when he makes that statement. The present system of purchasing supplies has been demonstrated over and over again to be vicious and rotten. The evidence in the Public Accounts Committee taken under oath demonstrates there is not the slightest doubt in the world about that. The system has resulted in hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money being expended without any return having been received. Is it not time we should devise some better means. And, we have not been able to bring out all the evidence we desired in that Public Accounts Committee. Although we have shown much that was wrong we would have been able to show a great deal more were it not that when witnesses are asked a question lawyers on the commiteee tell them not to answer it. I say it, and I say it advisedly that any one who has sat in that committee from day to day can reach no other conclusion than that these lawyers were pleading the defence of their clients; they were defending their clients, the government, every time. We were blocked on every hand by them when we tried to bring out the evidence.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I have heard the hon. gentleman use the same words before. When he states that the members of this committee who are lawyers were pleading for their clients it conveys an imputation, and if it be true such members of the committee are guilty of an infringement of the Independence of Parliament Act and of the rules of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman want to make a speech or to ask a question?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what he means by it.

Mr. SPROULE. I will tell the hon. gentleman what I mean. I say that when we are endeavouring to bring out the information which would show wrong-doing and improper and wrong expenditure of money the witness is told not to answer the question by one of these lawyers. Does not that look like it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. In the first place, I say that statement is not correct, but that is not what I am at——

Mr. SPROULE. I say that members of that committee get up and demand the right to bring witnesses forward to prove the case for the defence before those who are proving guilt are done with their witnesses. Does not that look like offering a defence for their clients, bringing witnesses for the defence before the witnesses for the prosecution are heard.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. It never occurred.

Mr. SPROULE. The very last day I was in the Public Accounts Committee I saw that done by a vote of the majority of that committee against the will of those who were desiring to inquire into the improper expenditure of public money. We are often blocked by the statement that we must be guided as far as possible by the rules of evidence in the committee and that the rules of evidence would not allow such and such questions in any court. I would like to quote the statement of Judge Winchester who when sitting in an arbitration in Toronto said:

> He would not follow the rules of law in admitting and excluding evidence. These rules he said are obsolete and antiquated and no business man would follow them in such an inquiry.

We are supposed to be business men in that committee and yet we are limited by the rules of evidence. We are stopped by what are called the rules of evidence in that committee and the majority of the committee is invited to vote down our right to put questions, and in view of that am I not justified in stating that we are not allowed to go on with that inquiry as we should be. We, who are the representatives of the people charged with the responsible duty of making an inquiry into the expenditure of every dollar of public money are obstructed in a hundred ways. Although we have shown wrong-doing and dishonesty and improper expenditure of public money we could have shown very much more had it not been for the obstruction of these gentlemen. And yet, when we point all this out, the Minister of Agriculture says: What do the electors think: what do the by-elections show? I ask the Minister of Agriculture what does his own royal commission say? Does it not say exactly as we say: That the management of the Marine Department is rotten. Though he will deny that in face of the report of the royal commission appointed by the government. And

to-day they dare to discredit that commission because it told the truth, and only a small portion of what they might have told if they had done as they were justified in doing, and probed to the bottom the condition of affairs in other departments. I give that back to the minister as a reply to his question whether the electors of this country believes there was wrong-doing in these various departments. In the Interior Department, in the Public Works Department, in the Marine Department, in all these departments we have been bringing out from month to month in the Public Accounts Committee and by the papers that have been brought down to this House, evidence of wrong-doing over and over again, mismanagement, incompetence, improper expenditure of public money, thousands and thousands of dollars of the people's money paid out to political friends for which no return was had. There are two methods by which the political pirates are robbing the country to-day. One is by the government employing their political friends who are in many respects only pirates to purchase the supplies required by the government at their own price and then sell them to the government at an advance of 100 per cent, 150 per cent and 200 per cent. No one will deny that. Need I point to the fact that Mr. Merwin purchased as a middleman fourteen articles for the government at a cost of $11,838 and sold them at an enormous advance. And that in face of the fact that any second or third-class clerk, or any engineer of the government, or the minister by a letter to the manufacturers could have purchased these supplies at the same price as Merwin did, because the manufacturer stated under oath in the committee that he would be glad to sell to the government at the same price that he sold to Merwin.

Yet Mr. Merwin purchased these fourteen articles for $11,839. What did he sell them to the government for? $18,012. It would cost him only fourteen letters, on which he would pay postage of two cents each, to order the goods for the government; yet he made a commission on these fourteen articles of $6,173, the equivalent of a very large salary to any man for a whole year. The government and the country paid $6,173 more for these fourteen articles than they would have paid had they been purchased by the engineer or by one of the agents or clerks of the department; and for this payment to a political friend of the government the country got no return. Inside of two years this firm bought for the government goods to the amount of $404,308. If they made the same commission on these that they did on the fourteen articles that I have mentioned—and I have every reason to believe from my examination that they made that much or more—they must have made on these purchases as commission $134,577, for which the country got no return. Is that right or wrong? The government say, through their mouthpiece, the Minister of Agriculture, that the system of purchasing from a middleman is right; the hon. member for Peel says by his amendment that it is wrong. That is the dividing line between the two parties. I have given transactions of only one department. If time permitted I could give transactions which have been carried out on the same principle and through the same class of middlemen in other departments, that would astound the country. Are we not justified in trying to find some remedy for the abuses that have crept in under the system that has been carried out by the present government during the past ten or twelve years? I say that we are, in the absence of some proposal by the government. In the face of these facts, is the government going to vote down the amendment to the amendment, which declares that purchasing from a middleman is wrong? If they do, they will be held responsible before the bar of public opinion, where the great jury of the nation is empanelled to try them. Will they move the adjournment of this debate to sidetrack this motion as they did the motion I made a few nights ago to get information? If they do, we will hold them responsible. In view of what has been brought out during the last three years; in view of the report of the Royal Commission, which hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to discredit; in view of the declaration that in the administration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries there is no evidence of conscience or of a desire to obtain any rebate or refund for the government on these large purchases, but that there is evidence that many of the employees are able, contrary to the declaration of Scripture, to serve two masters successfully, both the masters here and the masters from whom they purchase; in the face of all this, will the government vote down this motion? If they do, they must take the responsibility before the bar of public opinion, and there will come a day of reckoning when the people will speak in a voice louder than thunder, and tell them that their actions are neither endorsed nor condoned.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Mr. Speaker, I do not desire at this late hour to detain the House at any length upon this subject; but I desire shortly to express my views on the resolution which has been submitted by the hon. member for North Toronto, the amendment moved by the hon. Minister of Finance, and the amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member from Peel. The resolution itself deals with a matter of paramount public importance. I presume that the departments of any and every government should be kept as free as possible from taint and fraud. If there be a suspi-

cion of either cast upon the departments of any government, surely it is a matter of paramount interest to that government to take hold of the situation very quickly, with the strongest possible determination to do the greatest good in the most effective manner and in the shortest time possible. Therefore this motion comes at a very opportune time, for never was a time when there has culminated in this House, as a result of a succession of charges made from this side of the House, a necessity for an absolute change in the system which heretofore has been allowed to govern or misgovern the departments of this government. Hon. gentlemen opposite have sought to defend the present system because forsooth the Conservative government in the past may have committed errors of the same character. In that connection it does strike me that the lament of the Minister of Agriculture was somewhat extraordinary. He deprecated the hon. member for North Toronto's disapproval of the system, which the Minister of Agriculture said had obtained under the Conservative rule. He differed from the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and deprecated the fact that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had disapproved of the system which, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) said, had obtained under Conservative rule. But does the hon. gentleman forget the attitude that he and his colleagues took prior to 1896? Does he forget how he and they agitated for departmental reorganization and made that a part of their platform in 1893? Does he forget that prior to 1896 he and they went up and down the country declaring that the then Conservative government was corrupt, that there was mismanagement, extravagance and dishonesty in the departments, and that if he and his colleagues were elected they would establish a better system of departmental supervision? Surely the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) must have a very short memory, as short as that of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) whom, however, with his many failings, I can pardon for that deficiency. The motion before the House is whether, under the present system, there have been grave abuses, the responsibility for which must necessarily fall on this government. The question is not what took place under the late government, but what is taking place under this government, and it is useless to try and shuffle off responsibility by saying that under the Conservative government similar crimes were committed. That is simply adding insult to injury. In taking that stand, these hon. gentlemen give to the people an exhibition of incompetency—perhaps not so much incompetency as dishonesty. They are simply trying to avoid the discussion of the crucial and vital issue which has been put before the country by the Civil Service Commission and with regard to which the people are intensely interested. The excuse that they are simply continuing the system which formerly prevailed and which prior to 1896 they condemned as bad and vicious, is one that the people are not likely to accept. What is the system which to-day obtains in the departments with regard to the purchasing of government supplies? It is this. There is a list in each department of a favoured few from whom only supplies are to be purchased. When supplies are required, instead of calling for tenders by public advertisement, an invitation is sent out to these favoured few who are on the patronage list. What happens? These few get together and form a combine and they decide which one of them shall get the government contract. That has been demonstrated in the Railway Department, the Public Works Department and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and by that system, this government loses hundreds of thousands of dollars and perhaps millions every year by having to pay excessive prices. Yet when a minister is asked if such and such a contract was let after public competition, he will coolly say yes, and it is only on being closely pressed that he will admit that what he calls public competition is simply competition restricted to a favoured few. That system is responsible for all these extravagances. My hon. friend from Hastings rather commiserated those who preside over the departments of this government.

I do not know but that, in a certain qualified sense, I agree with him. For, with the example the ministers of the Crown have set in this government, what would you have expected in the ordinary course of human nature but that these gentlemen would follow the lead of the Prime Minister? Where you see the Prime Minister of this country rising in his place and voting down resolutions such as those to condemn the Wagner steals, the Nixon steals, the North Atlantic Trading Company steals. the Merwin and Brooks middlemen steals, the 'Montcalm' and 'Arctic' steals—when you see the leader of the government first to rise in his place and vote down inquiry, vote down resolutions to condemn these well-known and admitted extravagances, what can you expect from the ministers whom he has brought into office as his colleagues? What can you expect but that in every department there will be a laxity of morality and of departmental discipline, that there will be carelessness in the expenditure of money, in the method of letting contracts, and great laxity in favour of political favourites, and always a tendency to forget the interests of the public upon whom the burden of expenditure must fall? If the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads the government did not realize it before, he must realize now where the responsibility for all this maladministration rests. We have charged, for instance, session after session, that the De-

partment of Marine and Fisheries has been allowed to run wild. We have charged extravagances and corrupt expenditures against other departments of the government. And we have been met with scoffs and sneers and adverse votes refusing us the right of inquiry into matters of expenditure that were of great importance to the people. And then, when there is a commission to inquire into the civil service, and when that commission brings down a report involving the Department of Marine and Fisheries, at long last the government must take notice of the facts. And what does the government propose? Has one hon. gentleman yet admitted the great gravity of the charges contained in this report? Can hon. gentlemen opposite boast that one of their number has risen in his place and said that the matters shown by this report are of such gravity as to require earnest deliberation in this House and to call for immediate reform? Not so. They do not seem to treat the matter as being of great moment. They regard it with the same complacency with which they treated the scandals brought against them by this side within the last three or four years—such scandals as I have already mentioned.

The contempt—for it is nothing else—which the right hon. gentleman who leads this House has shown for the rights of the people will not long be tolerated by the people who suffer from it. This country is alive to the significance of this report and the necessity for the reform covered by this resolution and the amendment to the amendment of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain). The people know that the best method to preserve the public morality is to carry the resolution into effect. If the amendment to the amendment be voted down, can hon. gentlemen opposite go before the people at the general election—which, we are told, is shortly to come on—and expect the people to believe that they are honest in any statement they may make that they are desirous of grappling with and suppressing the extravagances and dishonesties which have been laid at the doors of the departments of government?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. BOYCE. I hear an hon. gentleman say 'No.' I do not suppose they believe such a thing. What will the Prime Minister do? Will he ask his followers to vote down the amendment to the amendment, or will he be honest enough to see the necessity for it and bold enough to adopt it and call upon his followers to accept it?—and thereby endeavour to strengthen himself with the people of this country, and be looked to, not as a public spectacle, but as a public example. Here is the spectacle of the Prime Minister, who posed before the people of this country prior to 1896 as the champion of public rights, who complained on the hustings, making that complaint the groundwork of his campaign, that the people's rights were being voted away, that their money was being extravagantly and dishonestly expended, and that extravagance in the departments of government ran riot and held high carnival. And what does he do to carry out the pledges of reform that he made? With an expense bill running over $100,000,000, does he give heed to the unqualified and undeniable cases of extravagance, mismanagement and down-right dishonesty in the departments which have been brought to his notice? Not for one instant. He simply turns a deaf ear to every case which we seek to bring to his attention, no matter how great be the extent of the wrong charged and how indisputable the proof. Where will this end? The right hon. gentleman has heretofore attempted to justify the vote he has given and which he has called upon his followers to give, and which they gave quite readily, by saying that, in his judgment, the charges fell short of that which ought to be investigated.

What will the right hon. gentleman do in the present position? He is face to face with a report from his own nominees, he is confronted by a conviction pronounced by judges appointed by himself. Yet he still pays no heed to that which he promised prior to 1896, and upon the faith of which he attained to power. He made a pledge to economize, to put down extravagance and corruption in every department—that was the charge against the departments he made then, and that is the charge which we make now. Now, although he expends over a hundred million dollars a year, he can complacently afford to criticise and pick flaws in resolutions of the character of the one brought in by my hon. friend from North Toronto, with a sincere desire to effect reforms. The right hon. gentleman stands to day as a spectacle before this country of a man who has failed absolutely to fulfil the promises upon which he obtained power. He is being criticised from one end of the empire to the other. The right hon. gentleman will remember the criticism of the 'London Economist' of only a couple of months ago. That paper said that his friends were saying that he had around him a number of gentlemen who had acquired riches by unknown means, and that it was impossible for him to get rid of them. That is what the London 'Economist' said, and it is on the records of this House. But there is something more that was said by a very eminent friend of his, a gentleman of great prominence in days gone by, a gentleman to whose words perhaps the right hon. gentleman and his followers may still pay some heed. I refer to the Hon. Geo. Brown, whose words my right hon. friend is often fond of quoting when they suit his purpose. As I say, the right hon. gentleman went to the country in 1896 upon the promise to reduce expenditure and to put down extravagance and corruption. Has he done so?

See how he and his followers meet the resolution proposed by the hon. member for North Toronto; see how they meet the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain); see how they disdain and scoff at every sincere effort made to right the wrongs that are so prevalent in this administration. Now I would draw the right hon. gentleman's attention to these words of the Hon. Geo. Brown:

If, sir, a public man avows certain principles, agitates those principles and seeks to overthrow the government to establish those principles, and when he has obtained power laughs at his professions and casts his principles to the winds, he is aiming a blow at public morality.

House divided on amendment to amendment (Mr. Blain).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Ames,
Armstrong,
Barker,
Barr,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Fowler,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Lake,
Lalor,
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Lefurgey,
Leonard,
Lewis,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Marshall,
Monk,
Morin,
Northrup,
Owen,
Paquet,
Robitaille,
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Sproule,
Staples,
Taylor,
White,
Wilmot,
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka)—46.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adamson,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Bickerdike,
Bole,
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carney,
Caron,
Cash,
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Crawford,
Demers,
Law,
LeBlanc,
Logan,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McLean (York, C.),
McLennan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Desjardins,
Dubeau,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gladu,
Graham,
Harty,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.),
Michaud,
Miller,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Pugsley,
Reid (Restigouche),
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Savoie,
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Telford,
Turcotte,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Watson,
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—90.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

| Ministerial. | Opposition. |
|---|---|
| Carvell, | Stanfield, |
| Greenway, | Tisdale, |
| Galliher, | Lancaster, |
| Grant, | Bennett, |
| Talbot, | Bergeron, |
| Schell (Glengarry), | Wilson (Lennon & Addington), |
| Dyment, | Beattie, |
| McCarthy (Simcoe), | Bristol, |
| Beland, | Walsh (Huntingdon), |
| Templeman, | Reid (Grenville), |
| Borden (Sir Frederick), | Haggart, |
| Sifton, | Maclean (York, S.), |
| Emmerson, | Lennox, |
| Tolmie, | Seagram, |
| Lemieux, | Kemp, |
| Oliver, | Osler, |
| Smith (Nanaimo), | Porter, |
| Guthrie, | Ward, |
| Tobin, | Avery, |
| Macpherson, | McLaren, |
| Black, | Ganong, |
| Ross (Yale-Cariboo), | Martin (Queens, P.E.I.), |
| Gordon, | Pringle, |
| Devlin, | Clare, |
| Hall, | Smith (Wentworth), |
| Sloan, | Crocket, |
| Ross (Rimouski), | Forget, |
| McKenzie, | Macdonell, |
| Proulx, | Perley, |
| Ratz. | Thompson. |

Mr. CALVERT. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) has not voted.

Mr. TALBOT. I am paired with the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment to the amendment.

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Fielding).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adamson,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Bickerdike,
Bole,
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carney,
Caron,
Cash,
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Crawford,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Dubeau,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gladu,
Graham,
Harty,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth),
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Law,
LeBlanc,
Logan,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McLean (York, C.),
McLennan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Pugsley,
Reid (Restigouche),
Robitaille,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Savoie,
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Telford,
Turcotte,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Watson,
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—93.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Ames,
Armstrong,
Barker,
Barr,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Fowler,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Lake,
Lalor,
Lefurgey,
Leonard,
Lewis,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Marshall,
Monk,
Morin,
Northrup,
Owen,
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Sproule,
Staples,
Taylor,
White,
Wilmot,
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka)—43

PAIRS:

Messieurs

| Ministerial. | Opposition. |
|---|---|
| Ross (Rimouski), | Paquet, |
| Carvell, | Stanfield, |
| Greenway, | Tisdale, |
| Galliher, | Lancaster, |
| Grant, | Bennett, |
| Talbot, | Bergeron, |
| Schell (Glengarry), | Wilson (Lennox & Addington), |
| Dyment, | Beattie, |
| Guthrie, | Bristol, |
| Beland, | Walsh (Huntingdon), |
| Templeman, | Reid (Grenville), |
| Borden (Sir Frederick), | Haggart, |
| McCarthy (Simcoe), | Maclean (York, S.), |
| Hall, | Lennox, |
| McKenzie, | Seagram, |
| Lemieux, | Kemp, |
| Emmerson, | Osler, |
| McLean (Huron), | Porter, |
| Sifton, | Ward, |
| Sloan, | Avery, |
| Oliver, | McLaren, |
| Black, | Ganong, |
| Macpherson, | Martin (Queens, P.E.I.), |
| German, | Pringle, |
| Devlin, | Clare, |
| Gordon, | Smith (Wentworth), |
| Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.), | Crocket, |
| Tobin, | Forget, |
| Ross (Yale-Cariboo), | Macdonell, |
| Proulx, | Perley, |
| Ratz. | Thompson. |

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Paquet) has not voted.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) I am paired with the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Ross). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding).

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) has not voted.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am paired with the hon. minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman).

Amendment agreed to.

House divided on main motion as amended.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Adamson,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Bickerdike,
Bole,
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
LeBlanc,
Logan,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,

Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carney,
Caron,
Cash,
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Crawford,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Dubeau,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gladu,
Graham,
Harty,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth),
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Law,
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McLean (York, C.),
McLennan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Pugsley,
Reid (Restigouche),
Robitaille,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Savoie,
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tolmie,
Turcotte,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Watson,
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—99.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Ames,
Armstrong,
Barker,
Barr,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Fowler,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Lake,
Lalor,
Lefurgey,
Leonard,
Lewis,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Marshall,
Monk,
Morin,
Northrup,
Owen,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Sproule,
Staples,
Taylor,
White,
Wilmot,
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka)—44.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

| Ministerial. | Opposition. |
|---|---|
| Carvell, | Stanfield, |
| Ross (Rimouski), | Paquet, |
| Greenway, | Tisdale, |
| Galliher, | Lancaster, |
| Grant, | Bennett, |
| Talbot, | Bergeron, |
| Schell (Glengarry), | Wilson (Lennox & Addington), |
| Dyment, | Beattie, |
| Guthrie, | Bristol, |
| Beland, | Walsh (Huntingdon), |
| Borden (Sir Frederick), | Haggart, |
| McCarthy (Simcoe), | Maclean (York, S.), |
| Hall, | Lennox, |
| McKenzie, | Seagram, |
| Lemieux, | Kemp, |
| Emmerson, | Osler, |
| McLean (Huron), | Porter, |
| Sifton, | Ward, |
| Cyr, | Avery, |
| Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne's), | McLaren, |
| Black, | Ganong, |
| Chisholm (Antigonish), | Martin (Queens, P.E.I.), |
| German, | Pringle, |
| Devlin, | Clare, |
| Gordon, | Smith (Wentworth), |
| Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.), | Crocket, |
| Tobin, | Forget, |
| Ross (Yale-Cariboo), | Macdonell, |
| Proulx, | Perley, |
| Ratz. | Thompson. |

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) has not voted.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am paired with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). Had I voted I should have voted for the motion as amended.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## ADJOURNMENT—CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns I would like to know if the government have any information as to when the report of the Civil Service Commission will be distributed among members of this House. It does not seem to be necessary that there should be any very great delay. The report of the commission is not as long as an ordinary issue of 'Hansard', which is brought out daily and is placed upon the desk of every hon. member of this House at eleven o'clock in the morning containing a full report of the debate of the day before. As members of the government seem to be anxious to stay here this evening it might be just as well for them to give the House some information as to what the policy of the government is in regard to the very serious and very grave charges which are brought against the government in the report of this commission appointed by themselves. Several days have elapsed, public opinion throughout the country is very greatly aroused and instead of giving the House any intimation as to what

their course will be with regard to the very grave issues involved by these charges—I use the word 'charges' advisedly—these hon. gentlemen sit calmly upon the treasury benches and occupy the time of parliament in taking idle votes for the purpose of adding four or five more to their majority. It is a silly and undignified proceeding and I never saw one more silly or more undignified. While I am on that subject perhaps they will be good enough now to interest themselves in giving the country some idea of what is to be done in regard to these charges of the utter and absolute demoralization of the public service which has been brought about under this administration. I think that it is high time that the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), instead of keeping the representatives of the people here and delaying this House for the purpose of taking unnecessary votes, instead of taking up the time of this House, valued according to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House at $16 per minute in waiting for this, and that the other absent member should give some statement to the people as to what is to be done by this administration in regard to the charges brought against it by the strong Liberals whom they themselves appointed to this Royal Commission. It is well that we should have some statement from the government on this subject and that at a very early day, and I think it is not desirable that this House should adjourn until some statement is vouchsafed as to what the policy of the government will be in that regard.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). In regard to the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) that the House should not adjourn I do not know that it is a very alarming one; we have occasionally stayed later than this and if necessary we can do so again. I very much regret that my hon. friend has found the discussion and votes of to-night so disagreeable. I cannot realize that there was any thing in them that should have created this very great disturbance in his mind whereby he has given us such a very strange exhibition during the last few minutes. However, that is a matter that I must leave to the hon. gentleman himself. Coming now to the question with which he began his remarks, he wanted to know when this report will be ready. That is a question for the King's Printer. The order of this House was that the papers be printed forthwith. I take it for granted that the order will be complied with and that in due time the report will be brought down. I would be very happy if I knew of any way of accelerating the bringing of it down. But, I take it for granted that the King's Printer will do his duty in that respect. When it is down we will be very happy to discuss it in its proper time and order.



Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is not so much a question as to whether the King's Printer is going to do his duty or not; it is a matter of whether the ministers are going to do their duty or not. For instance, what is the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) going to do about it? He stands as an accused person before this whole country. His department is held up to the winds to go through all its tattered garments and he, himself, with it is held up to the criticism and judgment of this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister did not lose any time at all in attacking the commission that he and his own government appointed. The report of the commission was not laid on the table until he got up and attacked man for man the commission that he and his colleagues appointed. He made a promise at that time to this House that he would make an investigation into his department and do it at once. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) also made a promise. He backed up the promise of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He said that there was a necessity for further investigation and that there should be an investigation. Now, several days have passed and what has the Minister of Marine determined to do? I think that he owes to this House an immediate statement of his policy in this regard. What does he do? I find here that he arose immediately after the report had been placed on the table and amongst other things what he said was this:

> The chairman of the commission, Mr. Courtnay, does not appear to have taken part in the inquiry concerning that department, and the report as to that department is made by the two other commissioners, Messrs. Fyshe and Bazin.

There is a direct imputation, which the minister knows how to make and which he has made that the portion of the investigation which went on in his department and which led to such deplorable results, as far as the minister is concerned, and which will lead to such good results, I shall hope, in so far as the country is concerned, was not participated in by Mr. Courtney, the Chairman of the Commission, and that therefore not so much countenance need be given to the findings of the other two gentlemen of the commission, Messrs. Fyshe and Bazin. What did it matter whether Mr. Courtney was with these two gentlemen when they were investigating the hon. gentleman's department or not? The result was the report of the commission, not the report simply of Mr. Bazin, or Mr. Fyshe, or Mr. Courtney, and there is no intimation at all that the three commissioners were not absolutely agreed in reference to the statements which were made in regard to my hon. friend's department. So that, it did

not seem to be what the minister should have done to undertake to create the impression in this House and the country that Mr. Courtney, the Chairman of the Commission, was not with Messrs. Fyshe and Bazin, and therefore the implication was that he had nothing to do with the investigation of the minister's department. He goes on again to say:

The order in council appointing the commissioners authorizes them to inquire into and report on such changes as may be deemed advisable in the best interests for the efficiency in the public service. I may venture the opinion that matters connected with the management and control of the departments can scarcely be said to come within the scope of this commission.

The galled jade winces and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries intimated, there in no unmistakable language that these gentlemen went beyond their duties and beyond the scope of their commission when they dared to interfere in his department to the extent of looking into his mode of management. Now, this hon. gentleman, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, has been in his department for two years and more. I shall not forget the time some years ago when he made a very determined defence of that department by holding up the dead body of his colleague which had just been laid away, and declaring that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were attacking the dead when they attacked his department. To-day he has a changed view in that respect, and time after time when he rises on his feet, he is not over and above declaring in veiled language, but yet you can easily see what he means, that he should not be held responsible for what took place in the Marine and Fisheries Department, that all this mismanagement, this trouble, this confusing of principle and conscience in that department was due to those who preceded him. Well, why does he not think of the shield he endeavoured to hold up to prevent an attack upon himself and his department two or three years ago. Why does he not hold up the same shield to-day and why does he speak in a way which is a direct imputation upon his predecessor in office. But where it strikes the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is this: That the commissioners went beyond simply saying what salary so and so should have and what grade so and so should have, and that they went into the management of the department as they had I think a perfect right to do, and he takes occasion to administer a ministerial rebuff to his own commission because they dare stick their noses into the affairs of his department without consultation with himself. He goes on further to give a hint, at a particular man I suppose, and he says:

I suppose it may be stated also that it was hardly within the scope of this commission or any of the commissioners to state that the increased cost of living was the logical result of the wasting, impoverishing and demoralizing system of protection.

Had he a double idea in that? Was he standing up as the apologist and defender at this time of the system, the wasting, impoverishing and demoralizing system of protection, which he himself since he has come into office has been foremost as a defender, and has kept upon the statute-books of this country? Or, was it a dab at Mr. Fyshe, one of the members of the commission. who, I believe, according to the report of the commission was the chief factor in having that choice bit of political wisdom embodied in this report. One or the other, or both, but whichever it was, or if it were both, it was for the purpose if possible of depreciating one of these commissioners who had dared to call in question the methods of my hon. friend's department. Well, he went on and after a great many words he made a promise to this House. He is eaten up with zeal for the honour of his officials and so he declares: That for the protection of the public interest and in fairness to the officials:

It is necessary that further inquiry should be made into the accusations and I propose to take without any further delay the necessary step to that end.

The hon. gentleman has had several days; there has been a delay. He says that without further delay he proposes to take steps. What steps are they? Has the minister done anything? If so I think the House has an interest in the department as well as himself, and I think he ought to take the House into his confidence and tell the representatives of the people what he proposes to do under this somewhat grave condition of affairs. Public opinion amounts to something in this country yet. I know the Minister of Agriculture does not think it does. He has not a very high opinion of public opinion; he says he has not been afraid of it so far—

Mr. FISHER. Because I have a high opinion of it.

Mr. FOSTER. He says he is not afraid of it now, but still public opinion is existent in this country, and I think public opinion at this time is voicing itself somewhat in reference to this peculiar state of things in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. He promised to take steps without further delay. The House is awaiting and the country is awaiting to know whether he is going to fulfil his promise and how he is going to fulfil it. Then, the right hon. gentleman who leads the government had something to say, and although he criticised the remarks that were made

by me, he agreed with me in some respects and in the end declared :

The commissioners have thrown out suspicions and made not only insinuations but also actual statements against the officials, and yet strange to say they say they named nobody, thus casting suspicion all over the department and without any definiteness which would show who the guilty parties were.

Now that is a grave matter to cast suspicion over a whole department such as the Department of Marine and Fisheries. And there again there is a cogent reason why delay should not occur and why these steps promised by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should be at once undertaken. Again I think we have the right to ask the hon. gentleman who presides over the Marine and Fisheries Department as to the steps that have been taken. The right hon. gentleman at the close of his remarks said :

I agree with the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that there is enough in the report of the commission to cause further investigation to be held. Whether it should be by royal commission or whether it should be by committee of this House my hon. friend is not prepared to say nor am I prepared to say, but I say there should be further investigation.

Now, I submit that all this calls for prompt action. The case itself calls for prompt action. The promise that was made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries calls for prompt action, and the taking up of that promise by the leader of the government himself gives us I think, the very best of reasons for asking the government to give us to-night before we leave what steps they have taken or what steps they propose to take in this very grave matter.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation at all in giving my hon. friend the information to which he is entitled, and I think it is just as well that we should try to be calm and not be carried away by excitement or temper. I do not think it adds at all to the dignity of the House or to the good feeling of the House, or the good conduct of the business of this House to have such words bandied about as 'scorn,' 'contempt,' and 'silly.' I can leave aside these words and come to the facts. I stated the other day, speaking as the head of the government, that there was enough in the reports of the commissioners who had been appointed to investigate the public departments to warrant further action. In this I expressed the same opinion as was expressed by the hon. member who has just addressed the House (Mr. Foster). He stated himself the other day that in his opinion there was enough in this report to warrant further action. What action should be taken he was not prepared to say; whether it should be by royal commission or by a committee of this House or otherwise, and neither was I prepared to say at that time. And how many days ago is that? It is just three days ago if I remember aright. Since that time as the hon. gentleman is aware there are more matters than one which have engaged the attention of the government. There are other matters in connection with the business of the session which had to be attended to. The ministers have had to be in their seats in the House and in their departments every day.

On Saturday council sits, and is it extraordinary that after three days the government is not prepared to say what action should be taken. That action should be taken we all agree ; but my hon. friend says you must give us here and now, at half past twelve in the morning. a statement of what action is to be taken, and if you do not give us that, we will sit and go on with the investigation. Is that a reasonable request, I ask any member of this House. We have stated that action must be taken, and action will be taken ; but the hon. gentlemen says we must have it here and now. I say it is not reasonable to ask that. He knows the duties that ministers have to attend to, the multiplicity of demands on their time which come from day to day and therefore it must not be thought extraordinary if I tell him that at this moment I am not prepared to say what action will be taken ; but action must and will be taken at the proper time. With regard to the question of the hon. leader of the opposition, who wanted to know when the report would be laid on the table of the House, that was a fair question, and a fair answer was given. A lot of material which forms an appendix to the report is in the hands of the printer and will be brought down as speedily as possible. I will say more : I am not afraid of this report. If the government appointed a commission, an independent commission, composed of men who are known for independence of character, it was because they wanted to probe everything. When the report is brought down, my hon. friend will find us, me in particular, ready to face him and give him all the information he wants.

Mr. SAM. BARKER (East Hamilton) Mr. Speaker, I think the right hon. gentlemen is rather shirking the question, if he will allow me to say so. This report has been in the possession of the government for nearly two weeks. The right hon. gentleman has not been obliged to wait for this report. If all we hear is true, he had it in his possession for nine or ten days before it was placed on the Table of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not correct. A partial report was made; but the remainder of the papers were brought down with a very slight delay, indeed before the ministers themselves had an opportunity of reading them.

Mr. BARKER. Will the Minister of Finance say specifically what portion of the report was not laid before the government nearly two weeks ago?

Mr. FIELDING. I say, in the first place, that the report was handed to me on the day of the budget speech—Tuesday, the 17th. My colleagues did not and could not have seen it for several days, because they had no opportunity. Then, there was a portion of the report, documents which were referred to in it, which had not been sent in. We asked that these documents be sent in. They were sent in, and immediately they were placed on the table of the House.

Mr. BARKER. Now we have the facts. The report was before the minister.

Mr. FIELDING. Part of the report.

Mr. BARKER. What he calls a part of the report, I understand to be the notes which formed no part of the report.

Mr. FIELDING. The notes, so called, were referred to in the report, and were stated to be essential elements in the judgment of the commission.

Mr. BARKER. They were simply notes. The report itself was in the hands of the minister nearly two weeks ago. It is all fudge, if I may use the expression, to say that he did not tell his colleagues, or that they had not heard of a report making charges against a department of the government which the minister himself says creates suspicion. Is a minister of the Crown to remain under suspicion for two weeks, or for three days, without making up his mind as to what he is going to do about it?

Mr. FIELDING. There is not a word in the report reflecting on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BARKER. The statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself was that the report created suspicion against his department without naming anybody, and therefore against the whole department. He is the head of the department, the responsible minister; and if suspicion has been thrown on that department, how does he escape? Surely he is more attacked than any body else until some distinction is made between persons. The hon. gentleman has lain under that suspicion for two whole weeks; the Minister of Finance has certainly known it all, and we are told that he did not communicate it to his colleagues.



Mr. FIELDING. I did not read it.

Mr. BARKER. What is the story we hear! This government have known that a Royal Commission, appointed by themselves, have made charges against a department of the government which casts suspicion upon the whole government, and they remain under that suspicion calmly waiting, knowing all about it, for the Minister of Finance had the report in his possession, even though he had not the notes of the commissioners upon which they based their judgment. There was the judgment; there was no doubt about the suspicion it cast; and with that suspicion resting upon them for two weeks, the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues cannot yet tell what they ought to do about it. In the face of the words used by the Minister of Marine, that he would act, and the words of the right hon. gentleman, who said that he would have to act, the country is waiting With such a charge against a minister of the crown—because it is against him—the government stand for two weeks idle, and are not prepared to say whether they will defend themselves before the people or not.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I do not know whether the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has read the report or not. I suppose he has not read it, or he would not have said some things which he has said. He states that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stands charged with very serious wrong doings. When he reads that report and the evidence, I may tell him that there is absolutely nothing in it, either directly or indirectly, against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. There are charges against the officers of the department. They are charged with administering the department in such a way that they are supposed to serve two masters. Now, is it fair that this matter should be investigated further? I think so; I so declared the other day in the House. I think it is due to the officers of the department that these serious charges made against them should be fully investigated. That has been my purpose, and it is still my purpose. I may say further that since the report came to my knowledge, which it did about eight days ago, I have taken steps to look into matters which are specifically mentioned in it. I found that the two specific cases which were mentioned in the report were not correctly stated. I thought it was my duty to mention these things to the House and the country the other day, when the report was brought down. Outside of that, there is a mass of evidence and a large quantity of notes which seem to have been prepared by one of the commissioners, which I have not had time to read, and which none of my colleagues

had time to read, because they came to the knowledge of the government just a day, I think, before the report was brought down. I went through one of the documents and had neither the time nor the opportunity to go through the others. But I took immediate steps to examine into all the cases concerning which I could procure the files and the documents. I have taken up the two cases which were mentioned specifically in the report, and I intend to investigate all the other cases when the report is printed, for I am anxious that the investigation should take place expeditiously, with the least possible delay. It is most serious for a minister of the Crown to find that the officers, upon whose advice he has to rely, stand before the country charged with being derelict in their duty. I am looking into the charges as expeditiously as possible, and if I should find any of the officers guilty, I shall deal with them promptly. I am extremely sorry to find that the report does not mention any names. I would have liked to have had the names mentioned because then I would be in a position to dismiss the officers complained of. The matter, however, will be investigated, and any officer found derelict in his duty will be dismissed or suspended.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am a little doubtful of the right hon. the First Minister taking immediate action. The right hon. gentleman takes the ground that he cannot act at once because this report has only been in the hands of the government a few days. But two years ago I brought the same matter to his notice. On reference to 'Hansard' it will be found that other hon. members as well as myself practically duplicated in this House what is contained in the Civil Service Commission report. On May 8, 1906, I spoke as follows:

Some one is getting that rake-off. There is a system going on in the Department of Marine and Fisheries by which, on almost every item in connection with this matter, there is a rake-off of at least 25 per cent, and the minister when he examines the accounts that go through his department, will have to come before the House and admit that there is 25 per cent at least paid on every item in connection with this matter over and above what I or any other member of this House could purchase these appliances for. That is a fact and I defy the hon. minister to dispute it. I can prove it here by the items in the Auditor General's Report. It is most unfair to have a system of that kind going on in the Marine and Fisheries Department. It is not going on without some one getting a rake-off. We should know who is getting that rake-off. It is a shame that this country has to pay these exorbitant prices.

Mr. BRODEUR. On which article?

Mr. J. D. REID. On every article in connection with the lighting system throughout Canada.

At the same time I added:

Mr. BRODEUR.

In addition to that the minister knows that when these goods have to be brought from a foreign country they are quoted to the government at a price with the duty added.

The matter was, therefore, brought to the attention of the Prime Minister on that occasion and action should have been taken then.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman speaks of a rake-off. Does he know of any one officer who has taken a rake-off? If he will give me the name I will suspend that officer right away.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am not acting as a detective, but if I had been in the department as long as the minister I would know whether any officials were getting a rake-off or not. It is the duty of the minister to find that out.

Mr. BRODEUR. When the hon. gentleman said that there were rake-offs I suppose he must have spoken of what he knew. Will he give the names?

Mr. J. D. REID. Did we not prove in the Public Accounts Committee, to the satisfaction of the minister himself, that there were prices paid which showed there was a rake-off given to Merwin?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows that these prices were certified to by Mr. Fraser, an appointee of the late government. Does he advise that I should suspend or dismiss Mr. Fraser?

Mr. J. D. REID. At that time the Minister of Marine and the First Minister insinuated that I and other members on this side were reflecting on the memory of the late Mr. Préfontaine. I defended the memory of Mr. Préfontaine, and if there is no Liberal in this House who will come to his defence, I want to say that I believe he was an honest man, and I want to add that the present minister has purchased goods from Merwin on the same terms and conditions as when his predecessor was minister.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is absolutely mistaken. He made the statement the other day in the House that I have been purchasing goods from Mr. Merwin as before. I have here a report showing that in 1905-6 the purchases from Mr. Merwin amounted $122,437.18, and with the exception of $674.50 the whole amount was ordered before I had charge of the department.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. gentleman takes the ground that these goods were ordered previous to his becoming minister. Admitting that fact, the fact nevertheless remains that exorbitant prices were paid for these goods and he admits that he accepted the goods and paid those prices. That does not show honest administration and ability on his part to occupy the position he does. What

does the Civil Service Commission report state? It states:

The work proceeds in a lumbering haphazard way, giving rise to constant blundering and confusion. There is no sign visible of a single directing head or an intelligent purpose unless it be that of spending as much money as possible. Zeal for economy and good management, or pride in the work, is not visible. Perfunctory and mechanical discharge of duties is the rule, with apparently no perception of any need for improvement. The lack of organization and of organizing power in the department has recently been very conspicuously and painfully illustrated by the fact that the accountant's or bookkeeping branch had apparently fallen into such confusion that expert accountants had to be called in to put things to rights and create some intelligible system.

That shows that the minister has not been able to manage his department. But we have further evidence—and that evidence the Prime Minister has had before him ever since last November—that the Department of Marine and Fisheries was just in the shape the commission describes. Let me read what this Mr. Richards, who made his report last November, said about the department. He said:

In a good many instances, the quality of important materials has been noticeably bad, even of materials so important as plates for steamers, renewal and repairs. As to quantity, there is no doubt whatever that the department has paid for materials which were never received.

Since November, the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has had that report in his possession, for it was submitted to the department at that time. Yet he has taken no action. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has had the same report. Why was not action taken?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What report is that?

Mr. J. D. REID. The report of these accountants to the present Minister of Finance. There is what is in that report as sworn to in the Public Accounts Committee. But we do not need to go to that, for it is in the files before this House. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) will not say that this is not in the report, for he knows that it is. And the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance know it too. We have waited five long months to have this reorganization undertaken, that the country may be no longer robbed. Yet now the government are trying to get out of it on the ground that this report has been only nine days in their hands. It is exactly in line with what was done two years ago. The Prime Minister put us off then by saying that he had put the present minister in to reorganize the department. Yet nothing has been done to set the department right.

Nor is this the only department; several others are in the same condition so far as the purchasing of supplies is concerned. In the Department of Railways and Canals, for instance, the same system goes on. I remember that, between 1891 and 1896, the system along the St. Lawrence canals was to advertise for supplies. Any one could tender, and the result was that the supplies were bought 25 per cent cheaper. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) asks: Do you want to keep a stock on hand? The system at that time was to advertise for prices for certain goods—practically everything used on the canal—in the quantity that would be used. Tenders were put in, and at any place along the canals these supplies could be purchased. But what is the system now? As the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) knows, along the whole system from Montreal to Kingston names are given of parties from whom purchases are to be made, and prices are paid higher than private individuals can buy for. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Perhaps I may be permitted to say that there is very grave doubt about it.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is only the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham's) statement——

Some hon. MEMBERS. It is as good as yours.

Mr. J. D. REID. Probably it is. But if we have an investigation in the Public Accounts Committee, I can prove the truth of what I have said. And, if we have time, I will take the opportunity to prove it to the satisfaction of the Minister of Railways and Canals. As to extravagance on the canals, the minister admitted the other night that he was agreeable to running a steamer along the river right up to the Bay of Quinté for the superintendent of canals, a system that was not followed years ago.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did not the hon. gentleman state that the superintendent should have this boat?

Mr. GRAHAM. What I explained was that not only did the superintendent use it, for his purposes, but that it was used for towing scows and for other purposes as well.

Mr. J. D. REID. I admit that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Graham) said that. But there is a difference of opinion about that, for it is only a pleasure boat, as any one knows who knows the boat.

I would call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that for three sessions in the Public Accounts Committee, we have been showing how these contracts have been let, yet he has not taken any action. We have

shown that the Department of Militia has been defrauded—at least, it has paid exorbitant prices, higher than those paid by private individuals. We have shown that the Public Works Department has been purchasing through men like John O'Gorman as middlemen. And the Railways and Canals Department also has been working through middlemen.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Whom?

Mr. J. D. REID. Wallberg is a middleman.

Mr. GRAHAM. He was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. J. D. REID. But the minister knows that Wallberg is not a manufacturer of steel girders or cranes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is a manufacturers agent, is he not?

Mr. J. D. REID. He swore that he was not an agent for any one. It is time that the Prime Minister should take action. Two years ago, we brought up the case of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. If we could see any sign that the Prime Minister intended to take action it would be a different thing, but in two years he has done nothing, and I cannot feel satisfied that he intends to do anything now. He has the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) in the Public Accounts Committee objecting to everything that comes up there when we get to a point where we are likely to learn something.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the limit of mistatement. The Minister of Public Works has not objected to anything in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did not he object to some gentlemen from the lower provinces answering some questions the moment we touched the vital point?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No proper question was objected to.

Mr. J. D. REID. The contrary is the opinion of every member on this side of the House as well as some on the other side. I hope the Prime Minister will take some action, and that the time is not far distant when he will be able to inform the House that something has actually been accomplished in the way of putting the departments in better shape.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). The rather peculiar course adopted by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in objecting to the adjournment has given to my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) an opportunity of getting off one of the utterances which he seems anxious to give on every occasion. Those utterances are utterly irresponsible in their nature——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. J. D. REID.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD—and involve——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I can hardly hold the term 'irresponsible' to be out of order.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD—involve, I say, on the part of my hon. friend the repetition of statements which have been reiterated from year to year without my hon. friend having the pluck to make a charge against anybody.

Mr. J. D. REID. A charge against whom?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Against anybody.

Mr. J. D. REID. I laid a charge against the department.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has been in parliament too long not to know that when a member wants to charge malfeasance in office against any minister of the Crown there is a proper way to do it. When my hon. friend to-night undertook to read what he said two years ago in regard to certain transactions in the Marine Department, and when the Minister of Marine asked him whether he meant to reflect upon Mr. J. F. Fraser, the official who had certified the very accounts he was attacking, my hon. friend had nothing to say against Mr. Fraser. My hon. friend has been talking about Merwin and his accounts. He has stood up in this House from time to time and certified to the character of Mr. J. F. Fraser, the man who certified to the minister that these accounts of Merwin were accurate. Yet my hon. friend is not willing to charge any person in this House, and he is not willing to say anything against Mr. J. F. Fraser, the gentleman who was appointed by his own friends when the Conservatives were in power, and who was found there by this government, and who like many others of these men who are there to-day, if what the hon. member for Grenville says is true ought to have been dismissed. My hon. friend comes to-day and reiterates charges and attempts to impute blame against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If my hon. friend is not prepared to-day to say to the minister that Mr. Fraser is not a responsible man, or an honest man, he has no business to make the statement he has made to-night. If Mr. Fraser is a responsible man, then his certification of the bills made out by Merwin must be taken by the minister to be absolutely correct. The hon. gentleman undertakes to come in now and ventures to vindicate the memory of the late Hon. Raymond Préfontaine. The hon. gentleman need not rush to the defence of Raymond Préfontaine; if Raymond Préfontaine's good name is ever defamed by reason of anything my hon. friend may urge it will be on account of the fact that there were in that department men who were Conservatives and men who should have been turned out by him and his predecssor. And if the

good fame of this government ever suffers discredit, it will be for a similar reason. Let there be no mistake about that. Hon. gentlemen opposite in former days planted certain people in the various departments. Unfortunately the services of some of those men were not dispensed with after 1896, and to-day when Mr. Fraser's name comes up my hon. friend stands up in this House and gives him a certificate of character, while at the same time he attacks the minister because Mr. Fraser certified to certain accounts. These gentlemen come into this House and talk about what they would do in the Public Accounts Committee. Now, if the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) knows anything against anybody in connection with the administration of affairs, why does he not have the pluck to stand up and make a charge? Hon. gentlemen opposite have relied wholly on their imagination in making their alleged disclosures. There have been no disclosures, no maladministration on the part of any one of the ministers. It does seem to me that the time has almost come when, for the dignity of this House, hon. gentlemen opposite who hurl these insinuations against ministers should be required to observe the well known parliamentary rule that when they have any charge to make against ministers in power they should pledge their seat and their word to the truth of their statements. But hon. gentlemen opposite, because, by misrepresentation and insinuation, they succeeded in changing the administration in Ontario for a certain time, think that they can now come to this House and repeat the same trick. That is a delusion they are labouring under to-day. It is true that in taking that position they have deserted every principle they ever claimed to have. At one time the great Conservative party claimed to be national policy party, they claimed to stand for a united Canada, they claimed to stand for big issues. But where do they stand to-day? They ignore every one of their professed principles, otherwise than by long-winded professions. When we come to the Halifax platform, which has been in existence now for five months, not one hon. gentleman opposite, with the exception of the member for North Toronto, has ventured to put upon the Order Paper a single proposition contained in the Halifax platform. So, deserting every theory and every policy they ever claimed to hold, they now come to this House and hurl forth these innuendos, these irresponsible statements, and expect the country to believe them. The hon. member for Grenville comes here and makes this little speech of his about Merwin every week or two, and when you ask him as to whether the man who certified Merwin's account is a bad man, he says, oh, no, that gentleman is a first rate fellow. And so they go. They talk about the Department of Railways and Canals and of the splendid condition of affairs that obtained in the good old Tory days when everything was bought on tender. Some of these days we will endeavour to enlighten the House about some of those communications which hon. gentlemen addressed to ministers and in which they desired their friends to be looked after. As regards the administration of railways in the maritime provinces, in the good old Tory days there was nobody but a Tory could look for anything in the way of contracts. If a man happened to be the lowest tenderer and a Liberal, he was passed over and the contract was given to a Conservative. If these gentlemen ever get into power, I believe this resolution of the hon. member for North Toronto, and all these fine spun theories about commissions to look after the buying of supplies, will be absolutely forgotten. After they have twelve long years in opposition one can fancy the cold and unwholesome welcome which await them when they tell their supporters that they are not going to have a chance to sell any supplies to the government. We are going to appoint a commission which will be irremovable except by impeachment and nobody, whether he is a Tory or anybody else, is going to have any control over it they say. I warn the hon. member for North Toronto; he will never attain the front rank of his party by advocating a policy of that kind. The Conservative party do not want any policy of that kind in this country. Then, my genial friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) knows very well in his heart that he would be the last man to support any such proposition. My genial friend from Grenville talks about the Railway Department and the middleman—about Mr. Wallberg, the middleman——

Mr. BOYCE. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is a bitter pill for the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce). That hon. gentleman remained in the Public Accounts Committee for a couple of weeks and then gave up the job of hunting for Mr. Wallberg because we were able to bring down a list of the contracts that had been awarded in the Department of Railways and Canals for which Mr. Wallberg had tendered and in every instance he was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the hon. gentleman not recall the fact that after being under examination for three or four days Mr. Wallberg begged that he would not be called again for three or four weeks?

Mr. MACDONALD. I recall the fact that the hon. member for West Algoma had abandoned the task of examining him.

Mr. BOYCE. I have not finished with him yet.

Mr. MACDONALD. All I can say is that if those who sit as members of the

Public Accounts Committee have no more onerous duty than attending the examination of Mr. Wallberg by the hon. member for West Algoma we will have a light task.

Mr. FOSTER. Your sitting appears to be always on your feet.

Mr. MACDONALD. Perhaps I might refer to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in that regard. The Public Accounts Committee has been regarded as a place where the subjects to be considered were the matters that were referred to the committee. But, when my hon. friend from North Toronto goes there he is not satisfied with carrying out the well known parliamentary usage in that respect but he brings matters before the committee and suggests subjects to deal with that were never referred to the committee and because some of us, who like to observe parliamentary usage in dealing with these affairs, venture to suggest the inadvisability of this procedure he hastens to his Tory newspapers in Toronto and in them describes the hon. gentlemen who stand for parliamentary usage as obstructionists although he knows that he is violating every parliamentary rule by his tactics. If the hon. gentleman had shown any anxiety to follow that principle of parliamentary usage which should guide a parliamentary committee it would not have been necessary for any of us to object to his methods. He knows in his heart that in every case in which we have ventured to object to his methods it is on account of the fact that he has transgressed against well known parliamentary rules and practice.

This little diversion we have had at this late hour has arisen on account of the fact that the hon. leader of the opposition displayed an unusual amount of bad humour. Why it was I do not know. Let me say as one sitting behind this government, that my hon. friend need not worry about the attitude of those who sit behind the right hon. First Minister in regard to the question as to whether action will be taken on the Civil Service report. The right hon. First Minister knows full well what his duty is in the present circumstances. We know what action may be expected by this House and the country as a result of this report with respect to anybody who has committed in any degree a dereliction of duty. My hon. friend need not worry about the day or date that this report comes down. When it is printed and before this House both sides will read it and I am here to say that we know that the right hon. First Minister will take such a course as will be worthy of his great name, that he will show to this country that he will not stand for mal-administration in the slightest degree and that if there be an official in any department of this government, whether Conservative or Liberal, against whom dereliction of duty shall be proved, he will deal with him as he has always dealt with wrong doers in the past.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE (Montmagny). Mr. Speaker, I think that this discussion is probably premature. I do not agree with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) in stating that the ministers have been desirous of keeping the report of the Civil Service Commission back from parliament, but at the same time I think that it is the desire of the country that that very important report should be brought down as quickly as possible. I understand that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) wanted to see the appendices to that report, and I think myself that they form the most important part of the report and that it would not be complete without them. But, I trust earnestly that it will be printed as soon as possible and distributed amongst the members. This is probably the most serious thing that has happened during this session. Probably the discussion we have had to-night is a result of the attack which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) made upon the Commission the other day even before members of the House had seen the report. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries—and I have risen merely for the purpose of contradicting his statement—asserts that he has not been called to account by this report. He is the head of the department and he is responsible to the country for what has happened. Having taken the portfolio he is responsible for what has taken place in that department. I do not think he can shield himself behind the officials of his department. Suppose the argument of the minister should be good, suppose he could shield himself behind the officers of his department, or suppose that everything had happened before he became the minister, I still say that the report holds the minister responsible for the act which have taken place during his administration. For instance, you will find in the report, as it has been printed in the public press, that the Falconer affair has been discussed by the commissioners and that there is a certain blame attached to the department in that regard. I am not going to discuss at the present moment the question as to whether that accusation is true or not. You will find also in reading the report of the commissioners this sentence having reference to the Department of Marine and Fisheries:

> There is no sign visible of a single directing head, or an intelligent purpose, unless it be that of spending as much money as possible.

I will not venture to say what the report is based on because I prefer to wait until

we have the report before discussing it. I remember that one of the ministers of the present administration left it under far smaller suspicion, under the suspicion created by an attack only on his private life. The late Minister of Railways and Canals resigned his portfolio in order to clear his character as a private man. It seems to me that in the British House of Commons a minister placed in the position that the Minister of Marine is in to-day would owe it not only to the country, but to his colleagues to tender his resignation until the suspicions with regard to his administration were cleared away. One of the members of the government said that there is no rake-off in the department. I beg to say the contrary, for I find the report says :

Some of the government officers are serving two masters and apparently succeeding with both, scripture notwithstanding.

I want to make my position very clear, and I say that I believe according to the report there has been a 'rake-off.' But I will say also that I have every confidence in the honesty of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I think he is an honest man and I think there is certainly no accusation of a rake-off against him. But he is responsible to the country for his department, and consequently constitutionally he is responsible for everything that has taken place under his administration and under the administration of his predecessors in office under this government. I hope the inquiry into the matter will be pressed as soon as possible. But, believing in the honesty of the Minister of Marine I cannot at the same time forget that not very long ago some of the ministers who are attacked in this report clung to their portfolios, or sacrificing their principle to the portfolio. When the school question came we saw that some of the ministers who believed in protecting the rights of the minority in the Northwest, clung to their portfolios, abandoning the minority, and it seems to-day as if the chickens were coming home to roost, and as if the ministers who refused to let go their portfolios on that question, honest ministers, should have to go to-day when their honesty as administrators of departments is challenged. Therefore I hope that the report will be brought down as soon as possible and that the investigation will take place without delay.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I have no doubt that many members of this House have during their time listened to some very amusing after dinner speeches of a somewhat extraordinary character, but I venture to think that they have seldom been treated to one, more original, more amusing, and more interesting than that which has been given us to-night by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). It is said that a successful after dinner speaker is one who talks a great deal about nothing, amuses his audience and makes them laugh, interests himself, and on sitting down receives general applause. The hon. member (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) filled the bill to-night. The extraordinary doctrine that he evolved from the gigantic brain of his with regard to parliamentary government is intensely amusing to those who know anything about the subject. He announced that no member of this House has the right to criticise a department, or the government, or mismanagement, unless he is prepared to stand on his responsibility as a member of parliament and take the risk of his seat in making a charge. What a wonderful announcement as to parliamentary procedure and constitutional government! Why, I thought it was the right of any member of parliament, from the greatest to the smallest to at any time criticise the government or any member of the government or any department of the government with regard to anything they believed to be wrong without imperilling his seat as a member of the House. What constitutional authority lays down the doctrine that even a member who goes so far as to make a direct charge against a minister of the Crown or against a department jeopardizes his seat? I know of no such authority. But if this Daniel come to judgment can tell me where I can find the authority I will be glad to be enlightened at as early a date as possible. With regard to the report of the Civil Service Commission, it is serious enough in all conscience to justify the government in taking it up before any other important work is gone on with. This scathing indictment against the government and the management of certain departments of the public service cannot be laid at rest for long. It is equivalent to a verdict of want of confidence in the government as a whole, and especially a want of confidence in the administration of the Departments of Marine and of Militia and Defence. If that is the case the Premier is not justified in allowing one moment's delay. The report was laid on the table three days ago, and if it was not discussed by the cabinet before that I think they were derelict in their duty because it is too serious a thing not to be noticed by the responsible heads of the government. Then, if reports are true the report must have been discussed in caucus a few days ago, and while that may not be absolutely correct yet, notwithstanding that the caucuses are private, the newspapers often do publish news as to what takes place in them. For instance, will any one say that the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) did not know what that report contained when he spoke in the budget debate. Although the report had not then been given to the House it looks very much as if his inspiration were obtained from that report. I venture to think that the

member for Brandon saw that report before it came to parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not so.

Mr. SPROULE. I will take the right hon. gentleman's word that so far as he knows it is not so, but we do know that many of these things leak out, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that the information with regard to the contents of this report became known beforehand. The Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister have said that there are a great many notes in connection with the report which they have not had time to read yet, and it would appear as if the whole report were not presented to the House, and if that be so the House was deceived. But it appears that there must have been something else to come down, that the House is not yet in possession of, that the ministers have seen, but have not had time to read.

Mr. BRODEUR. The papers to which I made allusion were brought down at the same time as the report.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood it to be stated that there were some to be brought down yet

Mr. BRODEUR. No, everything has been brought down.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, everything has been in the possession of this House at least three or four days, and has been in possession of the government for a much longer time, or the Minister of Marine could not have attacked the report of the commission at the very moment it was laid on the table of the House. The minister says there is nothing in the report reflecting upon him, although something has been said against the management of his department. But who is responsible for the management of his department? Is it not the minister? He is the only man the country will hold responsible for it. If these irregularities have taken place under his eye and he has never reproved any of those under him or made any improvement in the department. we are justified in holding him responsible. He tries to shield himself by saying that a great deal of this took place under his predecessor. But constitutionally he is as responsible for the management of that department under his predecessor as under himself; he assumed that responsibility when he took the position of minister. An intimation has been given to this House that in view of the disclosures which have been made in the report of the commission, further action will be taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He says: 'There have been insinuations and implied charges, but nobody's name has been mentioned; I want to have a further inquiry to satisfy myself who is at fault.' Is that going to satisfy anybody in the country? Suppose he does that, what will the world say? Ask my brother if I am a rogue. Is the minister likely to incriminate himself for what has taken place in the department while he has been at the head of it? Under the law no man is expected to incriminate himself, and the minister is not likely to do so. Is that what we are waiting for, with these extraordinary charges hanging over the department? The report of that commission is equivalent to a motion of want of confidence in this government, especially in the Department of Marine and Fisheries and in the Department of Militia and Defence. Would a minister of the Crown in Great Britain remain at the head of a department for one day while charges of this kind were hanging over him, without compelling the government to give him an opportunity to vindicate his conduct? In my judgment he would not. He would resign until his character was cleared. Would any Prime Minister of England allow one of his ministers against whom such charges were made, to hold office for three days or even one day, without telling the House what course he was going to take? Is this an evidence of what the Prime Minister has always told us, that he endeavoured to follow the British constitutional practice, as it was found in the mother of parliaments? The right hon. gentleman has departed far from it in his conduct on this occasion. The country will hold not only the heads of these departments, but the Prime Minister, to account for the delay that has taken place, while a great shadow of crime has been hanging over his government, without making any effort to vindicate its character. The eyes of the country are directed to this parliament. They see the government press at the capital declaring that there must have been suspicion of mismanagement in the first place, or the government would not have appointed a commission of honest, fearless and intelligent men to make this inquiry; and the press of the country, or the greater portion of it, even the most violent supporters of the government, have had to admit that wrong-doing has taken place under this government, and that there must be a further investigation; yet the government are continuing to manage the country as though everything were swimming along in the happiest possible way. I say the eyes of the country are upon this parliament. They are waiting to see whether the Prime Minister is going to live up to the precedents he derives from the mother of parliaments. If he is not, they will soon find that he has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. The right hon. gentleman cannot afford to let a moment pass without taking action on the report of this commission. Nothing will satisfy this House or the country but the most searching inquiry, either by a committee of parliament or by an independent commission, into every department of the government

from cellar to garret. The government can not allow another day to pass without taking action on the serious indictment made by that commission. Every day they allow the present condition to remain as it is will be so much additional evidence given the people of their unfitness to administer public affairs.

Mr. L. A. RIVET (Hochelaga). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I did not have the privilege of listening to the remarks—eloquent I deem—of the hon. member for East Grey, but what struck me was his virtuous indignation because the hon. Minister of Marine had not yet resigned. Pious people seldom exhibit signs of honesty such as he has displayed. He claims that the hon. Minister of Maine should not remain a moment longer a member of the Cabinet and that, on the other hand, the Prime Minister ought not to keep him as his colleague on the ground that the famous report of the Civil Service Commission has not yet been taken up.

I wonder how it is that our good friends opposite feel so uneasy. Unless I am mistaken, the Commission has not criticised the administration of the Marine Department within the last four, five or even ten years, but its criticism covers a far more extended period.

The hon. gentlemen opposite were in power for eighteen years. Far too long, God knows, for the welfare of the country. However, during all those days they never thought of holding an investigation such as the one which has just been held and whose report has been laid on the Table of the House a few days ago. Why have they not done anything when they were in power and why are they now, scarcely a couple of days after the report has been tabled, so eager to discuss it? Why do they condemn the Minister and the Cabinet of which he is a member, even before studying that report?

The country to which the hon. member for East Grey has appealed by giving vent to his indignation will not take any stock in the pranks the hon. member has just indulged in. The people have confidence in the Cabinet. This very evening, I had the privilege of attending a public meeting at which reference was made to this report and particularly to the statements affecting the hon. Minister of Marine.

I can assure the members of this House that the people do not take in earnest the bold statements of the hon. gentlemen opposite and have absolute confidence in the government.

Our friends on the other side of the House want to get at the facts. Truth will out, thanks to the measures taken by the minister, and then the hon. gentlemen opposite will be the first to feel aggrieved. The government have no reason to fear investigation, for the welfare of the people is their only aim; but it was not always so, when the hon. gentlemen opposite have held investigations.

I did not intend to offer any remarks, but when I came in and noticed the hon. member for East Grey going to Great Britain to hunt out examples so as to condemn the Prime Minister for still keeping in the Cabinet the hon. Minister of Marine, I said to myself: Evidently, the hon. member for East Grey is not in his usual frame of mind.

I trust that nobody will take any stock in this discussion upon the motion that the House do now rise, started in order to deceive the public, and that this appeal to the country—whether made in earnest or not—will have, please God, the same result tomorrow as it had before, namely, the best advantage of the country.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). It seems to me the right hon. the First Minister does not fully realize the responsibility under which he is or he would have acted differently. What are the facts? Two weeks have gone by since the government have had knowledge of this report. During that time the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), if he has any knowledge whatever of the inner workings of his department, had ample opportunity to inquire into the truth of the findings of this report and take action on them or deny them absolutely. But when the report was laid on the table last Thursday we had the weakest exhibition imaginable made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He was not able to deny categorically the charges made, but he made reference in a vacillating manner to some of the findings of that commission and insinuated that something more would have to be said about the report later on. Is it to be believed that the minister, who has been at the head of the Department of Marine and Fisheries during the past two years, is ignorant of the facts that have been brought out in that report? He certainly cannot escape responsibility. Whether he was hopelessly ignorant or had any knowledge of what was going on in his department, we do not know, because he has not taken us into his confidence, but there is in this House a gentleman, who has been taking a great interest in the debate but saying nothing, who might be able to throw some light on the situation. I refer to the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) who presided over the Department of Marine and Fisheries during the absence in England of its head (Mr. Brodeur). I now beg to address myself to the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) and ask whether during the time he presided over

that department, irregularities of a serious nature were not brought to his attention ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Unquestionably, no.

Mr. BOYCE. Then, I address myself to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) : If he had to wait for a Civil Service Commission to ascertain the irregularities of his department, can he rely on the weak defense he has brought before this House and country and declare that further investigation will have to be made before he can satisfy himself, forsooth, notwithstanding his two years as head of the department, that there is or is not something in the charges that have been made ? During the time the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) presided over the Department of Marine and Fisheries, possibly he was in a position to judge of the way that department was being run ; and possibly, if he would speak, he might be able to say whether complaints were or were not made to him, or whether he did not make some comments with regard to the department as he found it or as he handed it back to the minister. Be that as it may, the situation calls for action on the part of the government. Whether the government will take action or not, we know not, but there is need for immediate action we know.

The Prime Minister must have been gratified by the eulogistic speech of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald). If the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) was, in the opinion of the hon. member for Pictou, speaking irresponsible words, I have no hesitation in saying with regard to some of the words of the hon. member for Pictou that they were the irresponsible words of an irresponsible gentleman. He said that we were to cease insinuations with regard to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that some hon. member should pledge his seat and his word, that we should, forsooth, make charges and not be content with hurling statements across the floor and casting reflections upon this pure Department of Marine and Fisheries. It is strange that an adherent of this government, be it right or be it wrong, should so far forget his position of responsibility as a representative of the people to say deliberately that it is necessary for members to make charges in a case like this. Here is the solemn finding of the commission as broad, as sufficient as it could possibly be made. Yet my hon. friend from Pictou, in the exuberance of his after dinner speech, finds that in order that these facts against the department may be brought to public attention, some gentleman must place his seat in jeopardy and make charges in this House. Possibly, on reflection, to-morrow, the hon. member (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) when he peruses his 'Hansard' will strike his pen through several lines of irresponsibilities—to use his own word against the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid)—and that he will possibly be sorry he spoke as he did under the circumstances under which he spoke. Let me say to him, as a word of advice, that one o'clock at night is a bad time to start making political speeches, possibly they will not read as well in his constituency at the time of election as they sound when he delivers them. I say that the right hon. Prime Minister must have been exceedingly gratified with the eulogistic comments of the hon. member for Pictou. That 'unerring instinct' which the hon. member for Pictou spoke of as having characterized the Prime Minister's action in dealing with charges against this government seems to have prompted the Prime Minister to strange things. It led him to vote down the resolution against Wagner, the man who stole from the poor immigrants coming into this country, and who was a prison bird. With 'unerring instinct' the Prime Minister voted that resolution down, and the government employed this criminal, this convict, this felon, at an increased salary. Another man whom the right hon. Prime Minister voted to retain at an increase of pay was named Dobbie. He was postmaster. The hon. gentleman (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) smiles. This case is a joke with him apparently. The report of the post office inspector showed that this man had stolen $1,000 from the postoffice. The Postmaster General ordered his dismissal, but, for political reasons, ordered his reinstatement. The 'unerring instinct' of the Prime Minister in dealing with charges brought to his attention in this House year after year did not prompt him to take any action in regard to this matter. These men who stole, some of whom were convicted felons, were not only not prosecuted, but were promoted for their misdoings, and for the service they rendered. The hon. member for Pictou says that the right hon. Prime Minister will investigate, that he will prosecute and that he will dismiss—I would like it if my irresponsible friend—I can call him nothing else considering the amazing position he has taken with regard to both parliamentary and legal matters in the speech he has just made—will mention one case in which the Prime Minister has shown his 'unerring instinct' by investigating anything, or prosecuting anybody, or dismissing anybody for wrongdoing brought home to him so long as he was a faithful servant or employee of the government ? If the hon. member for Pictou will consult 'Hansard' during the period he has had the honour to be a member of this House, he will find it very difficult indeed to show a case in which the Prime Minister has not refused to investigate, has not stood in the way of investigation, has not balked and forbidden investigation even though the case for in-

vestigation was clearly made out. As for dismissal, why, the right hon. gentleman far from dismissing anybody, has exalted those who have committed these wrongdoings, or rather voted to sustain the exaltation of Nixon and Wagner, the so-called gentlemen who steal from the public purse of this country.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). The Prime Minister appointed a commission to inquire into the civil service, a commission composed of men in whom he had full confidence. That commission has made a report which reflects seriously upon the government, and now the right hon. gentleman proposes to take some action to investigate the Marine and Fisheries Department, and others. Why did not the right hon. gentleman move on the report of a commission he appointed two years ago, a special committee composed of members of this House to investigate purchases made for the steamer 'Arctic'? That committee brought in a majority and a minority report. The minority report ought certainly to have attracted his attention because it contained facts which should have been acted upon at once. It was proved before that committee that 8,000 pounds of pemmican were bought at $1.25 per pound from friends of the right hon. gentleman, and that purchase amounted to $10,000. A gentleman came as a witness, but as he was refused a hearing by the majority of the commission, he made this sworn declaration:

In the matter of the 'Arctic' investigation into the supplies purchased for the 'Arctic,' under reference to a special committee of the House of Commons, by a resolution in the House of Commons on May 18, 1906.

I, Leon Constant Van Bever, of the city of Toronto, in the county of York, manager of the Canadian departments of the William Davies Company, Limited, do solemnly declare:

1. I have been for a number of years engaged in the manufacture of meat products, including meat extracts, such as fluid beef, solid extract of beef, beef cordial, powdered, dried and fresh beef, and various products made therefrom.

2. I have examined a sample of the pemmican (so-called) furnished for the 'Arctic' expedition, and the firm with which I am connected would be pleased to furnish to the government, or any institution or individual, an article similar and equal in quality to such sample in lots of 1,000 pounds or over, packed in ten pound tins, boxed, strapped and ready for shipping freight prepaid to any railway station in Canada at the price of 35 cents per pound.

3. My said company have been willing to supply the same article at the same price at any time during the year 1904.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act 1893.

(Sgd.) L. C. VAN BEVER.

Declared before me at the city of Ottawa, in the county of Carleton, this 26th day of June, A.D. 1906.

(Sgd.) F. M. BURBIDGE.
Notary Public for Ontario.

Now if this 8,000 pounds of pemmican had been purchased for 35 cents a pound, it would have come to $2,800; therefore, there was a rake-off for some one of $7,200, Take another case of a lot of bovril bought from some of his friends, 5,900 pounds at $1.65. We put a witness in the box who swore that he would have supplied the same article at $1.10, showing another rake-off of $3,245. Then another one of their friends supplied 805 pounds of tobacco at $1.34; and we put a member of this House into the witness box who swore that he would have supplied the same quality of tobacco at 67 cents per pound; showing another rake-off of $539. These facts were all placed in the hands of the Prime Minister, and yet he refused to act. But now when his own commission have made a report which shocks the country, the Prime Minister says he is going to move in the matter. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture is not in the House now, or I would refer to a statement he made vindicating every purchase that was made in connection with the 'Arctic'. I would like his constituents to read this declaration of Mr. Van Bever, perhaps they would not take the same view of it that the Minister of Agriculture takes. The Prime Minister knew that all these rake-offs were going on and yet he refused to move. Now however he says he is going to move in regard to the Militia Department, and I think he would find the same bad state of affairs existing in all the departments. We cannot spend a hundred millions of dollars in this country and spend it properly. Here is how the money is frittered away—one friend getting a rake off on a few pounds of pemmican of $7,000, another on bovril of $3,000 and another on a few pounds of tobacco of $5,000. That is the way the money is going, and when it is brought to his attention the right hon. Prime Minister says that he will move in the matter. But he is moving too slowly. The country wants him to move quickly. We do not want this government to spend more money until we know that the country is going to get better value than they have been getting in the past.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton). It is something like old times to hear the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) speak because of the last three speakers we have had on the other side of the House, not one has said a word about the 'Arctic.' Every one has kept away from that old familiar subject. If there is one subject in regard to which this government was

more thoroughly vindicated than another it was the question of expenditure upon the 'Arctic.' I think I can safely say that there was value received for the expenditure of the country connected with that boat. I recall speaking on that occasion, and I then said and I still think that in so far as the 'Arctic' is concerned, the country got value for what was paid. I think that if no greater impression is made upon the country than that which hon. gentlemen opposite succeeded in making with reference to the 'Arctic' it cannot have much effect.

In regard to this report, in so far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, I do not think they are particularly anxious for it, to be acted upon or that they are absolutely sincere in the views which they have put before the House to-night. In so far as my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and the government are concerned, the report has only been in their possession a short time. The report, everybody admits, is an important one, one which must be taken cognizance of, Therefore, it appears to me to be absolutely without the mark for hon. members on the other side of the House to say that, because the report has been on the table of the House for three days the government are absolutely guilty of delaying of waiting of hesitating and of vacillating in regard to it. It does not appear that any time has been lost because it is an important report and surely in three days it would be absolutely impossible for the government to make up their minds as to what they should do in regard to it. It appears to me that if the opposition had wanted to show their good faith they would have endeavoured to allow it to go and adopt some measure in regard to this report and they would have allowed the members of the government to go home and get some rest, rather than keep them here until this late hour of the night in order that they might be in a better position to prepare the policy which they desire to adopt in regard to this question. Certainly the action of hon. gentlemen opposite will not tend to bring the action of the government upon the report down any quicker. As far as that is concerned, the government have not been guilty of any laches and I have no doubt that they will do more than hon. gentlemen opposite would desire them to do. As soon as they have had time to take cognizance of the report they will bring down such a measure as will put matters to rights, if is is necessary that they should be put to rights. The most that the country will expect the government to do will be to take cognizance of the report, and I feel confident that they will not be slow to form a sound judgment with regard to it, and that they will not lack courage to adopt a policy that will give general satisfaction to the country.

Mr. PARDEE.

I want to say a word in reference to what the hon. member for Leeds has stated here, that in so far as the Minister of Marine is concerned, he had gone on, even in the face of what was disclosed with reference to the Merwin contracts in the Public Accounts Committee, still purchasing articles from Merwin. Since the Minister of Marine and Fisheries became Minister of Marine there have been purchased from Merwin $122,437 worth of supplies of which he himself has only been responsible for $674.50. In other words the present incumbent has only purchased on original contracts from Merwin $674; so that it is not fair for any member of this House to stand up and say that in the face of overcharges of 25 and 50 per cent having been shown in the Public Accounts Committee, goods were bought from Merwin. In the next breath they say that the minister is still responsible for all the goods that have been purchased by him from Merwin knowing, as a matter of fact, that the present incumbent had only purchased $674 worth of goods from Merwin, during his own incumbency and during the years which he has been the responsible minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have always been under the impression that a minister taking a department was politically responsible for all the acts of his predecessors. Does the hon. gentleman controvert that?

Mr. PARDEE. My point is simply that you could not have contracts and absolutely repudiate those contracts without being liable in the same way as a private individual.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That was not the point the hon. gentleman was making. The point he was making, was that the minister was not responsible because these contracts were made by his predecessor.

Mr. PARDEE. Yes, I say the minister is not responsible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not politically responsible?

Mr. PARDEE. No, not politically responsible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a new doctrine.

Mr. PARDEE. He is in the same position as a private individual. If the contracts were there and he repudiated them the government would be liable in damages. All he has done is to carry out the contracts that were made by his predecessor and all he purchased were a few small

repairs amounting to $674. There have been no new orders given by the minister to Merwin. I think that is something that should be placed before the House and the country because it is a different impression that is attempted to be conveyed by hon. gentlemen opposite. As far as the present administrator of the department is concerned, I think he is administering it well, that he is administering it in the interest of the country, and with a singleness of purpose, and I feel satisfied that he recognizes that it is time to put his house in order, and that it will be in an absolutely satisfactory condition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before inquiring into the business of the House, I would like to say that the doctrine of political responsibility enunciated by the hon. gentleman is in absolute antagonism to every authority on the subject. I would like to ask the Prime Minister what business we will take up to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I dissent very much from the constitutional doctrine of my hon. friend, but this is not the time to discuss it. We will take it up later on.

Mr. FIELDING. We will take up concurrence and the necessary proceedings with respect to the Supply Bill and then the budget debate.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.13 a.m., Tuesday.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 31, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 138) respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 137) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 139) for the relief of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell.—Mr. Galliher.

### BRIGHTON WHARF.

On the orders of the day being called :

Mr. C. L. OWEN. Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask if it is the intention of the government to take over, put in thorough repair and extend the wharf at the village of Brighton, in the riding of East Northumberland ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to give my hon. friend an answer to this question to-day. Perhaps he would kindly give notice of the question and I will see that the necessary information is at hand when I come to answer it.

### THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. When may we expect the report of the Public Accounts Committee relating to the Ross rifle ? It is some weeks since the evidence was taken and the report has not been brought down. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) inquired about this on Friday night, but I see from 'Hansard' there was no answer to the inquiry.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend is aware that the government has absolutely nothing to do with that. The Public Accounts Committee sat to-day, I understand, and that would be the place and the occasion to raise the question.

### RETURNS UNOPPOSED.

Mr. J. D. REID. Would it be possible to have orders No. 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32 on the Order Paper (relating to locomotives, late trains, and new steel rails on the Intercolonial Railway) allowed to go as unopposed motions on Monday next, as it is necessary that I should have these papers when we are discussing the estimates ?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Certainly, I will give instructions now to start hunting the information.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). I desire the same privilege in regard to orders No. 33 and 34 relating to the demand of the Charlottetown Board of Trade or others respecting loading of coal vessels and correspondence, &c., and to Prince Edward Island freight rates.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would ask the same privilege with regard to order No. 27 (relating to the purchase of blankets, Militia Department).

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. These orders will come up on Monday.

### QUEBEC BRIDGE COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have the government any information as to when we may expect the printed copies of the report of the Quebec Bridge Commission ?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I cannot give the information. The portion of the report previously brought down is in the printers' hands.

## WESTERN ENTRANCE, TORONTO HARBOUR.

Mr. CLAUDE MACDONELL. What is the delay in the letting of the contract for the new western entrance to Toronto harbour ? Tenders were in two or three weeks ago.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). There is no delay beyond the ordinary delay which takes place in the letting of all important contracts. The matter is now going through the regular course.

## SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Mr. FIELDING. In order that we may advance the Supply Bill covering the items which have already been approved by the House, it becomes necessary that I should move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means. We have already a motion to that effect before us, on which is proceeding the budget debate, and I suggest that we might, with the unanimous consent of the House, agree to adopt that motion now for this purpose, and that, immediately after the Supply Bill is disposed of, the motion be restored to its present position, and the budget debate proceed.

## SHIPPING RINGS.

Mr. C. L. OWEN (East Northumberland). Mr. Speaker, there is a matter I wish to bring up before this motion is carried. The following is a clipping of Canadian news from an American paper :

Last week at a meeting of the Royal Commission investigating shipping rings in London, England, J. C. Eaton, head of the great department store business of Canada, appeared and said that transport between Britain and Canada was in the hands of the Canadian and North Atlantic conference, and the action of the latter had been to force ocean rates up on Canadian traffic but not advance rates on United States traffic. The companies interested in the combination against the interest of the Canadian Atlantic trade were, according to Mr. Eaton, the largest importer perhaps in the Dominion, the Allan line, the Canadian Pacific, the Dominion line, and the Manchester lines, which he alleges have agreed to force up British rates to Canada from 10 to 15 shillings per ton measurement on westbound goods for any Canadian port except Montreal, while if the goods were for points in the western States half the ocean rates are accepted. He also alleged that German traders are given lower rates than British.

I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to that.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. About a year ago we received an intimation that it was the intention of His Majesty's government to appoint a royal commission to deal with the question commonly described as that of shipping rings, and we were asked whether we would care to nominate a member of that commission. Although at the moment there was no special matter in which Canada seemed to be concerned, still we thought it desirable to respond to the invitation of His Majesty's government, and accordingly a gentleman belonging to the government service, and having a special knowledge of the shipping business, in the person of Mr. Isaac H. Mathers, assistant receiver general at Halifax, was nominated, with an allowance for travelling expenses, but without any extra allowance for services. Mr. Mathers went to London and attended the meetings of the commission. The proceedings moved very slowly. Mr. Mathers came back to Canada and went again to London. The work moved slowly, and seemed to be of such comparatively small interest to Canada, that Mr. Mathers doubted whether any good purpose could be served by his remaining. The Minister of Trade and Commerce therefore recalled him. Recently a matter arose in which Canada was interested and the minister requested Lord Strathcona to authorize one of his staff to represent Canada. I think the interests of Canada in the matter referred to are being looked after by Mr. Griffith of the High Commissioner's office.

Mr. SPROULE. As I have a circular on what is a cognate subject, perhaps this is an opportune time to bring it to the notice of the House. It is as follows:

London, March 21, 1908.

Sir,—My executive committee have instructed me to forward you a copy of a letter sent by them to all the principal millers and shippers of flour from Canada. The letter inclosed explains itself, and my committee hope that they can depend on your good offices to get a bill of lading which is an injustice to Canada, made into a fair and equitable document.

Both Australia and the United States of America have had the same difficulties with steamship owners in the past, and these were overcome by the Sea Carriage of Goods Act, 1904, as regards Australian shippers, and the Harter Act, as regards the United States of America.

Thanking you on behalf of my committee,
I remain, sir, your obedient servant,
W. T. ODAM,
Honorary Secretary.

This is the circular letter which was sent:

London Flour Trade Association,
Corn Exchange, London, E.C.,
January, 1908.

Gentlemen,—This association has had several interviews and some correspondence with the Canadian Federation of Steamship Lines with reference to the bill of lading on which flour is shipped to London, and we under-

stood in June last that the whole question was referred to Montreal, but up to to-day, we have heard nothing.

We can do practically nothing more on this side, and it rests with the millers and shippers of flour in Canada to bring such pressure to bear that the clauses objected to should be taken out of the bill of lading altogether.

In the first instance, shippers are to blame for accepting a through bill of lading, containing a clause (14) which reads as follows: 'The property covered by this bill of lading is subject to all the conditions expressed in local bills of lading used by the steamship, or steamship companies carrying this property at the time of shipment,' without either knowing or caring what objectionable clauses there may be in the local bill of lading by which all shipments must be made, and by which, in one instance at least, that is specified later, might make their documents practically valueless. This is a most serious matter to all concerned in the flour trade, both shippers in Canada and receivers in London.

The clauses in the sea-board bill of lading are here given, and each clause is followed by this association's objections in red. The Thomson line local bill of lading is the one which is actually before us, but the Canadian Pacific Steamship Company has exactly the same clauses, although in some instances they are numbered differently. The points at issue are as follows, viz.:

Clause No. 1. Reads that among other things, 'the ship is not responsible for hook marks or injury from hooks, stowage or contact with, or smell or evaporation from any other goods or from live stock or their excretions however caused, &c.,' and then goes on to say 'quarantine expenses upon the goods of whatever nature or kind shall be borne by the owners of the goods.'

Surely the steamship company should be responsible for tearing and loss of flour if they permit hooks to be used, and the steamship company should also be responsible for taint through improper stowage, while for human food to be in danger of being rendered unfit for human consumption owing to excretions of live stock which the ships carry entirely for their own profit, and for the ships not to be liable is iniquitous. Then surely quarantine expenses should be borne by the ship and not by the goods.

Clause 2. This contract or any question arising thereunder shall be governed by the law of England, &c.

This clause makes it doubly important that only just and reasonable clauses should be in the bill of lading, especially as it has been decided in the high courts of justice, quite recently, that if shippers accept such a document as this, then the receivers here must bear the consequences thereof.

Clause No. 3. Notwithstanding any written description in this bill of lading, the ship and shipowners are not accountable for the description, weight, measure, gauge, quality, condition, quantity, brand, contents and value of the cargo, all of which are unknown.

Clause No. 4. The owners of the vessel are not answerable for any discrepancies between the shipping marks, as described above, and the actual marks on the goods; nor for any difference between the contents of the packages and description of the same in the bill of lading as herein described and those actually delivered.

This association consider both clauses should be deleted, for they relieve the shipowners of all responsibility as to brands, which practically means that they can deliver brands indiscriminately at this end without penalty. For instance, supposing a merchant buys a high patent and the steamship company deliver low grade, under this clause there is no redress.

Clause 5, in part, reads as follows: But nevertheless the goods may be delivered to the consignee named therein without the production of an endorsed bill of lading, and such delivery shall free the master, owners and agents from all liability to deliver the goods to any other person.

It is of vital importance to the trade that this clause should be deleted, for it gives the shipowner the power to deliver the goods without production of bill of lading, or presumably, without a proper guarantee, and such clause would prevent altogether the security of such documents being of any avail to bankers or other bona fide holders, in fact, it destroys altogether the financial value of the bill of lading.

Clause 7. The shipowner is not to be liable for any damage to any goods however caused which is capable of being covered by insurance.

This seems to be a general exemption clause from all liability for damage and should be eliminated.

Clause 16. The agents of the ship to have the option of forwarding cargo by craft, on deck, or under, at ship's expense and shippers' risk.

It is absolutely an unheard of thing to carry flour on the deck, so that this clause requires no further comment.

Clause 18. That the shipowners shall in no case be responsible for any loss or damage thereof, or in any wise relating thereto, whether such loss or damage arise from defects, or insufficiency, either before or after shipment, in the hull of the said steamers, &c., &c.

This clause should be expunged.

My committee suggest the addition to the Canadian bill of lading of a notification clause as follows:

'Carriers of goods on through bill of lading shall notify consignees accordingly on receipt of steamer's manifest.'

It is suggested by my executive committee that if the steamship companies do not wish to issue new bills of lading that they enter into an agreement with my association by which these objectionable clauses may be considered null and void.

Yours faithfully,

W. T. ODAM,
Honorary Secretary.

My object is to bring this matter to the attention of the government, so as to induce them to bring such pressure to bear on the steamship companies as will induce them to amend these regulations so that they will be more equitable and suitable for the pro-

tection of the shipper on this side and the receiver on the other.

Mr. FIELDING. I received a circular, no doubt of the same nature as the one my hon. friend has read. I imagine it has been sent to every member of parliament. I do not think the matter has officially been brought before the government, but I believe a Bill touching that subject is now before the Senate.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There was a deputation down here last week on that very matter.

Mr. FIELDING. Possibly, but I had not the pleasure of meeting them. They may have met some of my colleagues. I think there is a Bill before the Senate which, I imagine, covers the same ground, so that we shall probably have an opportunity of passing upon it.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

Mr. FIELDING. The items of Supply which have been passed from time to time have, as usual, been collected by the proper officials, and I have now two resolutions to submit to the committee for the purpose of confirming the appropriations already made. I may say that the appropriations made by way of supplementary estimates for the year 1907-8, which closes to-day, amount to $5,319,633.32. Accordingly, one of the resolutions which I have to submit reads as follows :

Resolved, that, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1908, amounting to $5,319,633.32, the same be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

There are other appropriations covering the coming year. A portion of these appropriations were voted in full, amounting to $4,585,415.06. In addition to this, there was a vote on account of one-eighth of the remainder, amounting to $11,246,403.06, making, altogether, $15,831,818.12 voted for the service of the year. I have a similar resolution providing for this amount. I move the first of these resolutions as just read.

Mr. HENDERSON. It would be interesting to the committee, I am sure, to know exactly the total appropriations for the year which closes to-day. Perhaps the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has the figures and can give us the total.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not these figures at hand, but I should be happy to get them and send them to my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask whether or not the estimates brought down for the fiscal year 1908-9 have been prepared on the same basis as in the past? That is, are we to expect next year supplementary estimates of the same character and practically of the same amount as those brought down year after year in the past, or has the government adopted any different rule in the preparation of these estimates?

Mr. FIELDING. I think the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) showed me that in his case he had taken in the main estimates all that he was likely to require for the year. Speaking generally, the aim is to take, as far as may be, the appropriations for the entire year. I think that, under our system of government, we may not hope at any time that we shall avoid wholly the necessity of bringing down supplementary estimates. To what extent it may be necessary to have supplementary estimates is always a fair subject of debate. I hope it will not be necessary during the coming year to have as large supplementaries as for the year just closing. In this, I speak of the final supplementaries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not prepared to deny that there will be a need of supplementary estimates now and again. But what I have objected to in connection with that subject is the preparation of the estimates in the first instance with the thorough understanding that they will not be sufficient for the purpose intended and that supplementary estimates will be brought down to make these good. My observation and my inquiries in this House would lead me to believe that, in the majority of the departments, that is the practice. It is a practice which I have never been able quite to understand. One might suppose that it originated in a desire to make a good financial showing. But, when a few years have elapsed, surely that reason entirely disappears; for, when one endeavours to ascertain what the financial expenditure for a particular year will be he naturally looks to the supplementary estimates of the past year and adds that amount to the estimates brought down for the ensuing year, and that method of computation has been found to hold fairly good in the past. It may be necessary that some supplementary estimates should be brought down, for there will always be emergencies and unforeseen cases and cases unprovided for. But the system I object to is the one, to which I have alluded, of preparing estimates in the first place with a thorough understanding that they are not sufficient and having in view supplementary estimates to be asked for later on.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to add a word to what has been said by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) with regard to the method of preparing the estimates. Surely, in nearly all the departments a very close approximation could be made to the requirements of the service. Of course, I do not expect that any of the departments

can always strike just the requisite sum. But what I object to more even than that which has been referred to is the undertaking of works during the course of the year for which no estimate has been made and then, at the close of the year, asking a vote in the form of a supplementary estimate for moneys that have been expended without the authority of parliament and for work that was practically not required. I gave an illustration a few evenings ago of a work in my own county. The Minister of Public Works asked us to approve a vote of $5,100 for dredging in a small harbour. Now, that dredging was simply not required —it was a useless work and is so regarded by the people living there. It was a work inaugurated by the Public Works Department, not something to complete what had already been estimated for, but a work undertaken, as the people living there believe, merely for the purpose of giving employment to a dredge or dredging company. That $5,100 should not have been expended by the government; the government had no authority whatever for paying out that money. I do not like the idea of voting these considerable sums after the money has been spent. I think that, as a matter of courtesy to the House, we should first be asked whether we approve of the undertaking.

If the House approves of it and votes the money, very well, the government is justified in expending it. But when the government comes down with an estimate for a small work like that of over $5,000, and asks this House to vote money they have already expended without the consent of parliament, I think it is going a little too far, and not treating parliament with that courtesy with which it ought to be treated. I hope that items of this kind will not appear in the supplementary estimates of next year. If the government have not asked for a sufficient amount to do the work, let the work lie over until they get parliamentary authority, then if the House approves of it, let them expend the money. Now, I hope I have made myself plain. I have on former occasions protested against spending money without the consent of parliament. I do not know how the Minister of Finance regards this, but I can look at it in no other way. I think that we on this side of the House, by pressing this matter, can assist the Minister of Finance very much in keeping down the expenditures of the country. If the different departments go on spending money without the consent of parliament you may rest assured that the expenditure of the country is going to grow, and grow rapidly. The way to check it is for the government first to get the consent of parliament for the expenditure, and if that is strictly adhered to—and I hope the Minister of Finance will hold all the departments strictly to account for expenditures of that kind—I am satisfied that the expenditures of this country will not go on increasing as rapidly as they have done.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no knowledge of the facts of the particular case to which my hon. friend refers, therefore I can only speak with reference to the general principle. The general principle he lays down is one with which I agree. Dredging, however, I think is usually done out of a general vote, unless there are exceptional circumstances when special votes are asked for. But a large amount of dredging is done under a general vote, and it is quite possible that an amount of dredging might be ordered which in the end would probably be somewhat in excess of the appropriation. I quite agree that no public works should be undertaken except and until parliament has authorized the vote. As to the general principle I agree with the hon. gentleman, and will endeavour to enforce it.

Mr. HENDERSON. If this expenditure to which I refer had been paid out of the general vote, why come down on the last day of the fiscal year and ask for a vote to cover it? If it was all covered by a general vote, why should we be asked again to vote it? It left the impression on my mind that it was not covered by a general vote; in fact I understood the Minister of Public Works to say, when I drew his attention to the matter, that this dredging was not yet paid for and that the dredging company had to await the passing of this item before they could receive the money. I am glad to know that the Minister of Finance approves of the principle, and I hope, in the interest of the country, that he will see that the various departments observe that principle; and we on this side of the House will be glad to assist him in keeping down expenditure in that way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I agree entirely with what has been said by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), except that I would be inclined to regard the course pursued in the case he refers to as something more than a lack of courtesy to the House; it is a violation of the law and of constitutional usage.

Mr. FIELDING. Where was the place?

Mr. HENDERSON. Bronte harbour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know anything about the circumstances of the case; but, as they have been stated, it is perfectly plain that the government have been guilty of a violation of the law. They are only entitled to undertake a work of that kind when they have a parliamentary appropriation, or have provided money by the Governor General's warrant, if the case fell within any one of the emergencies covered by statute in that regard. So this is not so light a matter as has been suggested; it is

one that I think demands the gravest consideration of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING. Is there in these estimates a special vote for dredging at that point?

Mr. HENDERSON. There is a special vote in the supplementaries, for which we are now passing a Supply Bill, for that particular place, and that money, let me tell the Minister of Finance, had all been spent before any appropriation had ever been made for it. I understood the Minister of Public Works to say that the dredging company was still awaiting payment; consequently they were not paid out of the general vote.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to another thing, an example of which has been before the House lately, and which leads to a great deal of abuse. Parties interested in a certain possible expenditure interview some minister with reference thereto, whether this expenditure is one which the government has ever contemplated or not. What is done to satisfy the applicant is for the minister to say: Well, I will send an engineer and I will have an investigation made. Now on general principles that might be said to be a perfectly fair thing to do, to send an engineer before you take any other steps. But what I complain of is that this is done in cases where nothing is ever intended to follow the sending of the engineer and the engineer is sent at public expense merely to satisfy the applicant for the time being, without any thought of construction following. Now a circumstance like that has happened with reference to the city of Toronto. Does the Finance Minister and the government seriously contemplate putting Dominion money into building a subway for the citizen's traffic in the city of Toronto, between the city and the Island? Is that an appropriation which the government seriously thinks it can undertake, and has it really undertaken to expend public moneys in that way? Mind you, this is simply the extension of the street and traffic system of the city of Toronto. An application was made and a deputation has waited upon the Minister of Public Works and I understand that the minister has expressed sympathy with the undertaking. Then he authorized a government engineer, at government expense, to go down and look over the situation and make a report to him. I would like to know from the Finance Minister whether the government has any serious intention of undertaking either in whole or in part, a work of that kind. If it has, why then it can give its reasons therefor; if it has not, it is the worst of all things to lead the people of Toronto to believe that the government are going to make an appropriation of public money for a work of that kind.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend asks me a general question to which I can only say that the government have no intention to make any such expenditure of public money. All I know of the matter he refers to is that, in answer to an inquiry in the House a few days ago, I think by my hon. friend himself, the Minister of Public Works said that a deputation having brought that matter to his notice, he would cause inquiry to be made by an engineer. Being asked the question whether the engineer was to be sent specially for that purpose, the Minister of Public Works said that the resident engineer in the city of Toronto would be requested to make a report upon the subject. Speaking not with reference to that particular work but to works generally, it is sometimes the least courtesy you can extend to a public deputation when they bring a matter before you, to promise to have an inquiry made, especially if the inquiry does not cost much. I would not agree that the promise of the Minister of Public Works that an inquiry would be made necessarily commits the government to do anything, or necessarily leads any one astray. It is difficult to say to a deputation that under no conditions will we listen to them; they have a right at any rate to have an inquiry into their request. If the request will not stand examination no public money should be expended, but if there is no more serious charge against the minister than that in response to a deputation he said he would direct his engineer to make an inquiry, I think it will be agreed that that is not a very grave accusation.

Mr. FOSTER. Then in this case it does not mean anything.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not now what it means.

Mr. BENNETT. It is quite clear that the dredge was sent there owing to the fact that it is owned by those into whose hands the dredging in Ontario has been delivered. The dredging outfit sent to Bronte is the Phin outfit. The Phins were honest, decent painters in their way. but with the change of government they blossomed into dredging people. The estimates for last year show an appropriation of $4,000 for Bronte, repairs to piers, &c.; there is no mention of dredging. But, I assume that after completing the summer's work these contractors had a dredge that was not being used, and as these dredging outfits are masters of the people, he simply placed that dredge in Bronte and charged up $5,000 for dredging. The minister says there is a general grant for dredging and he assumes this amount is taken from that grant. There was a large grant for dredging and not only was it exhausted but we voted $107,000 for general dredging in Ontario and Quebec in the supplementary estimates. Unfortunately it does not specify

how much went to Ontario and how much to Quebec. I suppose in many cases the dredge is sent into a harbour before the contractors are directed to send it by the department. At Southampton one of the Bowman dredges was sent in. No request had been made by the town council or any one but the Bowmans sent in a dredge and earned, I think, $5,000.

Let us look at some of these items for dredging. For Yamaska there was an appropriation of $20,510 and in the original estimates, $15,000 for dredging. I am not sure whether this was done by those active politicians in Montreal, the Cohen Company or the Ottawa Company which is controlled by the son of the hon. member for Ottawa, a young man who a few years ago was engaged as an insurance agent about town, but who now has blossomed into one of these millionaire contractors with dredging outfits. For Ontario, I notice there was $116,500 for dredging. These look like large figures, but when you have a dredging outfit with the contractor's own inspector standing around town and the dredge charging up work at $2 a yard instead of 30 cents a yard, classing material as rock instead of sand, it is no wonder that we have these colossal figures. The Boone Company was a struggling dredging company doing a little business, pottering around the lakes up to a few years ago, but by the aid of powerful political influence they have succeeded in wresting $2,000,000 from the people of Canada, and the inspector who was appointed to supervise their work was displaced by reason of the president of the board of trade at Collingwood asking for his removal on the ground that the country was not getting return for the money expended. The Great Lakes Dredging Company earned $1,300,000 in a few years.

Then take the company of which Hon. A. G. McKay is the controlling spirit. it has secured over $300,000. It is not a question of the country finding employment for the dredges, it is a question of the dredging outfits finding some place to go and work, and the disclosures from day to day show that these men are not earning their money. If the First Minister should go to the Public Accounts Committee he would find the tenders of two rival companies written by one and the same man ; the secretary-treasurer of the one company actually wrote the tenders for both. The very envelopes are a tell-tale, but the handwriting is so plain it cannot be mistaken. The First Minister may say : Why not investigate that in the Public Accounts Committee? I cannot do that; there was no payment with reference to work done under that tender last year so I am estopped. Does not the Prime Minister think it is high time inquiry should be made into this matter? There were two works to be done, one at Midland and the other at Matchedash bay. A company at Midland of which F. W. Grant, a brother of the hon. member for North Ontario is president, and another competing company, the Penetanguishene Company tendered, and the tender of the Penetanguishene Company is written by Mr. Grant who also wrote the tender of the Midland Company. Is not that a startling state of affairs? The figures are so arranged that the Penetanguishene Company are the low tenderers as between the two for the Matchedash work and the Midland people are the low tenderers for the Midland work.

It has got to such a stage that these dredging outfits simply laugh at parliament and at the people. Does not the first minister think this is a case for inquiry and investigation even though I may be precluded from inquiry by the fact that there is no item for this in the current year's expenditure. It is high time that these dredging concerns and their representatives and their owners should be taught that they cannot collude in an attempt to defraud the people of Canada. It is up to the first minister to institute an inquiry. I brought the matter up in the Public Accounts Committee but I was stopped by reason of the fact that I could not show any expenditure this year under these contracts, but there are the two tenders and as plain as the noonday sun the figures on the tenders of these two rival companies are written by the one man. It is simply startling. If the first minister will direct the Public Accounts Committee to allow an inquiry as to these two tenders, that will be proved up to the hilt because there is no mistaking the handwriting. A number of gentlemen on this side of the House have seen the tenders and they are all as convinced as I am that they are in the handwriting of Grant. Let me give another instance to show the collusion and fraud that is going on in connection with these dredging tenders. The Owen Sound Company and the Penetanguishene Company put in supposedly rival tenders, and the tender of the Penetanguishene Company was inclosed in the private envelope of Mr. McKay who is the leading spirit in the Owen Sound Company, and I may tell the first minister that when McKay's agent was brought down here and when Dr. Spohn of the other company was brought down here, they both glibly swore there was no collussion between them and they asked reasonable men to believe that they could not account for how these envelopes came into their possession. The witness Wilkinson on behalf of the Owen Sound Company said I do not deny they are envelopes furnished to me by McKay but I do not know how Spohn became possessed of these envelopes. Well, the fact is they never dreamed the envelopes would be preserved. The country will have to judge of the evidence of these two men and where they are best known the country will judge, and the country as a

whole will believe that the tenders were so arranged that each party was contracting not for a special work, but that there was collusion from the very outset and that the evidence of that is clinched by the presence of the tenders in the same envelopes. I now ask the first minister if he will direct the Minister of Public Works to allow a full and free inquiry in the Public Accounts committee ?

Mr. CLARKE. Did you not go into that matter thoroughly the other day in the committee?

Mr. BENNETT. I will tell what I did. When Dr. Spohn was giving evidence I handed him the tender put in by the Penetanguishene Company, his own company, and I asked him if it was his signature. He said it was the signature of Kastener, one of his partners. I then asked him if the body of the tender was in Kastener's writing and he said apparently it was not. I then showed him the handwriting of Grant signed on behalf of the Midland Company, and I asked him if he did not believe they were the same and his answer was that he was not a handwriting expert.

Mr. CLARKE. That matter has not been reported to the House yet.

Mr. BENNETT. That is true but it has all been printed. These men have got so bold in connection with these dredging operations that they do what they like. I ask the first minister if he will allow the bringing of witnesses before the committee to prove that these two tenders of these different companies are written by the one man. The figures are the same, the handwriting is plainly the same and the only difference is that Grant signed on behalf of one company and this man Kastener signed on behalf of the Penetanguishene Company. It is extraordinary to think that the government will not investigate into this. If that matter has been brought before the Civil Service Commission I have not the least doubt in the world that they would have reported upon it. The government should be the guardians of the people's money and they should hold an inquiry into this matter. No wonder my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Schell) stood up in the House one night and said he had been asked by dredging men to go into their companies. Why should they want him if they did not think they would get a party advantage out of his presence in the company. Let me tell the first minister in connection with this very same Midland Dredging Company that I have stated it repeatedly on the platform and in the committee that this so-called Midland Dredging Company has among its other stockholders a son of Senator McMullen. There is no doubt about it. These people around Midland boast of what they can do on account of their political connections. Senator McMullen met me in the corridor and said he wished to tell me something and that for the future he did not wish me to associate his son's name with that dredging company. I said : He is a stockholder in the company. He said : He was formerly but by reason of the disclosures in connection with the dredging I made him dispose of his stock. I remarked to him : You are losing very handsome profits, and he assented to the fact that the profits were pretty handsome. It is openly canvassed on the streets of the different towns of the north country where stock is held in these companies that the profits arising from them run from fifty to seventy-five per cent. I believe every word of it when I remember the financial standing of men who a few years ago had an old dredge probably worth $3,000 or $4,000 and who today have in the harbours, dredges that are worth $100,000, and as a writer recently said in an English paper of others they lavishly display their vulgar wealth and openly boast of it. Look at the opportunities they are afforded when they can put one of these dredges into a bay and with the aid and connivance of a friendly inspector earn, $500, $600 or $700 a day. No wonder it is that the Boone Company has scooped in already $2,000,000, that the Great Lakes Dredging Company have had $1,300,000 and that the Owen Sound have captured $350,000. I am going to ask for a return as to what amount of money has been earned by this Stewart Company of Ottawa, so-called. I was not prepared to-day to discuss this whole question of the dredging but I intend to do so later on. However as the first minister was here I thought it was a most excellent opportunity to ask him to direct the Minister of Public Works to allow a full and free inquiry in the Public Accounts Committee along the lines I have indicated, and if so I will prove beyond demonstration that the handwriting in the tender of the so-called Midland Company and the handwriting in the tender of the Penetanguishene Company is all in the handwriting of Mr. Grant except the signature in one case. It is up to the first minister to say whether or not there will be an inquiry along these lines and I want him to answer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Since my hon. friend has put a question to me in that way, I must say that he has taken me by surprise. He is more familiar with these matters that I am, and when he asks me thus suddenly to grant an inquiry into a statement just made on the floor of parliament in that way, he surely must realize that I am not in a position to give him an answer.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I will try and make myself more plain. There are to-day

on the files of the Public Accounts Committee four tenders, two of them on behalf of the Penetanguishene Dredging Company and two on behalf of the Midland Dredging Company and all four of these tenders, and the figures as well, are in the handwriting of the secretary-treasurer of the Midland Dredging Company. Surely on the face of it that looks like a fraudulant tender when two supposedly rival dredging companies have their tenders written by the same man, and that they are written by Mr. Grant I know owing to the fact that I know his handwriting. The only difference is that the tender of this Penetanguishene Company was signed by Mr. Kastener. But I am prevented from an inquiry into the two contracts owing to the fact that there has been no expenditure mentioned in the Auditor General's Report in respect to them.

Mr. PATERSON. If my hon. friend would take a word of advice from me—I am an older parliamentarian than he is—it will not be given in anything but a friendly spirit. He is a critic in this House, properly so ; that is a part of the duty of the opposition ; but if he will permit me to say so, the weight of his criticisms is wholly discounted by the statements that he accompanies them with the insinuations that he throws out. When I have noticed so often that he has been told point blank by those who know that the statements he has made have been utterly without foundation, that shakes any reliance I might have on his criticisms being in the public interest ; and when I notice that his criticisms are invariably, I think I may say, coupled with insinuations of wrong-doing, whether it be by a minister or by some member of the House, or by his cousin or his aunt, it seems to me that he only weakens his position. With reference to myself, I think I have been long enough in parliament to have, except when my Scotch rises, a judicial temper, and I am willing to listen to criticisms and give weight to them ; but when criticisms are offered in the way the hon. gentleman offers them, it cannot fail to weaken their effect. I only rise because a matter of dredging in Bronte Harbour has been brought up. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) alluded to it. Then the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) rises and says it is very easy to see why this dredging was done in Bronte Harbour—it was done by the Phins, friends of the Minister of Customs. Now, what was the necessity of bringing my name in, as if I had done anything wrong, or as if I had something to do with getting Mr. Phin a job of dredging in that harbour ? When I know that the hon. gentleman's insinuation is absolutely without any foundation, my faith in all his criticisms is shaken. He says Mr. Phin is a friend of the Minister of Customs.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. minister deny that they are well known to him and strong political friends of his ?

Mr. PATERSON. I will not deny that they are well known to me. So is the hon. gentleman well known to me ; so is the hon. member for Halton ; so are other members of this House, and a great many other respectable men known to me. The hon. gentleman says these Phins, of Brantford, are friends of the Minister of Customs. They are very well known to me, and are very respectable men, so far as I know. That they were ever engaged in the painting business I have no knowledge. They are not living in Brantford now, but in the town of Welland. I believe they are honourable men ; I hold that opinion until something is proved to the contrary. As to the suggestion that because they were friends of mine they got that job, all I can say is that I had no knowledge that they got it, and that I did not even know that there was any dredging being done at Bronte. I only mention this as an illustration in my own individual case of the hon. gentleman's method of criticism, which shakes my faith in all he says. Will he take a word from me ? He is not without ability, and I find no fault in his seeking to delve into everything that is wrong ; but I think it will be agreed by all that one who criticises will strengthen his criticisms if he leaves out these insinuations, which are without foundation. That is all I wanted to say. I want to enter into no controversy with the hon. gentleman. Of course, I would like to stand well in his opinion, as in everybody else's ; but if he has not confidence in what I am telling him now, it will be my misfortune. I only ask that when he mentions my name in connection with the matter again, if he thinks there is anything improper about it, he would give some reasons for thinking so. I ask him now, in all honour, why he mentions this man as a friend of mine, unless it is to insinuate that he got some work that was not in the public interest or that I was the means of influencing his getting it.

Mr. BENNETT. The Minister of Customs, as usual, has gone off at half-cock, so to speak. I never said a word about the Minister of Customs influencing the awarding of these contracts at all. He states that the people were not painters in Brantford. Will he say what their business was prior to 1896, when they became dredging contractors ?

Mr. PATERSON. Different things. I think he was a varnish manufacturer at one time, and he may have been in other work. He was not in the painting business, so far as I know.

Mr. BENNETT. Is not the minister splitting hairs, because I mentioned paint-

ing instead of varnishing. What a fine distinction. It is a well know fact that the Phins were very strong Liberals, and were not engaged at all in dredging prior to 1896; but after the change of government they blossomed out as dredging contractors.

Mr. PATERSON. How did they get into the dredging business ?

Mr. BENNETT. I think the minister can answer that better than I can. That is the mystery in all these cases. Now, the minister said I had made statements which were known to be untrue. I challenge him to show a single instance in which I made a statement in this House that I have not proven by the book. If he cannot do that, he must sit back and admit that he makes reckless statements charging gentlemen on this side of the House with making statements that are not true. I have a reputation just as good as that of the Minister of Customs. I ask him what statement I ever made in this House that I had to retract ?

Mr. PATERSON. Just the other day I think the hon. gentleman rose up and said, may I ask the Minister of Marine if so-and-so ?

Mr. BENNETT. What was it ?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot remember the exact thing ; but the minister had to rise and say that there was not a word of truth in it. The hon. member made another statement, and the minister said there was not a word of truth in it.

Mr. BENNETT. I have the minister driven into a corner again. He cannot produce the 'Hansard' and he will not find a word in 'Hansard' to bear out the statement he has made. He makes a great amount of noise and I have respect for his age, but I do not propose to let him bully me, as long as I am a member of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT. These hon. gentlemen may interrupt as they please. I am after bigger game than they. Where does the Minister of Customs find his authority for his statement that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said my statement was untrue the other day ? Let him be man enough to follow that up and prove it or must he sit there convicted of throwing out reflections and slanderous statements which he cannot back up. I challenge him to prove from 'Hansard' a word of his statement. The other day I asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if there was any reference in the report to the Sorel shipyard and its director Mr. Desbarats, regarding certain shortages and defalcations there, and the minister said that my reference should not have been to Mr. Desbarats, but to Mr. Roy, because it was Mr. Roy who was in charge of the department where the defalcations had occurred. Is not that altogether different from the statement by the Minister of Customs that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had told me I had stated an untruth. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries made no such statement and the Minister of Customs knows it. The Minister of Customs is a very poor sample of a bluffer.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not want to get into a Billingsgate discussion with the hon. gentleman and shall not lower myself to his level.

Mr. BENNETT. The Minister of Customs must be judged by the standard other people have of him. When a gentleman of his years and standing in the cabinet charges an hon. gentleman on the opposite side with having made an untruthful statement and then is not manly enough to attempt to back it up, he must take the consequences. There is an apology due me by the hon. gentleman. He has travelled to East Simcoe and made there his loud and long speeches and I am back here again, and I hope he will come there again.

Mr. LAW. He might go once too often.

Mr. BENNETT. I am quite willing to take the risk. The hon. minister says that I never rise here without implicating someone on that side or some relative, I grant that I have done that and done it repeatedly and have furnished the proof of any statement I made. What statement did I make to-day relative to any gentleman on that side ? It was necessary for me in discussing the dredging question, to introduce the so-called Dominion Dredging Company of Ottawa and show who composed it. Who compose that company ? Mr. Stewart, son of the senior member for Ottawa, is in it. There is not a man in the city of Ottawa who believes that Mr. Stewart's son ever had the capital to finance that huge dredging outfit. So long as members are doing what they are doing to-day, so long may they expect me to expose their conduct. What can the Minister of Customs find today with reference to Mr. Stewart, if he goes to the Public Accounts Committee ? He will find that Mr. Stewart has a perfect graft on the insurance of all the boilers owned by this country. This same gentleman negotiates these insurances and has the benefit of them. Is that not true ? Here is a return in which there is a checque showing the signature of Mr. Robert Stewart right on the back of it. Let any of the ministers who know the signature of Mr. Stewart look at it :

To the Bank of Montreal,

Pay to the Boiler and Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada the sum of $390.

A. GOBEIL,
Deputy Minister of Public Works.

The Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Ottawa, Stewart & Sons, agents.

The right hon. the First Minister can see it. It is the signature of Mr. Stewart, the senior member for the city of Ottawa. Further on this is endorsed :

For deposit only in the Standard Bank of Canada to the credit of R. Stewart & Sons.

That is the depth to which parliament has sunk. And there are more of these cheques in the department. It is not an accident or a chance. Here is another cheque for $450 to the same company indorsed on the back : 'for deposit only in the Standard Bank of Canada to the credit of R. Stewart & Sons' —endorsed by the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company, R. Stewart, agent, and the endorsation is in the handwriting of Robert Stewart, son of the hon. member for Ottawa. What can you expect of a parliament when the highest aim of its members is the amount of graft they can filch out of the public ? That is the depth to which parliament has got down to-day. I did not propose to expose Mr. Stewart to-day, but the Minister of Customs dragged him out in all his nakedness and petty graft. What does the Minister of Customs think of that ? Does he think it is honourable on the part of a member of parliament ? Not only is it not honourable but it is against the law, yet there will be no attention paid to it by this government. Let the hon. minister not talk too much about my statements regarding hon. members or some of them will be woke up. I never said a word impugning the honesty of the Minister of Customs. I think he is an honest man but he is weaker than ditch water or a jelly fish when it comes to holding on to office, for he will wink at anything that is done so long as he can hold office. I do not believe that personally he profits to the extent of one farthing by his position. I have made that statement repeatedly to Liberals when they have canvassed my opinion as to the honesty or dishonesty of certain members of the cabinet. But I ask the Minister of Customs to make good his charge that I have repeatedly made statements about certain members of parliament which have been shown to be utterly false and untrue. Will he stick to that charge or take it back?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know whether I used the word 'untruthful' regarding the references of the hon. gentleman to members of this House, but I did allude to statements and insinuations which he made and which received direct contradiction. He has referred me to 'Hansard.' Well, I did not take the trouble to look up 'Hansard' and I do not want to enter into a personal controversy, but he can understand that my remarks were for his benefit, and it would be only a proper return for the good opinion he has expressed with reference to myself if I could show that he had been able to express more charitable and correct views regarding my colleagues. If he did, I would value more the tribute of honesty he has paid for me. For my part, I do not think that I have ever set myself up as a model for my fellow men in any way. The Minister of Customs is human as his colleagues are. I believe that we are all trying to do our duty, and I only wanted to point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) that, as a critic, he weakens his criticisms by these evidences of personal vindictiveness and malice. There is no need for that in this House. We should not try to injure one another personally because we differ politically ; our political controversies can be carried on more effectively in the other way. Other hon. gentleman on that side of the House do not make their criticisms in that way, and their criticism count for more for that reason. I was not going to trouble the House with quotations from 'Hansard,' but as the matter has been brought up, let me read what the hon. gentleman said. I quote from page 5809 of the unrevised 'Hansard' :

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I quite agree with the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that we are rather taken aback because we have not yet seen the report. Perhaps the minister will inform us whether or not the report contains any strictures on the fact that over a year ago a gentleman was assigned as a commissioner to inquire into padding of the lists at Sorel in connection with his department. Statements were made before that commissioner and charges were laid that material that had been paid for by the department or by the people of Canada had never been delivered and that these alleged defalcations amounted to $150,000. The inquiry into those serious allegations was commenced over a year ago, but there has as yet been no report laid before parliament of the inquiry.

Now, notice this. This is the way the hon. gentleman's criticisms go :

It is easy to understand this.

Just as he said it was easy to understand how the Phin dredge got the work in Bronte harbour because Mr. Phin was a friend of the Minister of Customs :

Mr. Desbarats, the man in charge of that department, whom the minister has not seen fit to suspend while that investigation has been pending, is a son-in-law of the Hon. R. W. Scott, Secretary of State of this government.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is absolutely nothing of that kind in the report which has been laid before the House. I may say also to my hon. friend that what he says with regard to Mr. Desbarats is absolutely incorrect. Mr. Desbarats has never been directly or indirectly connected with the branch of the service to which he refers. It was a matter under the control of the chief engineer of the department and Mr. Desbarats is in charge of the yard at Sorel, and has absolutely nothing to do with it. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken.

Mr. BENNETT. I will have to accept the minister's statement.

Mr. PATERSON. If I were to go further I think I could find other matters. But I do not wish to carry this on. But I say again that it seems to me it would conduce more to the amenities and courtesies of debate in this House, and say it with frankness—carry more weight if the hon. gentleman in making his criticisms confined himself to the question, instead of showing, as he shows in almost every utterance, that he is actuated by some personal malice or enmity. There is no necessity for that. Wrongdoing should be condemned, but there is no reason to try to insult men, and particularly to drag in the names of men who have no connection with the subject under discussion. In my judgment, that is not the manly way. Moreover, I think it destroys, in large measure, the effect of criticism that might otherwise command more attention.

Now, if I have said anything that is not strictly fair, if I have gone further than I should have gone—I am not aware that I have—I am sorry for it. I believe I have not said anything more than is borne out by what I have read, or what I might have read, not merely in the way of direct statement on the part of the hon. gentleman, but in the way of putting questions so as to carry an insinuation. And, while I am on my feet, I might as well refer to that point also—there is this continual cry of 'graft! 'graft!' till it is dishonouring to the nation. I say this continual crying of 'graft,' 'graft,' when there is no graft about it is dishonouring to the nation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh. oh.

Mr. PATERSON. Some hon. gentlemen laugh. Well, just let me refer to one other utterance to show what I mean. I have not 'Hansard' before me, but I think my recollection of the debate is sufficiently clear. Hon. gentlemen opposite found that there was a sum of $124 paid to the D. W. Bole Drug Company, also a payment to the Campbell Milling Company, with which Senator Campbell is supposed to be connected, and also a payment for lumber to a concern in which Senator Edwards is said to be interested.

Mr. BENNETT. Who said that?

Mr. PATERSON. I think it was the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett).

Mr. BENNETT. Be careful. Look up 'Hansard.'

Mr. PATERSON. Who was it?

Mr. BENNETT. You are making the speech.

Mr. PATERSON. I said I thought it was the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT. You are a poor thinker.



An hon. MEMBER. It was the member for Peel (Mr. Blain).

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. member for Peel may have brought it up, but I think the hon. member for East Simcoe alluded to the matter and said: Aha! This is being spread among members and senators and we will have to inquire into it. That is my recollection of what was said. I will look it up, but in the meantime I do not assert it except as my recollection. And what is the fact? Here is the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) whose company received $124. That concern is one that is doing I don't know what business—I suppose hundreds of thousands of dollars a year.

An hon. MEMBER. Millions.

Mr. PATERSON. Millions, says my hon. friend. And this concern, after putting in a tender, gets a contract that amounts to $124. And the shout is raised, Oh! Oh! this corruption is spreading throughout the Senate and everywhere. Now, is it not too absurd—if it were not wicked—for men on such grounds as this to send abroad to the world the cry that the House of Commons and Senate are permeated with corruption? Because a concern doing millions of business secures, without the knowledge of the member for Winnipeg and after putting in a tender, secures a contract of $124——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is that an incorporated company?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes. And Senator Edwards—his company sells a little parcel of lumber which would not amount to the snap of his finger and which, probably, he knows nothing about, but which was sold in response to a tender; Senator Campbell in the same way in a tender for the supply of flour—all of them perfectly legal transactions. And for such a thing as this the cry is raised that corruption is spreading through the Commons and Senate and that it must be looked into. When hon. gentlemen condescend to that kind of thing, it weakens even a charge which might have weight. For the people will say that if these are the charges hurled at the government by the opposition, then the charges brought by the opposition cannot have much behind them. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite will see that this is unworthy of them and destroys the effect of criticism that might have some foundation. Now, I do not want to say any more, but if this kind of discussion is to be continued, I can look up 'Hansard' and refer to utterances that are recorded there. I have no desire to do so. I do not think I have said anything that was unfair. I do not think I used the word 'untruthful' with regard to the hon. gentleman. If I have said anything that went beyond the record that I read, I want to be considered as not having said it. I want to confine myself to the record.

Mr. BENNETT. At page 5810 of 'Hansard' it will be found that I said this:

It is easy to understand it. Mr. Desbarats, the man in charge of that department, whom the minister has not seen fit to suspend while that investigation has been pending, is a son-in-law of the Hon. R. W. Scott, Secretary of State of this government.

Now, what is the answer of Mr. Brodeur?

There is absolutely nothing of the kind in the report which has been laid before the House.

Now, what was the minister saying there? He says there was no reference to the Sorel work. What wrong does he suggest in saying that? Is that any reflection on myself, when he says there is absolutely nothing of that kind in the report which has been laid before the House, but that it has reference to the Sorel work. Then he says:

I may also say to my hon. friend that what he says with regard to Mr. Desbarats is absolutely incorrect. Mr. Desbarats has never been directly or indirectly connected with the branch of the service to which he refers.

Why, it was proved that there had been defalcations, the minister said so himself. That is the whole drift of the thing. I did not say that Mr. Desbarats had committed them, or who had committed them, but the minister said it was incorrect to state that it was in his division, it was in the division of somebody else.

Now, the Minister of Customs is posing here to-day as a gentleman who never says an unkind word. Well, the trouble is that that gentleman takes a fling at an opponent whenever he can get a chance. There is no man on that side of the House quicker to take a fling at a political adversary than this same meek, mild-mannered Minister of Customs. The other night he roared here before the House and demanded of the opposition, dared the opposition, to say where there had been any graft. I got up and showed where one of his own officers had committed a theft. And what was the answer of the Minister of Customs? Did he say: Well, if it is true, did the thief give back the money? No, he did not say that. But this peaceful, this mild-mannered, benevolent gentleman says: Did he get it on easy terms? Wasn't that very kind of the Minister of Customs? What was he driving at when he made that reference to myself? I asked the Minister of Customs what he meant by that when he said the other night: 'Did he get it on easy terms?' Well, the minister did not answer. It was just an opportunity for him to try to get off some of his spleen. He was stunned, badly stunned. He was challenging and roaring for proof and, when the proof was given, he was knocked down flat. Now, what did the minister mean when he said: 'Did he get it on easy terms?' He knows what he meant by it. There was a letter of mine dug up by that impudent deputy over in the Department of Indian Affairs, Pedley, an old letter of mine of twenty years before; and I hope that when a change of government takes place that fellow will be dismissed from the department—he should have been long ago. He had dug up a letter of mine asking that on a certain island a lease might be granted to a person, not to myself, but asking what would be the easiest terms upon which the island would be leased. And the minister, with that great power of his to remember anything that he can throw back, found this stored up in his cranium, and he thought: Now, I can give the member for East Simcoe a body blow. He stores all these little things up in his mind, and when he thinks he can get an opportunity he throws them off. Now, I want to tell this government that I am going to expose every grafter in this House on every opportunity. I don't care whether it pleases them or not. When I make any statements in this House they will be facts, and I defy any gentleman on that side, the Minister of Customs or anybody else, to disprove what I say. Hear the wail that the Minister of Customs sends up about this cry of graft. Who is sending up the cry of graft? It is the public generally, it is the clergymen of this country, it is the commission appointed by this government themselves. Now they have the proof right here before them, in addition to what can be proved in the Public Accounts Committee. Why do not the First Minister and the Minister of Customs say: If it is a fact that there is fraud and collusion going on between the contractors and the department, we will have it looked into. Now we have a new arrival, the Minister of Public Works, and I make the same offer to him. I have asked the First Minister, the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance to consider this state of facts. There is to-day lying up in the Public Accounts Committee four tenders, all written by the same hand, the representative of the Midland Dredging Company, a brother of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant). How it stings them when you are able so frequently to mix up wrong-doers outside with a member of parliament. Now, these tenders lying up there are all four written in the handwriting of this Mr. Grant, two tenders of his own company and two tenders of the Penetanguishene Company. Now, I ask the Minister of Public Works: Does he not think it rather a bad state of affairs that contractors think they can do that, put in tenders all written by the same party, though supposed to be from rival tenderers, and that all investigation into them should be choked off? And how? By an hon. gentleman on that side rising in his place and saying: There is no

expenditure under these two contracts in last year's Auditor General's Report. Now, I ask the Minister of Public Works, as I think he is jealous of the reputation of his department, will he consent to that matter being thoroughly investigated in the Public Accounts Committee? I will sit down for an answer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will say to the hon. gentleman that neither I or any other member of the committee can prevent an investigation of the accounts at the proper time. The hon. gentleman knows that.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman knows that time will be next year, and not the present time.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman wanted me to be very careful when I talked about these criticisms, to be sure whether it is he who made them or not. If that meant anything, it meant that it wasn't himself.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister attributed to me the introduction of the names of all these three gentlemen to the House in the first instance.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, yes; that is a very nice way of trying to get out of it. I said that the hon. gentleman made a criticism, that so far as I remembered his remarks, he said that the parliament had got into a very bad shape because there were senators and members of the Commons actually getting public money. Now, I find in the 'Hansard,' page 5693:

Mr. BENNETT. On page M—17, I find W. C. Edwards & Company, Ottawa, were paid $803.64 for lumber. Were tenders asked for?

Who introduced that?

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman said I had introduced the names of all three persons.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I have given one; I have given one-third.

Mr. BENNETT. That is a big percentage for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PATERSON (reading):

Mr. BUREAU. Yes, tenders were asked for from the largest firms in Ottawa and Kingston.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems extraordinary that the supply did not go to a Kingston firm, as there must be a good many lumber yards in that city.

It is really too bad to find senators giving their attention to the Department of Justice. It may be expected that members of the Commons will follow their example and see what profit they can make out of this department too. Is the W. C. Edwards of the company Senator Edwards?

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. Bureau answers, and then Mr. Taylor speaks about N—10. I am not dealing with Mr. Taylor. Then I find:

Mr. BENNETT. Now, I want to call the attention of the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) to another item, and I call attention to it because of its contemptibility—if I may use that word. Here, at page M—24 of the Auditor General's Report, I find an item:

Bole Drug Company, Limited, sundry drug supplies, $142.01.

May I ask if that is the firm with which the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) is connected?

Mr. BUREAU. I suppose it must be, but I have no information on the subject.

Mr. BENNETT. What does the inspector say? He knows whether the Caldwell in one case is the member for Lanark or not, and whether the Bole in the other case is the member for Winnipeg or not. We will get through these items all the quicker with a 'yes or no' answer.

Mr. BUREAU. The inspector says that there have been changes made in these companies and that he does not know whether these people are interested in them or not.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the public generally will understand the matter. And this is the depth to which we have got.

'This is the depth to which we have got.' The Bole Company which an hon. gentleman tells me is incorporated with a capital $6,000,000 and does a business of $5,000,000, being the lowest tenderer got a contract of $142.01—'and that is the depth to which we have got.'

In a city of the size of Winnipeg, where there must be druggists belonging to the Liberal party, when a petty bill of $142 worth of drugs is to be bought, the department must purchase from the company of the member for the city. As to the Caldwell case, I know nothing about it. I have always understood that the member for North Lanark is associated with the company for selling these things, and the inspector knows it or he does not know it.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the statement untrue?

Mr. PATERSON (reading):

Mr. BUREAU. I think the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) is mistaken when he says he is well informed about the Winnipeg transaction. The inspector informs me that the drugs are bought by contract and that tenders are publicly called for and the contract given to the lowest tenderer. Even supposing that the hon. member for Winnipeg should happen to be a member of the company that tenders successfully, I do not see that there is any harm in it under these circumstances.

Mr. BENNETT. It is simply a matter of taste. If the member of parliament thinks that he should be associated with the company that gets a contract for $140—well, as I say, it is a matter of taste.

Mr. BUREAU. The hon. gentleman does not truly represent the facts. This is not a

private contract, but is a contract given after a public call for tenders, and awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend state that the goods supplied by the Bole Drug Company were supplied after tender ?

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Bureau reports that it was by tender. I call the attention of the House and of the country to the items which I have read. The hon. member (Mr. Bennett) cited them as an illustration of the depth to which we have descended. I think the country will say that if we have not descended lower than that there is not much fault to be found.

Mr. BENNETT. That is a matter of opinion. When it is proven in this House and to the satisfaction of the country that people are obtaining money from this government to which they are not entitled, why does not the government make them refund the money ? While the government permits members of parliament to act as they do, the minister cannot expect not to hear of these matters from this side of the House. It is proper that these things should be mentioned in the House. The minister says that probably this sale was put through by the W. C. Edwards Company and was utterly unknown to Senator Edwards, but the minister knows that for the past ten years this same concern has been selling hundreds of dollars worth of goods to the departments. It is all a question of taste and so long as Senator Edwards thinks that the company of which he is the head and front, should sell to the departments, so long as we have a government composed of gentlemen like the Minister of Customs who are prepared to hold on to office and take everything that can be laid on them by their confreres and colleagues, so long will we have the state of affairs pointed out by this commission the other day, that there was nothing less than wholesale thieving going on in the departments to-day—and the Minister of Customs knows it and every hon. gentleman on that side of the House knows it, and the country knows it, and will know more before the session is over.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) if they do not think the Independence of Parliament Act has been violated in the case of the account referred to by my hon friend. I have the account here. It is not an incorporated company that has drawn the money. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs takes exception to a few of the companies that had tendered on private tenders and drawn money, saying they are incorporated companies and that they had a perfect right to do this. But here is a firm, father and son; the father happens to be a member of parliament, he and son are in business jointly and they draw a lot of money and there is a joint signature to the government cheque. What is it for? Has this been paid out for the benefit of this member and his son ? We all have in our cellars hot water boilers for heating purposes. The government have many of these boilers and a political friend of theirs must inspect them, charging $5 for each hot water boiler and $10 for each steam boiler. There are five in the drill hall in Toronto, $25 ; two in the drill hall at Brockville, $10; two in the Royal Military College dormitory, $10; three in the Royal Military College gymnasium, $15; two at the Royal Military College hospital, $10. Then there is another steam boiler at Kingston for which a charge of $10 is made. There are seventy-four of these hot water boilers, all inspected at $5 a piece.

Mr. FOSTER. Belonging to the government?

Mr. TAYLOR. Belonging to the government, in the military buildings all over the country.

Mr. SPROULE. Inspected by whom?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Boiler Inspection Insurance Company. The account is made out :

To the inspection of the following boilers in military buildings, for the season 1906.

Here is the cheque:

Pay to the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company the sum of $450.

This is signed by Mr. Fiset, Colonel, and J. W. Borden, accountant. This cheque is handed over to R. Stewart & Co.; they sign in order to draw the money:

The Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company, R. Stewart & Sons, agents.

This is handed in 'for deposit only' to the Standard Bank, to the credit of R. Stewart & Son.

I ask the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if that is not a violation of the independence of parliament. I have another here for $452, and another for $390, a total of $842 I suppose every member of this House has a furnace and a hot water boiler in his cellar and he does not pay for inspecting them every year, but the government sends a man round and pays him $5 each to inspect each hot water boiler and it happens to be a member of parliament who draws the money. I want to know from the Minister of Customs how close this comes to graft, how close it comes to members of parliament dealing direct and drawing money from the government. There is no public tender about this. The government simply hands over $840, and these gentlemen go to work and draw the money. The

Minister of Railways knows whether it is necessary to pay $10 each for inspecting the boilers in the Brockville drill hall and I know something about the boilers in Kingston. But here is a job and here is a member of parliament closely associated with it. He and his sons are agents for this insurance company and they draw the money in their own name. If that is not on a par with selling goods to the government I don't know anything about it. I have the cheques here and I send them to the Prime Minister and he can see that a member of parliament signs them and draws the money. In the other account a cheque is issued on the same date, the 16th of January for inspection of the Public Works Department, and the cheque is signed by Mr. Gobeil and Mr. Menard for the account and the cheque is for $390.

Mr. PUGSLEY. To whom is the cheque payable?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is not that an incorporated company?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think it is, but Stewart the member of parliament for Ottawa, he and his son are not an incorporated company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They may be agents.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is the point, they sign as agents and get the money and deposit in the bank.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not follow that they get the money.

Mr. BENNETT. They get their commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood the hon. member for Leeds to say that the company was not incorporated.

Mr. TAYLOR. What I say is that Stewart & Sons are not incorporated and they are the parties that get the money so far as the cheques show. These payments were for the inspection of boilers at $10 each in the custom house, Montreal, the post office Toronto, custom house, Toronto, the excise warehouse, Toronto, public building at Brantford, public building at Windsor, the custom house, London, the post office, London, the custom house, St. John, the post office, St. John, the savings bank, Halifax, the parliament buildings, Ottawa, the West Block, the East Block, the Post Office, the Supreme Court, the Langevin Block, the Printing Bureau, the Experimental Farm, which the Minister of Agriculture knows something about; in all $390 in that account, and the cheque is made out and endorsed by R. Stewart & Sons, and the money paid over to them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The cheque is not payable to R. Stewart & Sons.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. TAYLOR. R. Stewart & Sons, are the agents and they sign themselves as such, and they have no right to draw the money as they do and get the commission. They have no more right to do that than has a member of parliament to sell goods to the government. That is a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act and the Minister of Public Works cannot contradict it and he is a lawyer. I call the attention of the Prime Minister to that and I want to see whether he will approve of it or not.

Mr. STEWART. Perhaps I might explain the matter which the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has just referred to. The cheques to which the hon. gentleman has referred are cheques for the renewal of insurance policies, that were placed, many of them, I should say about half of them, in the year 1883 or twenty-five years ago. Some additional policies were taken out by the Public Works Department for work which they considered very valuable to them for the year 1883 down to the year 1902 which was previous to the time I became a member of this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. These are not insurance policies at all that I am referring to.

Mr. STEWART. They are policies issued by the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada, and when I explain what the nature of the business is I am sure the hon. gentleman will have reason to remove any reflection which he may have intended to cast. The Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company was for many years the only company in Canada doing that kind of business which they have been incorporated to do. The hon. gentleman seems to think that this boiler inspection is entirely unnecessary, but let me point out to him that the first object sought for by the insuring of the boilers is the protection of human life. There are a number of boilers just below us in this building and if they were not properly inspected and a report made on their condition to the Public Works Department from time to time, and if an explosion should take place, which is not at all an infrequent occurrence, it seems to me that serious responsibility would rest on the government. Explosions of hot water boilers have taken place in some of the public buildings of this country I regret to say. A few years ago the hot water boilers in one of the public buildings in Halifax exploded and two men were killed. Within the last couple of years the same thing has happened in one of the public buildings of Ontario. The first object sought in this insurance therefore is the protection of human life. There is not a public school in this city, or a separate school, and I venture to say there is not a church in Ottawa in which the hot water boilers have not exactly the same protection that the government provides in this respect.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there any other companies in Canada that do this kind of insuring?

Mr. STEWART. I will give the hon. gentleman the information as to that in a moment. I was saying that I do not believe there is a large public building in this city where the people congregate in which the boilers are not subject to this inspection, and of course the primary object is to provide protection for human life.

Mr. SPROULE. Against explosions?

Mr. STEWART. Against explosions.

Mr. SPROULE. I should advise you to put one on the Minister of Customs.

Mr. STEWART. In 1883 the government then in power considered it necessary to secure this advantage and they went to the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada which was the only company doing this class of business at that time. From time to time American companies have come in here but they failed to make ends meet and they had to leave the country, no doubt because there is not enough of that class of business to make it remunerative for competing companies. In 1902 or 1903 the Casualty Boiler Insurance Company came into existence, and I want to say in fairness to myself that from that moment down to the present time not one policy of insurance has been added, so far as I know to the insurances that were previously issued, in favour of the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada. I have never sought any advantage for the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada because of my position as a member of parliament, and when I mention that none of this business has been transacted in my office since 1902, some time before I became a member of this House, it will be easily seen that there has been no desire on my part to profit by my position. I do not know that any other explanation is necessary. The cheques to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has referred were simply the cheques in large part as I have said, for the renewal of these premiums which have been on the books from 1883 down to the present time. Perhaps I should say further that the office of R. Stewart & Sons have been for twenty years—well, my son has not been with me for twenty years—but the office of which I am the principal, has acted as agents of that company for at least twenty years. When the premiums fall due, they come to our office and are payable to the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company, but in our office as in other offices there is one bank account into which all the cheques payable to the different companies for which we do business go. We have numerous cheques for other insurance companies, and we keep a separate account for each one, and transmit to the head office every month. Is it not the most honest way for these cheques to be endorsed R. Stewart & Son, the same as all other cheques that come to us. I might have sent the cheques to the head office, but the most convenient and honest way was to endorse them with the name of the firm, because we did not think there was anything to conceal in the matter.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend did not understand my question. The question was whether there were any other companies in Canada doing this business than the one which R. Stewart & Sons in Ottawa represent?

Mr. STEWART. I think I made myself clear. In 1902 the Casualty Boiler Insurance Company of Canada came into existence, and since that time the business of the Department of Public Works has been placed with that company with which I have nothing to do.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member who has just taken his seat says that these are all renewals of policies that were issued in 1882 or 1883. Am I right?

Mr. STEWART. No, I did not say that. I stated that the first policies were issued in 1883, and comprised about one-half of the whole amount the hon. gentleman has referred to this afternoon, and that none of the items referred to any business since that date, because no business has been placed with the company since 1902, two years before I became a member of this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that these were simply renewals of policies that had been issued previously. I know a building at Brockville which was erected previous to 1882, and a new account has been placed there, but it does not say anything about insurance. It is for the inspection of boilers; it says nothing about insurance.

Mr. STEWART. So far as I am concerned, I have had nothing to do with insuring those boilers. I do not believe there is any insurance connected with the account; but the inspection is a valuable part, and there are always premiums where it is necessary to have insurance go with it. The government do not as a rule carry insurance, but they get the valuable information I have mentioned. Inspectors go around who are able to find out defects or weaknesses in the boilers, and insist on the proper remedy being applied, or they will cease to have the boilers under their charge.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to ask my hon. friend from Ottawa if this statement is correct: from 1883 to about 1904 by another company the boilers of the Public Works Department were insured and regularly in-

spected ; this insurance was taken from this company in 1904 and transferred to a company doing business under an Ontario charter only, known as the Canadian Casualty Company.

Mr. STEWART. I may say to my hon. friend that the policy to which he refers was written about twenty years ago, and that in 1902, or since I became a member of this House, the business was taken from the company represented in my office, and was given to the Canadian Casualty Company with a provincial charter. The fact that the business went from a company in my office to another company is an indication that my position as a member of parliament has not been used in favour of the company of which I have the insurance.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wish to do any injustice to the hon. member, but I wish to ask him whether the cheque that was read was endorsed by his firm or is it a bogus cheque ?

Mr. STEWART. The cheques that have been read are endorsed Boiler Inspection & Insurance Company, R. Stewart & Son, Agents. I do not know whose endorsement is written on the back of the cheques. I do not think it is my handwriting, though I do not know any reason why it should not be. It may be that of another member of the firm.

Mr. BLAIN. I will send the cheques over to my hon. friend and ask him if the signature is his signature or the signature of his firm. Perhaps my hon. friend would give the date of the cheque ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The 16th of January, 1907.

Mr. STEWART. There are two cheques. They are endorsed by the Boiler Inspection & Insurance Company, R. Stewart & Son, Agents. They are not in my handwriting, though I do not know what difference it would make if they were.

Mr. BLAIN. Whose handwriting is it ?

Mr. STEWART. The junior member of the firm, Chas. E. Stewart.

Mr. BLAIN. Your son?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wish to catechise my hon. friend, but although he has pointed out that this is old insurance, he will not deny that the insurance is now being conducted in the name of the firm of which he is a member, and that last year and this year he has received payments from this government for insurance done by a company of which he is the senior member.

Mr. STEWART. That is hardly a fair statement. The Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company are receiving cheques from the government, and these cheques pass through the office of the agency of that company in this city.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the hon. gentleman doing that in the public interest, or has he any private interest in it?

Mr. STEWART. I have been doing this for twenty years, and I am quite sure the public interest has not suffered in any way.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not suggesting that the public interest has suffered, and I am not suggesting that the boilers should not be inspected, as one would infer from the speech of my hon. friend. The only point at issue is whether this hon. gentleman, who has a seat in this House, is receiving any benefit from insurance done by a company of which he is the senior member. His company receives a commission out of the business done by the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company with this government, of which he is the supporter in this House. He will not deny that statement.

Mr. STEWART. I have made a very clear statement of the whole matter. This is simply a continuation of transactions that have been going on since 1883.

Mr. BLAIN. Will that make any difference?

Mr. STEWART. I would like to know how the public interest is suffering.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not suggest for a moment that it is, neither are we discussing the question whether the boilers should or should not be inspected. The point—and it has been brought up by the Minister of Customs, and he is responsible for it—is this. I am asking whether the member for Ottawa receives any pecuniary benefit from the cheque which has been read to the House by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett)? If he says that he does not receive anything, we will accept that. If he says he does not receive any commission whatever, I will apologize to the House for anything I have said or suggested.

Mr. STEWART. I am not asking for any apology from the hon. gentleman. I have given a very clear statement of the case. None of this business was secured while I have been a member of parliament or through my influence. On the contrary, since I have been a member of this House my influence did not retain the business that the management of the company might very well expect to have been done for them at Ottawa. That business left my office and went to a rival company in 1904, since I have been a member. The hon. gentleman has endeavoured to show that there has been some violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. I would ask him, in all fairness, now that he has heard

my statement of the case, to revise the opinion he has expressed. The papers bear out the facts I have mentioned. They show that not only was none of the business secured at any time since I have been a member of this House, but that business actually left my office, as the agency of the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company, while I have been a member, and my influence as a member was not used to retain it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think my hon. friend has gone into a number of explanations that are really not necessary or relevant. If he thought it desirable to make any explanation, there are only two points that are of the slightest relevancy, and I do not know that he has quite touched these. They are simply these—whether, in the first place, the certificate or policy, or whatever you call it, is issued or renewed annually. The other is whether or not the firm of which he is a member receives any commission. I am not expressing any opinion as to the effect of that, but these are the only two points on which the slightest question can possibly be raised.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think these have been explained.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman did not touch either to my knowledge.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He has stated that he has been the agent of the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company since 1883, and that since he has been a member of parliament he has continued doing its business as before. He rendered accounts to the government for the premium, and the payments were made to his firm as agents for the insurance company. He then accounted to the company and received from the insurance company a commission for his own firm, I presume. I cannot see that he has done anything wrong morally or that wrong can be imputed to him——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But there has rather been an insinuation cast upon him that he has profited by his influence with the government as a member of parliament, and the question is whether or not, under the circumstances, he comes technically under the Independence of Parliament Act, and whether or not it can technically be said that he is in receipt of money from the government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I was endeavouring to get a statement of the facts which I thought material and to set aside those which are irrelevant. Mr. Corby, who was a member of this House, found it necessary, through some technical violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, to resign his seat.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Currier, too.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And Mr. Currier also. The hon. gentleman has overlooked the other point, and that is whether or not this contract is a matter of annual renewal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Suppose it is?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is all we want to know. I am not making any argument, but as the hon. gentleman has seen fit to make an explanation of the facts, I rise to point out that there are only two facts which are at all material. No charge of personal wrong-doing is made. The first question is whether or not the contract is annually renewed, as most insurance policies are. And the second is whether or not the hon. gentleman's firm gets a commission out of the business. These are the only two considerations with regard to which the hon. gentleman should find it necessary to enlighten the House.

Mr. McCOLL. The firm of Stewart & Son are agents for a certain insurance company. Their business is to collect premiums, which are payable from year to year, and they get a commission for collecting these premiums. That commission, however, they do not get from the government, but from the insurance company.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) has made a very fair statement of the case, and I think that the discussion has rather degenerated into a cross-examination of my hon. friend. My hon. friends opposite will agree that this is hardly the place in which to conduct a cross-examination. With regard to the point raised by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I do not wish to advance any opinion as to the legal effect, even if a commission were paid, because I think it is a very fine point; but as regards the question of fact, my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) has stated to the House exactly how it stands. He has explained how those cheques came to be signed by him, and I think he has given a very honest and frank answer to my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor).

Mr. MILLER. There is one other point I think of importance. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) has said that public schools, churches and other large institutions in the city carry the same kind of insurance as the government. I would ask if the Boiler Inspection Insurance Company charge the government any higher rate of premium than they charge to other institutions for the same service ?

Mr. STEWART. No, certainly not.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me the situation is simply this. The hon. member for Ottawa is doing a business. He effected these insurances in the first place, I take it.

Mr. STEWART. I did not effect any of the insurance on the books of the Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company so far as the government is concerned.

Mr. SPROULE. But it was since transferred to the hon. member's company to manage. On it, I assume, he gets the usual commission—five, ten or fifteen per cent. This commission he retains out of the moneys paid to him. The insurance contract is renewable and the hon. gentleman continues to renew it. Therefore he has a beneficial interest in the business to the extent of the commission. This goes on for years. At a certain time he becomes a member of parliament. Now the Independence of Parliament Act provides that a member of parliament shall have no transanctions with the government for which he receives a portion of the country's money. But the hon. gentleman continues to conduct the same business and receive the same commissions year after year and also to sit here as a member of parliament.

Mr. GALLIHER. If my hon. friend will allow me——

Mr. SPROULE. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) speak louder. I cannot hear him. He is big, but he has a small voice.

Mr. GALLIHER. That is probably the reason that I am more modest than some other members of this House. I would point out that not only has the member for Ottawa been doing business as agent——

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) putting a question? If he is going to make an argument, I would suggest that he might wait until I have done.

Mr. GALLIHER. Surely I have the right to point out——

Mr. SPROULE. No, the hon. member has no such right, if I understand my rights here. If he wants to put a question I will answer, but I am not willing that he should interrupt my argument to go on with an argument of his own. He can speak when I get through.

Mr. GALLIHER. I rise to a point of order. I wish to ask the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) a question.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not a point of order.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) will see that he cannot ask a question except by consent of the hon. gentleman who has the floor.

Mr. GALLIHER. Then, will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) permit me to ask a question?

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly, if he will ask it and not go into an argument.

Mr. GALLIHER. If the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) is doing business as agent for this firm—general business and not with the government alone—and collects premiums on which he receives a general commission, is it not from the money belonging to the company that he is paid and not from the moneys of the government or any individual?

Mr. SPROULE. Let us suppose that this firm was in England and had no representative in Canada except R. Stewart & Son. Or they may have taken over that business from some other firm. In any case, they continue to conduct the business. He renews insurances year after year and collects premiums on which he gets a commission. He has a beneficial interest in those premiums. That money continues to be paid to R. Stewart after he becomes a member of parliament. Is he not, then, getting some of the money of the country though he is a member of parliament and which the Independence of Parliament Act declares he should not get? If his firm was an incorporated company, which, I understand, it is not, the case would be different. But, if I understand the law correctly, the hon. gentleman is acting in direct violation of the Independence of Parliament Act.

Mr. McCOLL. The hon. member (Mr. Sproule) if he would think for a moment, I think, would see this—that when this money is paid, it is not paid to R. Stewart but to the insurance company; the cheques are made to the insurance company. The government's money goes to the company, but the money paid to Mr. Stewart comes from the company.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose that R. Stewart & Son were the whole company like the Arundel Printing Company in England——

Mr. McCOLL. We are taking the case as it is.

Mr. SPROULE. But suppose this was the case; suppose the company were in South Africa and that Mr. Stewart were here representing the company, would he be violating the Independence of Parliament Act by receiving this money of which he retains a portion? Take another instance of years ago which I recall. When Mr. Anglin was speaker in this House, the firm of which he was a member happened to do some printing for the government, and, when the matter was brought to the attention of the House, he had to resign his high position. The sum involved was only a small one, but that does not alter the crime. It has been contended that the amount was very small. But a crime is a crime regardless of the amount involved. The contention of the Minister of Customs is that because the D. W. Bole Company handled millions and the amount they received from the government was very small it was not a crime. But if they had handled only hundreds of thousands or even hundreds that would not

have altered the crime. In the same way it makes no difference whether R. Stewart & Son get five, or ten, or fifteen per cent out of this money—it is money paid out of the public funds of Canada and of which Mr. Stewart receives a portion. That is the gist of the whole matter. And I believe that if the question were submitted to the courts they would without very much delay decide that the hon. gentleman had violated the Independence of Parliament Act, whether he did it intentionally or otherwise.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) and the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. McColl) have made an argument which convicts themselves. The cheques were made payable to the company. They were endorsed by R. Stewart & Son and deposited to their own credit in the bank and they sent the amount due, less the commission. So, the very money paid by the government went to their credit in the bank. Had Messrs R. Stewart & Son sent these cheques direct to the company and then received a commission from the company, the argument might have been different. These cheques went direct to the company that was doing business with the government.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

### PRIVATE BILLS—INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Institute of Architects of Canada.—Mr. J. C. Walsh.

On section 4,

Mr. GERVAIS. I move that clause 4 be struck out.

Mr. WALSH. I am willing to strike out the first paragraph of clause 4, as my hon. friend objects particularly to the phrase 'establishment of classes.' I do not think that the establishing of classes of membership is a question of education but I am willing to strike out the first clause. The other paragraphs of the clause simply refer to the different members who would be admitted, members of the Quebec, Toronto and Alberta associations and those who are not members of any association but who have been practising for two years. I think the elimination of this first paragraph would meet my hon. friend's objection.

Mr. GERVAIS. I have reasons for pressing my motion. I would not like to have it conveyed to the public that this new corporation could establish classes as between architects ; I would not like to have conferred upon it the right to discriminate between the architects of Quebec and Alberta or Ontario. I object also to the proposal to give to this would-be corporation an apparent right of control or supervision of the classes and classification of architects. The committe must remember that this corporation will be a paper corporation purely and simply—I would call it a statute-book corporation because it will not teach anything, it will be a bookless, aimless, profitless and staffless school.

Mr. J. C. WALSH. It will be a club like the engineers.

Mr. GERVAIS. If it is to be a club, let the committee so state. That is why I gave notice of my amendment to strike out clauses 3, 4 and 9. No provision is made by the future corporation for the communication of the knowledge, skill, &c., which will constitute an architectural education.

Mr. J. C. WALSH. Since you have objected to that society, we have withdrawn it.

Mr. GERVAIS. I have moved to strike out the whole of clause 4, because if this corporation is to be purely and simply a social club what is the use of giving to it the apparent right to supervise and control the teaching of architecture throughout Canada ?

Mr. J. C. WALSH. There is nothing about teaching in the Bill, that has been eliminated.

Mr. GERVAIS. Quite true. But why does this Bill mention, for example, in subsection (a) of clause 4 :

> Members in good standing of the province of Quebec Association of Architects, the Ontario Association of Architects, the Alberta Association of Architects, the Manitoba Association of Architects, the Toronto Architectural Club, and the Regina Architectural Association.

It would be preposterous and useless to give an admittedly social club the even apparent right to interfere with the education of architects who are members of architectural associations throughout Canada.

Mr. J. C. WALSH. I would move in amendment to the amendment to strike out the first paragraph of section 4.

Amendment to the amendment agreed to, and section as amended adopted.

On the motion of Mr. Gervais section 5 was stricken from the Bill.

On motion of Mr. Gervais section 10 was stricken from the Bill.

On section 11 :

Mr. GERVAIS moved that the section read as follows :

> Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to encroach upon the rights and privileges conferred upon any association of architects hav-

ing a charter or which may hereafter have a charter from the legislature of any province of Canada.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the effect of that?

Mr. J. C. WALSH. In each of the provinces of Alberta and Quebec they have an association of architects, and naturally they are jealous of their rights and do not want this parliament to pass legislation which may affect them in any way. The point is similar to that raised when Dr. Roddick presented his Medical Bill in this House. This parliament then voted against the principle that we should do anything here which would be calculated to interfere with the rights of the provinces in the matter of education. We recognize the rights of the provinces, under this amendment, to deal with their educational institutions and the requirements for entrance into the learned professions.

Section 11, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported and read the third time.

On the motion of Mr. Gervais the title of the Bill was changed to: An Act to incorporate the Architectural Institute of Canada, and passed.

## CANADIAN NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY COMPANY.

Consideration of an amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 67) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the nature of this amendment?

Mr. LENNOX. I think it limits the amount of security.

Mr. SPROULE. Better leave the Bill until the member who is promoting it is present; he may not be satisfied to accept the amendment.

## WAYS AND MEANS.

House again in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. ALCORN. With reference to the subject under discussion when the House arose at six o'clock, with the permission of the House I wish to direct attention to sections 14, 15, 16 and 18 of chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, an Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons. Section 14 reads:

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

Section 15 reads:

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

The hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. McColl) raised a point which appears to be covered by this section. His point was that the money when it reached the hands of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) was the money of the company for whom he acted. But this section covers the case of a member who is interested or concerned in any service or work, or performs any service for which any public money of Canada is to be paid, so that it would appear to be of little or no consequence whose the money was if the money is the public money of Canada and is paid for that service and the member of parliament has an interest in that money.

Section 16 reads:

If any person disqualified or by this Act declared incapable of being elected to, or of sitting or voting in the House of Commons, or if any person duly elected, who has become disqualified to continue to be a member or to sit or vote, under the last preceding section of this Act, nevertheless sits or votes, or continues to sit or vote therein, he shall thereby forfeit the sum of $200 for each and every day on which he so sits or votes.

2. Such sums shall be recoverable from him by any person who sues for the same in any court of competent civil jurisdiction in Canada.

Section 18 reads:

In every contract, agreement or commission to be made, entered into or accepted by any person with the government of Canada, or any of the departments or officers of the government of Canada, there shall be inserted an express condition, that no member of the House of Commons shall be admitted to any share or part of such contract, agreement or commission, or to any benefit to arise therefrom.

2. In case any person, who has entered into or accepted, or who shall enter into or accept any such contract, agreement or commission, admits any member or members of the House of Commons to any part or share thereof, or to receive any benefit thereby,

every such person shall, for every such offence, forfeit and pay the sum of $2,000, recoverable with costs in any court of competent jurisdiction by any person who sues for the same.

So that it is not merely a case of a contract by a member with the government. The policy of the Act extends to any share or benefit to be derived by the member from a contract made by any other person with the government. Without expressing any opinion upon the particular case in hand, it might be well for the hon. gentleman concerned to particularly inquire and satisfy himself what the operation of these sections may be in his case.

Resolution reported, read the first and the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 136) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 31st of March, 1908, and the 31st of March, 1909.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

## WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Mr. FIELDING moved :

That the House again resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

He said : The object of this motion is that we may restore the budget debate to the point at which we left it.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL (South Oxford). Mr. Speaker, when I moved the adjournment of the debate, I was showing the great advantages that had accrued to Canada under the preferential tariff which Canada gives to Great Britain. This government is on record as having a standing offer to Great Britain that at any time she may wish to enter into negotiations with Canada with a view to a larger preference or to a mutual preference, this government will be prepared to discuss the question. I wish also to point out, as an appreciation of the principle adopted by this government in granting a preference to Great Britain, that the Australian government have recently adopted the same principle in their tariff by granting to Great Britain a preference in their markets. Truly may it be said that Canada has taken a long step towards the federation of the empire in matters of trade. Following up the same aggressive and statesmanlike policy, this government, through the good offices of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries during the last year, have successfully completed a trade treaty with France. It is too soon to form a correct idea as to the benefits that may accrue to Canada from this treaty ; yet I am sure that it requires no prophetic vision to satisfy any candid mind that great good will result to Canada, from having access to a market so important as that of France—a market that buys a billion and a half dollars worth of goods in a year, of which from three to four hundred million dollars worth are goods of a class which Canada can naturally supply. The treaty gives Canada an entrance to that market under the minumum tariff for a large number of articles such as we are exporting to the markets of the world, and an advantage in that market above our greatest competitor, the United States, and the other countries who supply like products. Instead of selling to France $2,000,000 worth of goods per year, we can reasonably hope in the near future to be selling double or three times as much. Many of the goods that we buy from France are goods that we cannot very well buy with equal advantage from any other country ; they are a class of goods that the people of Canada want ; and in giving a concession to France on the goods that we purchase from her, we are relieving our own people of a certain amount of taxation as our friends opposite would say. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) after speaking some four or five hours and showing that the people of this country were deriving a very large revenue, twice the revenue that accrued to the former government, said that we would lose in revenue under this treaty with France some $400,000 or $500,000 per year. Before that he was trying to make the point against the policy of this government that under it the people were too heavily taxed and too much revenue was raised. But after speaking three or four hours in that strain, he turned right around and swallowed all he had said. He turned a double somersault and claimed that by reducing the duties on goods coming from France, this government was going to lose some $400,000 or $500,000 of revenue. After condemning the government for collecting too much revenue, he finds fault with it for reducing the duties and thereby losing some revenue. Consistency, thou art a jewel. Under the minimum tariff provided by the French treaty, we will have freer entrance into the markets of France for goods that we are selling them to a considerable extent to-day and the sales of which must, with this advantage, be largely increased. Take 1906, because we have not the complete returns for 1907, I find that we sold to France in that year $164,330 worth of cattle under one year old. We sold also to France canned lobsters to the extent of $935,188 worth, green apples $209,131 worth, canned vegetables over $60,000 worth. We sold also during this last year nearly half a million dollars worth of agricultural implements.

Mr. W. JACKSON. What statement did the hon. gentleman make regarding the export of cattle to France?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I said that we sold to France in 1906, $164,330 worth . Under the arrangement which has been made the reduction on some of these articles amounted to over 50 per cent and in others to even over 100 per cent. For instance the duty on apples is reduced from 44 cents per hundred pounds to 17 cents.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Do you say that under the French treaty the duty on apples has been reduced?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. Certainly.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Is it not a fact that fourteen years ago Canada had the privilege of the minimum tariff with France? I made it a point to go and see the commissioner himself, Mr. Macdougall, and he told me there has been no change in the last fourteen years in that respect. That is the statement made in the 'Farmers Sun.'

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I did not get it from the 'Farmers Sun' but from another authority quite reliable, and I am satisfied there is a very substantial reduction, and I think the amount I have named is correct.

Mr. HENDERSON. I know that the hon. gentleman does not wish to be misleading, but he must bear in mind that the minimum tariff was given under the late French treaty just as under this one. The United States have the same advantage of the minimum tariff with France.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. The United States have not the same advantages as we have on many articles. We have in this tariff a special advantage on some 147 articles and we only give them concessions in our markets on some 110 articles. We also have a special provision providing that we give no retroactive advantage to goods coming from France, in lieu of an advantage given to us on cereal products.

Mr. W. JACKSON. Does the hon. gentleman still contend that Canada is allowed the minimum tariff on apples, evaporated and green, under this recent treaty? I claim that we have had it for fourteen years and the Americans have had it eight years.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. Notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman says, I still contend that we have an advantage in the French market on fruit which Americans do not enjoy. And I firmly believe that the shipments of apples from Canada to France will materially increase under this treaty. I believe also that our shipments of manufactured goods will increase. I know, as an absolute fact, that very substantial reduction has been made on agricultural implements. I know, as a matter of fact that some $7 will be saved the Canadian shippers of agricultural implements on certain kinds over and above the duties which have to be paid by the American shippers, and that our Canadian manufacturers expect to reap a very material benefit. Instead of selling half a million dollars worth of agricultural implements to France, we may reasonably expect in the near future, unless the Americans are able to negotiate a treaty with that country on similar lines, to sell one and a half to two million dollars worth. I believe also there is provision in this treaty whereby in case any other country at any time receives an advantage from the present tariff on any article, Canada will participate in that advantage. That to my mind is a very important clause in this treaty because by it we are assured of an entrance into the French market on a basis equal to that of any other country.

The hon. member for Wentworth was complaining that the government had not opened up many new markets. I will call attention to the treaty entered into with Japan by this government. I know there was a treaty between Japan and Great Britain entered into some twelve years ago, and it was left optional with the Dominion whether she should become a participant in that treaty. We know that, for reasons which were considered sufficient, Canada did not avail herself of the opportunity to become a party to the treaty, but following the war between Japan and Russia, following the conquest of Korea by Japan, and following the restrictions Japan put upon her emigrants to foreign countries, so protecting Canada from an influx of her population, this government, two years ago, thought it wise to become a party to that treaty. We know that since Canada became a party to that treaty, our shipments to Japan have materially increased and that the Japan market bids fair to become a very important market for Canadian products. Canada enjoys the advantages which she did not enjoy prior to becoming a party to that treaty, and we believe that in the near future a vast trade will be developed between Canada and Japan. Our manufacturers have goods which Japan wants to buy and many of our raw products will likely find a market in that country.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) felt disposed to criticise the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) because he did not provide a means by which the banks would advance money to shippers of grain in the west on local bills of lading. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was serious or not, but if he was, I doubt if there is another member in the House who would really think the government should engage in advancing funds on local bills of lading and undertake to do work that properly belongs to the banks. But I do know that the people of this country have reason to con-

gratulate themselves and to congratulate the Minister of Finance, upon the courage and promptness with which that hon gentleman came to the relief of the banks last fall when he advanced them $5,300,000 to assist them in handling the crops in the western part of the Dominion. Only a man who had courage and conviction and business capacity would have risen to the occasion, and I believe that the hon. minister (Mr. Fielding) not only merits but receives the approval of every fair-minded man in this House and in the country. The hon. member (Mr. Lake) also called attention to certain grievances the people of the west were labouring under in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. He complained that the government had not taken action to relieve the people from the burden of the privilege of exemption from taxation which the Canadian Pacific Railway enjoys. It is easy to talk about what the government should do. The hon. gentleman's own friends entered into a contract by which the Canadian Pacific Railway were relieved of taxation on their lands in these western provinces. And now the hon. gentleman comes to this government and says: We are suffering from the incubus put upon us by the Conservative government and we want you now to come to our rescue, to take this case to the courts if you cannot put through legislation by which the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be compelled to pay taxes on their property. It is a serious thing for a government to take away rights granted by this parliament, and even if the government had the power, even if the courts should in any way give it that power, I doubt if the government should confiscate property granted and privileges accorded to a corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway any more than they would the rights and privileges of a private individual. The hon. gentleman also complained of the sale by the government of lands, timber limits and grazing leases in the west. He approached that subject rather timidly, in fact, he simply made the statement without attempting to discuss the question. I do not wonder that he was rather timid in his reference to the timber limit deals. After the exhaustive investigation in the Public Accounts Committee, after the complete vindication of the Department of Dominion Lands and the sales of the public domain made by this government, by which parties who received timber limits paid from three to ten times as much as were paid for similar privileges under the previous government. After it being shown that during the term this government has been in power they have only disposed of some 6,400 square miles of timber lands as compared with 26,000 square miles either sold or given away by our friends opposite, I do not wonder that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) referred to this question rather timidly. Instead of selling timber limits at a nominal sum, as they alleged this government did, the former government gave the limits away to their friends. I have a record here which shows that they parcelled out among their friends immense tracts of timber. Not only did they do that in the west, but they did the same in Ontario. We know what was done in Ontario in the eighties, when this government parcelled out thousands upon thousands of acres of our best pine timber limits in northern Ontario. That is on record and the names are on record in this House. I did not take the trouble to bring those names to present to the House, but they are a matter of record, as also are the orders in council that were passed granting the privilege of cutting timber, each order in council covering 32,000 acres of land. And these grants, let it not be forgotten, were made without any consideration whatever; and, had it not been for the strenuous fight put up by Sir Oliver Mowat, the champion of the rights of Ontario, these timber leases would have become operative and these parties would have had the timber that rightly belonged to Ontario without paying a cent for it. So, in regard to the disposal of the timber lands in the western province, I find there were some 201 applications made on behalf of members of parliament, largely for their friends, and orders in council were passed granting timber limits not only to 201 but to a great many more than that number. I have here the names of many who received timber limits. For instance, Hon. David Tisdale got 50 miles. Mr. J. Craig Boyd, an election agent —I suppose some here have heard of him— got 50 miles. Mr. F. W. Gibbs, son of Hon. G. W. Gibbs got 50 miles. Mr. Wm. Wilson, a Tory candidate, got 50 miles. Mr. J. C. Rykert, member for Lincoln, who obtained a limit, as he said for friends, in the Cypress Hills, for $250 odd, sold that timber limit in a short time for $100,000.

Mr. LALOR. And what was done with Mr. Rykert in connection with the timber limit ?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. It does not make any difference what was done with Mr. Rykert, but it is on record the sale was made.

Mr. LALOR. Is it not a fact that Mr. Rykert was expelled from the House by Sir John Thompson ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Not for that.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I am glad the hon. gentleman has mentioned that one was expelled. Well, if one was expelled, there were about five hundred others who should have been expelled or punished, because their cases were exactly parallel.

Mr. TAYLOR. How would you expel five hundred from a House of two hundred ?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I find among other applicants for timber limits made for themselves or their friends a name somewhat familiar to the members of this House, T. S. Sproule, M.P., made application for his brother, R. J. Sproule, and five others.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to tell the hon. member that he is astray, or else, if he has copied that, either the original is wrong or he has made a mistake. I made application for a good many more, not one of whom except one did I ever see, so far as I know, and that was Mr. Nelson, of Dundalk, a former resident of my riding, and a political opponent of mine. He was the party that sent me in the applications.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I am glad the hon. gentleman is honest enough to admit that he made applications for a great many.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to ask the hon. member if he thinks there was anything wrong or improper in a member of parliament, when applications were sent in to him to be forwarded to the department, doing so as a matter of courtesy. That was all I did in any case. Of all the applications put in, so far as I know, I do not think there was even an order in council passed in any case except one, and when the party went out west there was practically no timber on the place, and therefore he never attempted to do anything with it.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. The hon. gentleman, I admit, was very courteous in making applications for his friends.

Mr. SPROULE. They were not political friends of mine.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. Then for his enemies. Because there was not much timber on the place, as the hon. gentleman expected, I do not know that he was to blame. I suppose if there had been a lot of fine timber, why so much the better for his friends—or his enemies. I find also that the Hon. Geo. E. Foster, for himself, made application on April 25, 1886, and also for two friends named John Sadler and Henry Muirhead on the same date, 50 miles each. I also find another member of this parliament who is known to most of you, Geo. Taylor, M.P., who made application for friends for townships 39, 40 and 41, ranges 18, 19 and 20, west meridian, not a very small application; he did not go in for small things. Another return brought down shows 449 applications were made for coal leases, and among them are the names of Mr. J. C. Patterson, M.P., four applications; C. C. Colby, M.P., seven applications; A. Boultbee, M.P., one application; Thomas Scott, M.P., three applications. There were several others.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—he has been perusing the records, I presume, of the Department of the Interior, where he gets his information. I challenge him to produce an application signed by me on behalf of anybody. Mr. Walter Beatty made an application in his own behalf, and I forwarded his letter. The hon. gentleman cannot find anything else in the department, no application that I ever made, either on my own behalf or on behalf of anybody else. He has made a statement. I challenge him either to produce the proof or to withdraw the statement.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. The hon. gentleman is like the rest, he says he made an application, and gives the name of one.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I did not make an application; I inclosed his letter in one I wrote to the minister.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. That is just as good.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is that a crime? It is simply disgraceful for a member to get up in his place and make a charge against a member of parliament, and then either refuse to take it back or to produce the document.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I am glad the hon. gentleman is candid enough to admit that he forwarded an application on behalf of some friend. I see that for Northwest lands, in a little over one year, applications were made for 2,295 townships, and among the names of those who applied were over twenty members of parliament.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Including Alexander Mackenzie.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. No, Alexander Mackenzie was not among them. Out of 115 names there are only four who can, by any stretch of the imagination, be classified as Liberals. The names are on file in the library, and any one who wishes can go and look them up for himself.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. member in what class he puts the names of those who put in applications on behalf of others? I happen to know something about their political affiliations in the case of some of them. How does he classify them?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I classify them mostly as Conservatives, the others I do not classify at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, my brother never got any, not a foot.

Mr. GERMAN. His name is on the list.

Mr. SPROULE. The application was put in, but no order in council was ever passed, so that cannot be included. As for the others, so far as I know, some of them lived in Ontario, though I never saw them; several of them lived in Manitoba at the time, or in Birtle. Mr. Nelson, who left my riding and took machinery up there to build a grist

mill, sent in, I think, fourteen applications for timber limits, with a request that I put them in proper form and present them to the department for him, as he intended to go on and erect a sawmill. I think he gave me the names, and out of all the names he sent me I never saw but one of the applicants, and I never knew but one, except from information he gave me, and that information was to the effect that they were friends of his, and I assumed, of course, that they were Reformers, as he was himself. They were friends of his who were going in with him upon this line of business.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. Of course, the hon. gentleman admits that he made the applications, and if he did not get the land it was no fault of his.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not admit that I made an application at all. The hon. member might just as well be fair and manly; if he is not, let me tell him that I am going to strike back and give him something that he don't want. I am not going to be treated this way. I have been too long in this House, and my name and reputation are too well known for me to allow them to be sullied by any such insinuation.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. The hon. member is evidently getting a little warm, because he begins to threaten.

Mr. SPROULE. Because of the unmanly conduct of the hon. member.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman said that the applications are on file; are they in the department or in the library?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I said the records were in the library.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. In the 'Hansard.'

Mr. TAYLOR. In the speech made by the late Ananias Cameron?

Mr. SPROULE. And John Charlton.

Mr. TAYLOR. They made statements, as the hon. gentleman is making them, without any authority.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I do not wonder that hon. gentlemen do not feel like discussing timber limits in the west. I am glad to know that the able and exhaustive answer that was given by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), relating to the policy of the government in dealing with timber limits in the west, answered every objection so completely and so fully that the opposition have not been able to find a single point upon which they can make an attack upon the government. The hon. member for Brandon showed that between 1891 and 1896 the Conservative government had sold 440 miles for $3.63 a mile on an average, that is less than one cent an acre. He also compared the prices that were obtained by the former government with those obtained by the present government; therefore I do not wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite are annoyed when we repeat those comparisons. When that hon. gentleman contrasted the publicity given to advertisements for the sale of timber land limits, and the length of time permitted for the examination of these limits, by the Conservative and by the Liberal governments, I do not wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite felt disposed to drop that question.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) also referred to certain scandals in the west and, because the courts were not capable of dealing with certain questions that arose, he declared that this government had been remiss in their duty. He did not tell us of the action of the Liberal legislature of Saskatchewan in the case of one constituency from which the returns were irregular, so that the candidate was not entitled to take his seat; the Liberal majority of that legislature passed an Act giving the seat to the Conservative candidate who apparently was fairly entitled to it. That stands in strong contrast to some of the tactics that were adopted by the Conservative party in the past. For instance, we have the circular sent out by that party in 1896 as to how to conduct elections. I do not think it becomes them to preach purity and to throw across the floor of the House such insinuations as I have heard them indulge in, or to make such protestations of their desire to see public life purified. It ill-becomes them to proclaim themselves the great apostles of purity in view of their record in past days. I have here the instructions sent out to their returning officers prior to the elections of 1896. Listen to the instructions sent out:

> We have the printing of the ballots, therefore, a sufficient number should be printed extra to enable the deputy returning officer to have them marked for our candidate and ready to use after the count to replace those read out wrongly to the scrutineers.

What a frank and interesting explanation.

> Or the deputy returning officer can have them marked and folded in his pocket to slip into the box in place of an opposition ballot, if opportunity offers.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is some Grit literature you are reading from.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. This is from the circular issued by the Conservative party in 1896.

Mr. BARR. Where did you get that circular? That was issued by the Reformers of Ontario

Mr. M. S. SCHELL (reading):

> To get control of both scrutineers, have one of our men—not a prominent one but a supposed kicker—to apply to the opposition as

scrutineer inside. They are generally short of workers——

The Liberals in those days were supposed to be generally short of workers.

—and a few plausible men will turn the election in a close constituency.

Mr. LALOR. Will the hon. gentleman give his authority for that circular?

Mr. CLAUDE MACDONELL. I think it is a disgrace to stand up in this House and read it.

Mr. BARR. That was sent out by the Grit government.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. This is a document sent out by the Conservatives to their candidates. It continues:

Efforts should be made to make these methods work in wards that give the heaviest opposition vote.

Having control of both scrutineers, a large vote can be polled—dead and absent electors, &c., can have their ballots marked.

Dead and absent voters can have their ballots marked. There is no redress if both scrutineers were present. A friendly constable should be present to keep the poll clear of loungers and inquisitive people.

The deputy returning officer should be a reliable sharp and plausible man, so that if we do not get control of the opposition scrutineer, he can, when the counting time arrives, ask both scrutineers to take a piece of paper and record the votes for their candidates as he reads the ballots which have been emptied on the table. He will then have a chance to read out wrongly.

He will then have a chance to read out wrongly so that a majority can be secured for our candidate. The ballots should be put back into the boxes as quickly as they are read. The extra ones will do to fix things correctly when he gets home.

Here is another clause:

Spoiled ballots can be made sure by a little doctoring. Opposition ballots can be spoiled by the lead out of a pencil fastened under the little finger with beeswax drawn across opposite our candidate's name in opening the ballot. If you cannot get control of opposition scrutineer have your deputy returning officer announce that he is against you so as to lead him astray if possible.

I do not need to tell you about a certain man named Freeborn, a Conservative who went to Winnipeg on behalf of the Conservative party to teach the deputy returning officers how to switch ballots. When Mr. Boyd, a Conservative candidate out there, telegraphed back to Ontario asking about Freeborn, he received the reply:

He was a good man in North Bruce.

Nor need I call attention to the way in which ballots were spoiled in London—296 ballots spoiled in seventeen polls—nor to other irregularities and acts of corruption by our friends opposite.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), speaking in Hamilton recently, said that all the Liberal party had to do on coming into power was to step into the boat the Conservatives had built. He also said that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was a great discoverer. It is quite true that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in 1896, came from the people with a mandate to take charge of the old ship of state. The ship was in a sadly battered condition, she was water-logged and in danger of stranding on the rocks; the leading members of her crew had recently been in open mutiny, their conduct had been such that their leader, the captain of their vessel, had in his exasperation called them a nest of traitors. It is no wonder that we had that period of depression of which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) tells us, from 1893 to 1896, the greatest period of depression that ever existed in Canada. Is it any wonder that with such a crew in charge of the ship of state, depression prevailed all over Canada?

But taking possession of the old ship of state and standing on the bridge with glass in hand and compass before him, with officers around him, every one of whom was an expert in his department, and with sails unfurled——

Mr. CLAUDE MACDONELL. Where was Cap. Sullivan at that time, was he on the bridge ?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. Sir Wilfrid, with firm hand steered the ship of state into the open sea, and his officers discovered new channels of trade, new fields of commerce, new possibilities of national development, hitherto undreamed of, and from that day to this the ship of state has been sailing the high seas of national prosperity, national development and national stability. Cecil Rhodes said that some men think in parishes, some in continents, some in nations. True it is that the men who took the helm of state in 1896 were large men, men with a wide outlook, men of courage, men who had the instinct of statecraft.

They did not think in parishes merely but they thought in continents and nations, and as a result of their rule Canada is to-day occupying one of the foremost positions among the nations of the world in the matter of commercial progress and commercial extension. Taking hold of the work that came to their hands in 1896, one of the first things this Liberal government did was to bring in another policy in matters of trade. Canada had been labouring under a high protective tariff for eighteen years; a tariff that had been given every opportunity to prove that it was capable of bringing prosperity to the Dominion as its framers claimed for it. We all know the results; for eighteen long years Canada laboured under this high protective tariff and instead

of the tall chimneys that were pictured to us that would arise heavenward we found that during these eighteen years of high protection the country industrially was practically at a standstill. The immigration of our own people to the United States was on such a scale that the increase of the population was scarcely half of that increase which should come to us from the normal increase of our own population. The immigrants, many of them who were brought into Canada during that time came and saw and went, and during the eighteen years our population had not increased more than five per cent. In devising a tariff the Liberal government did not employ a few persons who were specially interested in a special line of production, but as commissioners the ministers went throughout the Dominion gathering information from manufacturers, from farmers, from business men, from merchants, from mechanics, from artisans, from all classes. And after the information was available to them the government devised a tariff; a tariff that was known then and is to-day regarded as a revenue tariff—not a high protective tariff, but a tariff, the principle of which is to collect a sufficient revenue to meet the necessary demands for carrying on the government of the country; a tariff that was not devised as the Conservative tariff was in the interests of the few as against the many; a tariff that was not devised in the interest of the classes as against the masses, but a tariff that was devised on broad and liberal principles. It was a tariff in the first place to foster and develop our own industries protecting them in a legitimate way from undue foreign competition; in the second place it was a tariff which did not unduly hamper trade or bring about an inflation of prices, thus imposing unjust burdens on the great producing classes of our community; it was a tariff in the third place designed to obtain the maximum of revenue and at the same time imposing the minimum of duties on imports to our country; and in the fourth place it was a tariff calculated to encourage trade with those countries willing to trade with us on a reciprocal basis. That was the kind of tariff which the Liberal government brought down in 1897 and which with slight changes has been in operation ever since. Last year, 1906, after the tariff introduced in 1897 had been in operation for ten years, another general tariff was brought down by the government and submitted to parliament, and what did we find? We found the great Conservative party which professes to have a policy on fiscal matters did not offer a single counter proposition to that tariff, and did not state what their policy would be in matters of trade. We found that but two speeches were delivered from the Conservative benches when that tariff was brought before the House, one by the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the other by the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). In 1903 and in 1904 the leader of the opposition declared for a tariff which he was pleased to term a tariff of adequate protection. It was a name which sounded well and it looked well in print, especially when printed in capital letters, but it was capable of a very wide interpretation and to this day the leader of the opposition has never given us his version of what he meant by the term 'adequate protection'. And when discussion took place on the tariff in committee what did we find. We found certain members on the opposition side who believed in high protection claiming that 100 per cent was not too high a duty to have imposed on certain manufactured articles. For instance the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) took that position; a tariff as high as Haman's gallows was not too high for that hon. gentleman. We found another hon. gentleman in the Conservative ranks claiming that the tariff should be made so high as to prohibit American goods or goods manufactured in any other country coming into competition with goods made in Canada. On the other hand, we found Conservative members from the rural constituencies saying that the duties should be reduced to ten per cent, and that the duty on agricultural implements which was seventeen and a half per cent should be reduced by one-half. We find that the opposition had a go-as-you-please policy on this question; no definite clear-cut or distinct policy that they could announce in this House when the tariff now in operation was submitted to parliament.

No one can view the development which has taken place under the present tariff, the progress that Canada has made, the general prosperity which is enjoyed by the people of Canada without feeling a thrill of pride, without feeling that Canada has made a progress that is not surpassed by any other country in matters of trade and commerce. For instance, if we make a comparison between the period from 1878 to 1896, with the last eleven years under the present tariff what do we find. Here are the figures:

| | |
|---|---|
| Total trade in 1878 | $172,000,000 |
| Total trade in 1896 | 239,000,000 |
| Increase in these 18 years | 67,000,000 |
| Average annual increase | 3,750,000 |

Here in this period we have an average increase in our trade of less than three and three-quarter million dollars per year. But let us look at the trade of Canada during the eleven years of the Liberal rule and we find the following figures:

| | |
|---|---|
| Total trade, 1896 | 239,000,000 |
| Total trade, 1907 | 617,900,000 |
| Increase in 11 years | 378,000,000 |
| Average yearly increase | 34,000,000 |

Look at it in another way—the increase during this last year (1907) alone over 1906

has been $67,100,000, a larger increase than took place during the whole eighteen years under the high protective policy of our friends opposite. The trade of the Dominion of Canada to-day is $93 per capita as against $42 per capita in 1896. The trade per capita in Canada is more than double what it is in the United States, that great country to the south with all its boasted commercial supremacy, and there is only one other country in the world that has a greater foreign trade than Canada, and that is Great Britain which exceeds our foreign trade per capita by a trifle

Again, our friends opposite are claiming that at present the balance of trade is going against us and they try to make some capital against the government because our exports are not as great as our imports. I do not wonder that our friends opposite feel strongly on this point and are trying to make some capital out of it; for they had an experience during their regime that convinced them that no country with a very large adverse balance of trade could be prosperous. During the eighteen years of their tenure of office, from 1878 to 1896, the total imports of Canada amounted to $2,044,807,768 and the total exports amounted to $1,682,592,467, or an excess of imports over exports of $362,215,301, or an average of $20,123,000 per year. Is it any wonder that the country was depressed, that trade was demoralized, that Canada was not making the progress that she should have made? As compared with the eleven years under the present tariff, what do we find? During those eleven years the total imports have been $2,295,947,369 and the total exports $2,165,574,140, or an excess of imports over exports for the period of $130,373,229. In other words, the balance of trade against the Dominion during the latter period has been only one-third of what it was during the former period, although the trade of the country has been infinitely larger, the percentage being only 7 per cent as compared with 21 per cent during the former regime. If there were no compensating assets, there might be reason to feel alarmed at this excess of our imports over our exports; but I am glad to say that we have assets that more than counterbalance the excess. For instance, among the imports we find $54,000,000 of settlers' effects, which wipes out about one-third of the amount. Then, it is estimated on the best authority that the American settlers who have come to Canada during the last eleven years have brought in cash $80,000,000. We know that they are settlers of the best class, men who have sold their farms at good prices and have brought their money with them to invest in lands of the Canadian Northwest. That $80,000,000 wipes out the balance of the excess of imports over exports. But that is not all. The 470,000 odd immigrants who have come to our shores from Great Britain have no doubt brought with them $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 more. Capital has been flowing to our shores. It is estimated that the great railroad corporations have brought in at least $180,000,000 to invest. This amount of capital put into circulation, much of it spent for rolling stock, for raw material, for construction work, accounts in a large measure for the large amount of imports shown in the trade returns during the last year or two. Further than that, we are glad to know that the population of the Dominion during the last eleven years has increased about 1,500,000 as against about 150,000 during the preceding eighteen years. I have a return here which shows that 472,402 immigrants came from Great Britain and 346,990 from the United States, making over 800,000 from these two countries out of a total of 1,169,133, who have come to Canada in the last eleven years. Of the balance the greater number came from Northern Europe, and only from 5 to 8 per cent were what might be classed as undesirable. So that we have assets that will in the very near future cause our exports to increase at a very great ratio. In a country that is growing fast, whose population is increasing and whose development is going on at a rapid pace, the imports must of necessity be somewhat larger than the exports. The United States has been frequently referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite as a country whose exports are greater than its imports; but what do we find in the history of that country? From 1855 to 1873 there were only three years in which its exports were greater than its imports. During that whole period its imports averaged $70,000,000 more than its exports. I might also direct your attention to other great countries of the world—Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Holland—in not one of which have the exports at all come up to the imports. In fact, in only three or four years during the last thirty years have any of these countries shown an excess of exports over imports. The same is true of Great Britain. So that when the argument is used by our friends opposite that our imports are greater than our exports, we take it that in view of the rapid development that is taking place, in view of the increased flow of capital to our country, in view of the immigrants coming to our shores, we have more than sufficient of assets to compensate for the excess of imports over exports. During the last eleven years we exported $482,981,673 more than we exported during the whole eighteen previous years. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) asked what had become of the surpluses which the Finance Minister has claimed that we have had during the past ten years, amounting to $94,000,000. I am very glad to tell him what has become of those surpluses; and I am very glad to know that this government has had surpluses instead of having to go to Europe to borrow money to carry on the government of the country.

We find that while under the Conservative regime the debt of the country increased from $140,000,000 to $258,000,000 in eighteen years, being a total increase of $118,000,000 or an average of $6,500,000 per year, the present government has provided for expenditures on capital account to the extent of $127,000,000 and yet has had surpluses sufficient year by year to pay for all the expenditures on capital account without going abroad to borrow, except to the extent of $5,500,000 during this period. And were it not for the $17,000,000 which have been spent in the last two years in connection with the Transcontinental Railway, we would have had a sufficient surplus to have liquidated the debt of the country to the extent of $12,000,000.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the debt now ?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. $263,500,000. We are aware that in the near future the debt will be somewhat increased. We know very well that, with the Transcontinental Railway under construction, a considerable amount will have to be expended on the construction of that road. But we also know very well that when the road is constructed, it will be an asset worth what it cost, an asset that will be bearing interest. We know that the government will receive from the Grand Trunk Pacific the interest on the money borrowed to build the road and that all it will cost this country as an absolute outlay—as an absolute gift, so to speak—will be in the neighbourhood of $15,000,000 or possibly $18,000,000. It has been estimated to cost from $13,000,000 to $15,000,000 but it may cost a little more. What is that compared with what the Canadian Pacific Railway cost the country ? What is that compared with the $60,000,000 hard cash and the 25,000,000 acres of land which we gave the Canadian Pacific Railway, besides the privilege of fixing its own rates and of freedom from taxation ? In fact the Canadian Pacific Railway has cost the Dominion some $200,000,000 or $250,000,000 as compared with $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 that possibly may be paid as a gift to the Grand Trunk Pacific.

An hon. MEMBER. Tell us about the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. That is one of the best deals this government ever entered into. If there is anything this government can take credit for above another it is the Saskatchewan Valley land deal. Any one who knows that territory, knows perfectly well that for years it was regarded as a totally arid tract and that on 60 miles of railway running through that country there was not a single station and only three or four settlers. Therefore when the government gave the company a sale of that land at $1 an acre, subject to the conditions that they should put some forty settlers in each township within a certain time, that was the best bargain that could possibly have been made—infinitely better than giving the lands away without any consideration. The condition binding the company to put settlers in that territory was alone sufficient to justify the transaction. When the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company desired a station in that territory, the railway company said no, but if you will pay for the agent, we will put one there. So they put an agent there and got the station. The company built hotels, they brought in settlers, stores were built, business developed, and to-day millions of bushels of wheat are being shipped annually from that district, and we have received many times over the value of that land under the most favourable circumstances. We have received as much as it would be worth to us to-day if sold to-day at the increased value of farm lands.

The full benefit which Canada is receiving under the present tariff is not realized until you compare it with the tariff of 1896. In 1896 our free imports amounted to $38,421,302. In 1907 they amounted to $140,994,207. If we were charging the average rate of duty on these free imports which was charged prior to 1896, we would have paid in duty over $50,000,000 more than we have done. When our hon. friends opposite claim that the tariff is not reduced and that we are paying as much customs to-day as prior to 1896, they are very far astray.

Mr. LALOR. What is the average taxation per head to-day as compared with 1896 ?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. The duties imposed to-day are $3.19 per every $100 worth imported less than in 1896 and prior to 1896.

Mr. LAKE. That does not agree with what the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) says.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I find that in 1888, for instance, the average duty on dutiable imports was $31.85 per $100 worth of goods imported.

Mr. LALOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. M. S. Schell) did not answer my question—what was the taxation per head in 1896 and what is it now?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I have given the rate of duty charged, and I will give more on that line. In 1889 the rate of duty was $31.86 per $100 worth of dutiable imports into Canada. In 1891 it was $31.38, in 1896 it was $29.97. From 1896 down to 1907 there was a gradual reduction until, in that year, it reached $26.33, or a reduction of $3.63 as compared with 1896. Taking the whole imports, dutiable and free, we find that in 1888, 1889 and 1890 the rate of duty was nearly $22 per $100 worth of imports. In 1896 it was $19.12. In 1907 it was $16.03, or a reduction of $3.09 as

compared with 1896. So when our friends opposite claim that the present tariff is not devised with a view to lessening the duties they are very wide of the mark. They will find that the figures I have given are absolutely correct.

Mr. LALOR. The hon. gentleman has not answered my question as to the taxation per head. Is it not a fact that the taxation per head in 1896 was $5.46 and that now it is $11.50 per head?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I find that, according to the statement of the president of the Manufacturers' Association, the average rate of wages of the artisan has increased $94 during the last few years. And, if you take the whole population of Canada as a basis for calculating the revenue, I find that somewhat more revenue has come into the treasury in proportion to the population than came in under the former government. But that is because of the increased capacity of the people to earn money. Their earning capacity is nearly three times what it was during the former regime. The hon. gentleman seems anxious to get an answer. I do not mind answering his question. The labouring man gets $94 more than he did prior to 1896, and while he may pay a little more toward the revenue, he has $94 a year with which to pay it.

Mr. OWEN. It costs to live double what it cost in 1896.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. If we consult the tables showing our exports to the various countries of the world, we shall find that we have been making very substantial progress in every department. The following is a summary:

Statement showing principal articles of export to all countries.

| | 1896. | 1906. |
|---|---|---|
| Animals and their produce | $ 37,404,396 | $ 67,186,175 |
| Agricultural products | 17,974,011 | 60,215,735 |
| The fisheries | 11,183,698 | 16,049,394 |
| The mine | 8,401,760 | 35,706,030 |
| The forest | 27,324,894 | 38,975,543 |
| Manufactures | 10,222,877 | 27,650,278 |
| Miscellaneous | 473,854 | 874,647 |
| Coin and bullion | 4,699,309 | 9,928,828 |
| | $117,684,799 | $256,586,630 |

In other words, our exports have increased over 100 per cent during the last eleven years. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said this increase was largely owing to the increased value of our goods rather than to the increased volume. Now, the tonnage on a railroad is not calculated on the basis of value, but on the basis of volume, and I find that in the last eleven years a comparison of tonnage in 1886 and 1896 and between 1896 and 1907 shows as follows:

Mr. M. S. SCHELL.

Railroad tonnage.

| | |
|---|---|
| In 1886 | 15,670,460 |
| In 1896 | 24,266,825 |
| In 1907 | 63,866,135 |

During the eleven years there was an increase of 39,000,000 tons, or 150 per cent over and above 1896, while their increase during the former like period was only 9,000,000 tons. These figures prove conclusively that the increased volume of business has been even greater than the increased value of the business. I claim that these figures entirely contradict the contention of the hon. member for North Toronto that the figures given in our trade and navigation returns are not a true index of the growth and development of the country.

Mr. OWEN. Does not the hon. gentleman know that we have just passed through ten years of the greatest prosperity the world has ever known? Surely he does not take all the credit of that for the government?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman appreciates the growth and development that have taken place during the last eleven years. The prosperity has been marvellous, and I think this government is entitled to some considerable credit for it. I know that prosperity has prevailed to a considerable extent throughout the world, but you can name no country that has shown an equal growth and progress to that shown by Canada during the last eleven years. It is recognized the world over that Canada has made greater strides forward than any other country. The optimistic statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister of this Dominion that the twentieth century belonged to Canada, is beginning to be fulfilled. I know that our friends opposite claim that the expenditure of the country is increasing. So it is, and we recognize that in a rapidly growing country we must have increased revenue and increased expenditure if we are going to keep pace with the needs of the time. I am glad to know that this government is not afraid to show enterprise and recognizes the necessity of keeping pace with the needs of the time. We find that the estimates of to-day are considerably more than they were in former years. Our friends opposite are not quite fair in their criticism of the growth of expenditure. They do not call attention to certain items that increase with the growth of the country, certain items which while they call for a large expenditure, bring in a correspondingly large return. These are not properly a charge upon the individual members of the community. For instance, the debt that we now carry is a legacy from our friends opposite. The interest on that debt and the sinking fund call for an annual expenditure of $12,363,247. The estimates for railways and canals this year call for $11,469,-

060. Now that sum is not a charge upon the revenue of the country, properly speaking. Every one in this House knows that the cost of running the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island Railway is included in the estimates, and the receipts that are derived from the operation of these railroads are put on the opposite side of the account, and one practically balances the other. While we are spending possibly double the money on the Intercolonial that we spent ten or twelve years ago, we are reaping a correspondingly increased return from it. So there is an amount going to the credit of the country which is not chargeable to income properly speaking. Taking again our Post Office Department. Under the former government they spent four million and a half dollars annually, and at the end of the year they had a deficit of six or seven hundred thousand. That sum was an actual charge. Instead of runing the Post Office Department on a business basis and under proper methods, they were unable to make ends meet, and while they asked for $3,500,000 in their estimates, at the end of the year they had a deficit of some six or seven hundred thousand which had to be provided out of revenue. This government asks for estimates to the amount of $6,000,000, and at the end of the year what do they have? Instead of paying out $6,000,000, we really pay out only $4,500,000, because we have a surplus of $1,500,000 over and above all the expenses of running the Post Office Department. I think that shows a difference in the methods of administration followed by the two governments. Certainly more money is expended at present, we spend a million dollars more on the Post Office, but we reap a profit of a million and a half dollars. I give those instances in two departments, which I think should convince any honest mind that the methods pursued by this government are business methods, and that when such methods are pursued, though we may spend a little more money, we derive a corresponding profit upon the investment, and this country is richer at the end of the year. When our hon. friends speak about the increased cost of running the government, I would refer them for instance to the Customs. We know that the administration of the Customs Department has increased materially enormously in the items of salaries and the cost of collection. But we get increased returns; the business of the country has increased so enormously that the revenue has increased also, though there is a lower rate of taxation. The business of the country has doubled, and naturally the cost of administration has increased. But instead of paying a million dollars for collection of Customs and for administration generally as under the former government, this government to-day is spending in the neighbourhood of $2,400,000. Then there are the provincial subsidies, these are a fixed charge. This government has not the regulating of these subsidies as practically they are fixed under the Act of confederation and they naturally increase from year to year. This year we are compelled to pay over $2,000,000 more than we paid last year. This is a fixed charge and when comparisons are made of the cost of government to-day with the cost under previous administrations, that is entirely lost sight of. The subsidies this year are $9,579,372 and, as I have said, this is a fixed charge.

In expenditures for public works on capital account the government has expended $127,000,000 and has not added a dollar to the debt of the country, while the former government spent but $80,000,000 and incurred a debt of $118,000,000. The estimates for expenditures on capital account for public works this year are $9,110,050. No one can possibly or reasonably object to the expenditures made under this department, when we consider the importance of developing our transportation facilities, improving the St. Lawrence channel, and enlarging our canals in order that our goods may be conveyed to European markets in the best possible condition.

We find that for agriculture $1,258,500 is asked for in the estimates this year, and that this government is expending nearly double what was spent by the former government in the interests of agriculture. Who will object to that? If our friends opposite object to it I am sure it is not to their credit. Expenditures made on behalf of agriculture have been bringing a return manyfold in excess of their amount, and I believe that such expenditures will be supported by every person.

On small subsidies and steamship subventions the expenditure is $1,497,833; on the administration of justice, $1,288,895: on lighthouse and coast survey, $2,717,050. These items which I have enumerated amount to $57,620,346, and I am sure that we are receiving value for every dollar so expended. The expenditures are made in the best interests of the country and when we consider the manner in which the affairs of the country have been carried on by this government and the largely increased revenue that has been derived with a lower rate of duty it must be admitted that the government deserves credit. If the revenue increases, as I hope it will, and the public expenditure increases, as I hope it will in a degree commensurate with the expansion and development of the country, we will witness in Canada a national development of which we have seen only the beginning.

This government has adopted legislation that has been of great advantage to the people of Canada, and we have reason to be proud of that legislation. Look for a moment at the measures that have been adopted by the Department of Agriculture. We

have, for example, the pure seed Bill, the Fruit Marks Act, the pure food Bill and others, every one of which has resulted in great good to the Dominion of Canada. Then in the Department of Labour, we have the Lemieux Bill adopted last session. Within one year eleven or twelve very important industrial disputes have been settled under the provisions of that Act. We have on our statute-books the best legislation respecting labour and capital of any country in the world. I make that statement advisedly and unreservedly. In support of it we have the testimony of those who have looked carefully into the subject. We have seen the government of the United States sending a representative from one end of Canada to the other investigating this Bill and its practical working in connection with disputes between capital and labour. We find the government of France also making special inquiry in regard to this measure. We have seen conflicts between capital and labour avoided by its application and this has meant during the last year the saving of thousands and thousands to both the labouring class and the manufacturers or employers of labour in Canada.

Then we have the Sunday Observance Bill brought into effect two years ago. We are advised that under the operation of that Bill one day of rest in seven has been provided for some 75,000 labourers and employees who formerly had not even that one day.

I might refer to other matters in connection with the legislation of this government. I hope that during this session the Bill that has been introduced by the Minister of Justice providing for purity in elections will be adopted. I believe it deserves and I hope it will receive the support of members on both sides of the House.

While we are proud of what has taken place in Canada during the last few years, we have unlimited faith in Canada, its growth and its glorious future. The development of our transportation facilities is one of the most important tasks which we have to face. Steam railroads are an absolute essential for our future development. If it is necessary I for one am quite prepared to support the construction of a railway to Fort Churchill to open the route from Hudson's bay to the European markets. That the time for that has come I am not prepared to say. If some such provision for the building of that road as was suggested by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) can be made, I do not suppose the construction of the road would be open to any special objection. I know, of course, that with the other large projects which are under consideration, the construction of the Georgian bay ship canal, for instance, it is wise for this government to go carefully and cautiously until they have completed the National Transcontinental Railway, but I believe that in connection with the proposed all-red route the Dominion of Canada may well, at any time that the British parliament and the parliaments of Australia and New Zealand are prepared to enter into that project, support it vigorously. I believe it is a project that will appeal to every true Canadian, to every true Britisher. Whether the route be from Blacksod bay on the west coast of Ireland or from Liverpool to Halifax or to Quebec, I care not, but if we have the best Atlantic service, connecting Great Britian with Canada by four and a half days steamers so that passengers may go in nine days from London to Vancouver, and then the very best service across the Pacific, Canada, standing midway between the Occident and the Orient, will derive wonderful benefit from its situation on this great highway. I believe the Dominion of Canada would receive more benefit possibly than Great Britian would or the government of New Zealand or Australia.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to detain the House any longer. While we rejoice in the development and growth of the Dominion of Canada, it is well for us to remember that true greatness consists not merely in our wide expanse of territory, nor in the naturally rich resources of our soil, but rather in the devotion of our people to a high and lofty ideal of public and private duty, actuated by a spirit of patriotism inspired by the highest motives; with a love for all that is pure, true, noble and good, and a hatred for all that is false, base and mean; frowning down everything that would make for strife and discord either of creed or of race, and standing for that which makes for amity, and for peace, and for national stability and national integrity.

Mr. A. BRODER (Dundas). I do not intend to detain the House at the great length the last speaker did. I shall deal briefly with some matters which I think may be of interest not only to the House but to the country, and I shall in the first instance correct a statement which was made by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) in this debate, and which was reiterated by the hon. member from Oxford (Mr. Schell) I do not for a moment say the hon. member for South Grey intended to mislead the House. He was quoting from the 'Farmers Sun' an authority which is generally well informed and which could not have made the statement I refer to in its editorial with a full knowledge of all the facts. I am referring to the importation of Canadian apples to the French market. The hon. member for South Grey was very anxious to eulogize his friends on the treasury benches and the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Schell) was equally anxious, but in this connection their eulogy was misplaced. When the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Schell) was called to the fact he was not stating the

matter as it appeared in the record, he said his authority was good and he persisted in the statement, a course which I think was neither fair nor courteous to the House. I have here the tariff of 1907 and embodied in this tariff is : an Act respecting a certain treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the French Republic, assented to on July 23, 1904, and in article 3 of that Act we find :

The following articles of Canadian origin imported direct from that country accompanied by certificates of origin shall receive the advantage of the minimum tariff matters, shall be enjoyed fully by France, Algeria and the French colonies.

And in that list we find: 'apples and pears, fresh, dried or pressed,' and so these articles have been in the treaty between France and Canada for the last fourteen years, and yet the hon. member would get up and say his authority was good and that they were put in the French treaty by this Liberal government. Now let us see what has been the result of that open market for our apples in France during all that time. I will take two years so as to get a sort of average of the result. According to our trade and navigation returns for 1903 there were $3,982 worth of dried apples went into France and the same year $57,572 worth of green apples went into France. In 1906, $209,131 worth of green apples went into France and no dried apples according to the trade and navigation returns. Now in 1906, there went into Great Britain green apples valued at $3,475,825, and dried apples valued at $12,257. In 1903, dried apples went into England to the value of $25,553 and green apples to the value of $4,379,826.

Now, it is easily seen that even with that open market for fourteen years the apple trade of Canada has not had much advantage in the French market. I have here the American-French treaty of 1898, and I find that American apples and pears went into France under exactly the same tariff as the Canadian apples and pears did. But, if you turn up this tariff in the present French treaty you will find that these same articles are mentioned just as they are mentioned in the Franco-Canadian tariff of 1894, although my hon. friend seemed anxious to give his party, this government, great credit for having negotiated a treaty with respect to them. I am quite willing they should have all the credit they are entitled to, but I do not intend that he should steal any apples off the Tory tree to throw to his friends.

There is another matter I wish to talk about. I am sorry the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schell) has left his seat, because I want to deal for a few moments with a circular which he read. He said that this circular came from the Conservative party to the electors and that it was spread throughout the country suggesting how to manipulate elections in a fraudulent way. I tell the hon. gentleman that he cannot give his authority for saying that Conservatives issued that circular, but I want to say to the House and to the country that the evidence we have in the courts and out of the courts proves that the party in power today are the people who carried out the injunctions in that circular to the very letter. It is pretty easy to understand where the circular emanated from. The people who carried it out to the letter are the Liberals of this country and I intend to give evidence to prove that and I shall give the evidence from their own party friends. I want to read to this House and I want to put upon 'Hansard' the confession of Mr. McNish, and who do you think was a witness to that confession. Why, none other than the gentleman who poses in this country as intending to give us a pure election law, the Minister of Justice, Mr. Aylesworth. Let us see what he put into the mouth of his client in order to get his party out of the coils of the law. Here is the McNish confession addressed to the prosecuting lawyers:

St. Thomas, June 26, 1899.

Messrs. Crothers & Price,
Barristers, &c., St. Thomas.

Dear Sirs,—We beg to advise you that Mr. McNish has discussed at length with his solicitors the charges contained in the petition which has been filed against his return as member of the legislative assembly of Ontario for West Elgin, and that they have to a considerable extent investigated the charges contained therein and other matters which have come to their knowledge in connection with the election. And the subscribers hereto make the following statements and admissions respecting the same:

1. That a large number of persons were specially sent into the constituency by men workng on behalf of the Liberal party for the express purpose of taking part in Mr. McNish's behalf in the election held on January 12, 1899, and we believe that fraudulent and corrupt means were used by some such persons to secure his election.

Carrying out the suggestion to the letter.

2. That several of the said persons illegally and without authority acted as deputy returning officers at the said election, and in at least three cases so acted in the names of reputable local men, having, under assumed names, been introduced to the returning officer by local agents of Mr. McNish.

Further carrying out the suggestion. Let us see what is next:

3. That in many of the polling subdivisions of the riding there were grave irregularities connected with the return of the ballot-boxes and their contents, the voting and the counting of the ballots thereat.

Following the circular again. It is easily seen where the circular came from.

4. That there were large numbers of persons brought into the riding for the express purpose of personating legitimate voters, and

assisted by some of Mr. McNish's supporters, such persons did personate qualified voters in voting for Mr. McNish.

5. That the declared number of votes for Mr. McNish largely exceeded the number of bona fide votes cast for him.

Carrying out the circular. We will print more ballots, the circular said.

6. That a large number of ballots cast for Mr. MacDiarmid were in some nefarious and corrupt manner manipulated, whereby the result of the election was rendered doubtful, and that in this connection the voting at Shedden and Middlemarsh, and in the several divisions in St. Thomas, where said strangers so acted as returning officers, merits special mention.

7. That there are good reasons to believe that there are many special and well-authenticated cases where agents of Mr. McNish concealed at their homes some of the strangers, who there paid large sums of money to electors to induce them to vote for him.

Do you want any stronger proof as to who had the circular carried out? Let us see what more there is:

8. That Mr. McNish will forthwith deliver to the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly his resignation as a member thereof for the said electoral district.

(Sgd.) DONALD McNISH.

Witness:
(Sgd.) A. B. Aylesworth.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him, two of this gang are now in the employ of this government, one as Indian agent at Parry Sound, and the other as customs collector.

Mr. BRODER. I want to go a little further, and give another little bit of history. What about Mr. J. B. Jackson? He came from South Oxford, the riding of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat; and he attempted to hire men to swear falsely if necessary in order to unseat a Conservative member. What was his reward? Under the hand and seal of the Minister of Trade and Commerce he was sent to Leeds, England, to act as a commercial agent of Canada. No wonder the hon. member for South Oxford finds it necessary to make a long speech in order to have it published and sent among the electors of South Oxford to fortify their consciences. What do we find in the late history of that riding? We find that in the last six months two men have refused to be Liberal candidates for the local legislature. What did Judge Street say of Mr. Jackson, who is in the employ of this government? He said this:

One of the difficulties I have in this case is the knowledge of the improper and reprehensible means and large expenditures which have been proven to have been devoted to absolutely improper purposes. It is impossible to follow the ramifications of such an expenditure, and in dealing with the last case I cannot get out of my mind the possibility of the course of inquiry having been affected by the expenditure of a very large sum of money. Here is Mr. Jackson, a lawyer in Ingersoll. Here is this man of the lowest possible character, as far as appears from what has been said about him, and one knows of the desperate efforts that have been made to prove the charges. Nothing was ever heard in my experience before like it.

Talk about issuing a circular—who has carried out the circular? Hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends have carried it out to the letter. Go to the St. James division of Montreal and you find Mr. Brunet disqualified, and some of his friends disqualified and put in gaol; but the Minister of Justice let some of the parties out. Then go to the St. Anne's division and you find the member elect disqualified there. So I would not talk much about the circular if I belonged to the Liberal party. I do not want to overlook the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who said that Jackson's whole sin was in not looking under the bed and up the chimney and into the garret before he did his nefarious work. When Sir Richard Cartwright was in the House of Commons he spoke of Mr. Jackson being rather zealous, but neglecting to look into these quarters. That is the excuse he gave for sending this man to one of the centres of England as commercial agent of this country. The hon. gentleman spoke of the labouring man getting $94 a year more than he used to. It is a great pity that some of that additional money was not sent to Toronto to help some of the poor people there. Now, I want to deal with the Minister of Agriculture. To hear him and his friends talk on the public hustings, you would think that when this government came to power a new heaven and a new earth were created, and that the Minister of Agriculture was the centre of the system, and everything agricultural revolved around him. What are the facts? I do not wish to detract one iota from the credit which the hon. gentleman deserves; but the Department of Agriculture is conducted under the same system that existed when he came in. Did the hon. gentleman and his colleagues introduce anything new?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, they did—stuffing chickens.

Mr. BRODER. That is a little thing, but they have learned by this time that chickens are able to feed themselves. Who established the experimental farms in this country—the Liberal party? No. In the Auditor General's Report for 1878, at page B—2 you will find that $90,000 was expended to establish experimental farms at Ottawa, Nappan, Indian Head and Brandon. In the same year the department purchased 75,000 of a pamphlet issued by W. H. Lynch, who had visited Denmark and studied the system of dairying there. These were sent out over the country to sharpen the minds of the people with reference to their dairying interests. In 1889, we find in the Audi-

tor General's Report, page B—20, that $90,000 was granted, and the government started an experimental farm in British Columbia in that year. The same year they granted $10,000 to encourage agricultural societies in the Northwest Territories. In 1890 they gave $70,000 to the experimental farm and $4,550 for the development of the dairying interests. In 1890 they appointed J. W. Robinson, dairy commissioner. The whole machinery which has since been operated and has resulted in the development we are so proud of, was started by the late Conservative government. I do not pretend to say that some improvement has not been made. No new country can stand still, but hon. gentlemen opposite talk as if the country would have stood still if they had not come into office. Well, the wheels must move whether they are in power or out of it.

I want now to take up another matter. I see that the present administration have followed out the lines laid down by the Conservative party with reference to the agricultural interests. Let us see what other people are doing with reference to experimental farms. Russia—that country which we think is standing still—has 102 stations; Germany has 80; France, 71; Austro-Hungary, 61; the United States, 60; Sweden, 26; Italy, 22; Belgium, 15; Japan, 15; Norway, 12, and Canada 6, including the last two added to the list by the Minister of Agriculture—one in North Alberta and the other in South Alberta. What about the expenditure? France spends in the interests of agriculture yearly $9,200,000; Austria, $9,270,000; Hungary, $9,400,000, and Russia, $25,280,000. And I want to say here that Russia is our future rival in the English market for many products. Japan spends $3,750,000; the United States, $10,000,000; and Canada, $518,976.56. Those expenditures are taken in the year 1906. I am taking what is granted under the head of arts and agriculture, and I strike out the items that are not in the interest of agriculture. For instance, I strike out the archives, $21,985, for I do not think that should be charged to agriculture. Also census statistics and criminal statistics. I do not think those should be charged to agriculture. Then there is the Year-book—I do not think that that is in the interest of anybody; and general statistics, $14,111.85. Historical data re Acadian families I do not think should be charged to agriculture; and it is after deducting these items that I find we have spent on agriculture during 1906 $518,976.56.

Let me now call attention to this fact, that while we have spent only half a million dollars on agriculture, we have seen fit to spend $4,294,124.62 on militia and defence, charged to income, and $1,299,875.65 charged to capital account, or a total of $5,594,000.27 on militia and defence. In other words, we have spent that large amount on war and only $518,976 on the great avocation of peace—agriculture. In other words, we have spent within a few cents of $11 on war for every $1 we have spent on agriculture.

Let us see what some of the provinces are doing. Ontario spends on agriculture $547,153.23 and Quebec $305,637.23. Let me point out that economy in many of the departments would give millions to the Agricultural Department. The right hon. gentleman could stand up, when our expenditure was $38,000,000 to $40,000,000, and suggest that he could save from $1,000,000 to $3,000,000. Why does he not apply his pruning knife now? He might easily lop off many a million dollars with safety to the country and without impairment of efficiency if proper economy were practised.

I say that the Agricultural Department is not meeting the difficulties and the problems which confront it. That is a serious statement to make, but I shall prove it from the blue-books and documents issued to the public. I have in my hand the dairy and cold storage commissioner's report for the year ending March 31, 1907, and I want to show that while the Minister of Agriculture claims to be making quite an effort to meet the difficulties which confront him—and I do not say that these difficulties are easily overcome—that proper care which should characterize the handling of our perishable products in the markets of the world is not carried out. I have here, on page 97 of the report, some correspondence regarding the handling of our cheese:

Liverpool Service.

Steamship....., sailed May 12.

A number of cheese boxes were broken by using shutes for loading. I went to the foreman and had him place stuffed sacks at the botton of shutes for the boxes to strike against.

Steamship.....sailed June 9.

The cheese stored in No. 6 hatch were very roughly handled quite a number of boxes being broken.

I spoke to the men a number of times, but they did not pay any attention to me until I went to the superintendent, who sent a man down to watch them. They handled them better after that.

Of course, it is not the agent that the Canadian government sends who has control over the ship hands. He ought to have told somebody else. Now, here is another case of a steamship whose name is not given, but which sailed on July 23. I do not see why the name is withheld:

Steamship....., sailed June 23.

Some cheese were handled very roughly with the platform slings. I spoke to the men two or three times, but they paid no attention to me.

They were not responsible to him.

I then went to the superintendent, who came and told the men they were to do as I said or he would discharge them all, which had the desired effect.

Steamship.....sailed July 14.

The cargo on this steamer was handled as carefully as possible. They kept a man at the hatch watching the men stowing the cheese in the ship. I had to speak to the carters several times for breaking boxes, and had to threaten to telephone the firms they were drawing for, which made them more careful.

Steamship..... sailed September 15.

I had to speak to the men a couple of times for handling the cheese roughly, and the foreman threatened to discharge them if he saw them again. I threatened to report a couple of the carters and one helper for throwing the cheese, after which they were handled very carefully.

Now, I come to the London service :

London Service.

Steamship....., sailed September 1.

The cargo on this ship was handed very well. I had to speak to the shore captain about the patent drop, as the men had not fixed it properly, and were dropping the cheese about six inches, thus breaking several of them. He immediately had it remedied.

Steamship....., sailed September 29.

The cargo on this ship was handled a little rougher than usual, as the boat was late, and they were rushing to get her out on time. I spoke several times to the men who were handling the apples and cheese, then I went to the shore captain, who told the foreman to handle the goods carefully and not break them if the boat stayed here a week. After that they were handled very much better.

Steamship....., sailed October 27.

Cargo handled carefully, with the exception of apples from railways by teamsters, who had to be cautioned several times for careless work.

Glasgow Service.

Steamship....., sailed June 14.

Some of the cheese were handled very roughly.

That is the condition of things, as shown by the reports of the department. I say the department is not meeting these difficulties.

Now, there is another matter that ought to concern the public of this country in reference to the handling of our goods. I will only read briefly from the report, but I think the matter is of very great importance. I read from the report of the dairy and cold storage commissioner, under the heading 'Canadian Produce at Ports in Great Britain.' This part of the report refers to Liverpool :

During the season of 1906 some improvement was manifest, but our inspectors' reports show that from June 19 to October 24, 10,045 packages of Canadian butter were left on the docks for two days and that 2,660 packages were left on the docks for three days and over.



What is the use of boasting about our cold storage facilities, if you put the butter in cold storage here and, when it reaches the other side, it is left lying on the dock for two or three days? Here again we see that the department is not meeting the problems before it. I think this boasting about the Minister of Agriculture should cease until he has put matters into proper shape.

Now, there is another matter that is very serious, but to which I will refer only briefly, as I wish to save the time of the House. The reports that I shall read will show that Canadian cheese is going over not in a condition to hold the market. There is some difference of opinion on the point. Some cheesemen of this country say it is not a detriment, but some say it is a very serious detriment. I conclude from what is said by the English correspondents that this is a serious matter and jeopardizes the prospects of our cheese in the English market. I quote again from the report of the dairy and cold storage commissioner :

(From George Little, Limited, Manchester, dated December 12, 1906.)

The condition of the cheese when reaching this market is almost a scandal and points to the fact that cheese are not allowed to mature in the factory, but must be sent forward immediately, on the off-chance of the cheese ripening and maturing in transit. We have during the last few days landed some 1,000 to 1,500 boxes of cheese and there is hardly one that we can send out for immediate consumption. Buyers turn up their noses at such stuff and tell us that they will look at them again in a couple of months' time. The system of buying c.i.f. places an importer at a serious discount, as he literally buys a pig in a poke, and has to trust to the exporter to give him decent value. We have made up our minds to do less importing solely on these grounds and we should be glad if you would place the saddle on the right horse and the blame on the right shoulders, and if at any conference of factorymen or officials in cheese centres, please urge the importance of amending this matter at once, otherwise the quality of Canadian cheese will decline more and more (as it has already done) in the estimation of the British public. Several years of prosperity and increased production may have made the dairy element indolent and indifferent about how their products turn out in this country, but it is a wrong policy to adopt and is inimical to the prosperity of your great country.

When you boast about the Minister of Agriculture and what he has done for this country, what comment are you going to make on that letter? I hope that the department will endeavour to remedy this difficulty. If not the cheese of this country will not be able to hold its place in the English market. The high price may have tided

them over serious difficulties for a year or two, but there can be only one result of cheese reaching the market in this shape. And, according to the returns, our exports of cheese and butter are falling off. You can draw a circle around the eastern portion of Ontario and the western portion of Quebec and you have within that circle of a few miles—few as compared with the size of the two provinces—practically the whole cheese industry of this country. What about the other provinces? I do not think there is very much encouragement in this report. I find the following at page 4:

Ontario and Quebec continue to produce the bulk of the cheese and butter made in Canada, and the development of the industry in these two provinces seems to have reached a point where there is not very much change in the situation from year to year, except the fluctuations due to climatic, market and other conditions. There is some multiplication of factories in both provinces, but the territory is now for the most part pretty well occupied, and new factories which are erected have to compete, as a rule, with existing ones for their supply of milk. In the lower lake district of Ontario there is a tendency to convert some of the cheese factories into cream-gathering creameries, and localities in which cheese factories were in operation ten years ago, but have been closed for lack of support, are now being occupied by creameries on this system. There seems to be very little tendency towards the establishment of creameries in that part of Ontario lying east of Toronto.

Now, what about the maritime provinces?

The dairy industry is not making much progress in the maritime provinces. The number of factories remains about the same in Prince Edward Island as for several years past. The production of cheese and butter during the season of 1906 showed some increase over the previous year and there is evidence that the herds are recovering from the effects of the unfavourable season in 1905. At present there seems to be some revival of interest in dairying in the island province.

The dairy industry in the province of Nova Scotia is rather declining instead of growing. There were 33 cheese and butter factories in 1900 and only 17 in 1906, the quantity of milk received in the latter year being about one-third of what it was in 1900.

Dairying shows more progress in New Brunswick. While the number of establishments for the manufacture of butter and cheese has not increased during the past six years, the value of the products has increased considerably. The dairy interest in New Brunswick is assisted and encouraged by expert advisers employed by the provincial Department of Agriculture.

In the western provinces the best development is shown in northern Alberta, which was the last of all the western provinces to engage in dairy work. There are now 41 creameries and 8 cheese factories in that province, and the number is increasing rapidly.

In the province of Saskatchewan there are 6 creameries, but no cheese factories. The creamery industry does not show much progress in the province of Saskatchewan.

In British Columbia there are 16 creameries in operation, and the business is established on a sound healthy basis.

I read from this report to show that the great dairy interests of this country are virtually at a standstill under the administration of the Agricultural Department of this government. Now that should not be so. This great industry which provides an asset to this country of from $20,000,000 to $24,000,000 for cheese alone, ought to be more carefully directed, and assisted if need be, and new territory should be taken possession of by this great industry. Now what is the outcome of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite? In the official records I find the most serious condition that can face any country. I want to read from one of the government's own witnesses. The only trouble with their witnesses is that they are so old before they reach us that they have lost their memory. I hold in my hand the year-book for 1906, and that gives a record of the occupiers of the soil. I want to call the attention of the House and the country to this very serious fact, that the occupiers of the soil in 1901 were less by many thousands than they were in 1891. The total number of occupiers of the soil in 1871 was 367,862; in 1881, 464,025; in 1901, 620,486; and in 1901—mark the difference—544,688. Oh, but hon. gentlemen say, we have sent a great many men out to the west. Well, in the older provinces there were 75,798 less occupiers of the soil in 1901 than there were in 1891. Surely that is a serious matter. Now let us see what is the condition of things in the west. In 1901 the population of the three provinces was 419,512, and in 1906, 808,863, an increase of 389,351. Where did they come from? We have heard a great deal about the thousands and thousands of people who came into this country from the United States, and the other thousands that were induced to come in from northern Europe and the British Isles. Let us see what the condition of things actually is. Out of all this population in the western provinces in 1901, there were born in Canada 277,755, and in 1906, 444,366. In other words, 55 per cent of the people in the three western provinces are Canadian born. Where did they come from? Some of them were born out in the west. Of 444,366 born in Canada, 1,277 were born in British Columbia, 146,857 were born in Manitoba, 3,514 in New Brunswick, 5,990 in Nova Scotia, 163,962 in Ontario, 2,957 in Prince Edward Island, 19,905 in Quebec, 46,987 in Saskatchewan, 5,400 in the Northwest Territories, and 8,366 not given by provinces. That is to say, that 405,193 of the 808,863 people in those western provinces, were born in the other provinces. So we see that we have not been doing such wonderful things for this country. Take the occupiers of the soil which he gives

here. The number in the three provinces in 1906 was 120,439, being an increase of 65,814 since 1891. Take that number from the 75,000 decrease in the other provinces, and not allowing for any further decrease in the old provinces, because they have gone west, there are 9,984 less people upon the farms of this country, including the great increase in the west, than there were in 1891.

Now I assert that the policy of this government is taking people off the soil, and this is an economic question which lies at the very basis of the prosperity and permanence of any country. Any policy that denudes the soil of its population in a new country, is a wrong one and has a wrong tendency. We talk about the tariff, about percentages of trade, while we overlook the greater question of the population that should be fastened upon the soil. I say that whether it belongs to the public men of this country, or whether it belongs to the men who stand in the sacred desks of this country to stay that unfortunate tendency of the population to leave the soil, whoever it belongs to are not doing their duty. Why, we see young girls by the thousand flocking to the centres of trade to stand behind counters in stores and business places, afraid of home making, afraid of motherhood—I say that while that condition exists in this country or any other, that country is in danger. There are problems that our public men should face and should solve; they should sit down in council if necessary and devise ways of arresting this fatal tendency. Look at Russia, with her 146,000,000 people, 20,000,000 of them in cities and towns, and 126,000,000 fastened upon the soil, the great future rival of Canada. Is there no remedy, is there no solution for this evil? It is a pity that this country, a country producing the necessaries of life above all other countries in the world, a country that can send her messengers out into the great trading areas of the world, that can stand in every gateway of the world and cry to the people as they pass by, Here is your bread, here is your butter, here is your cheese, here is your beef, your mutton, your pork. But unless we do our duty and fasten the people upon the soil we will never be in a position to become feeders of the rest of the world. Why should we not add to the curricula in our agricultural colleges rural engineering, farm mechanics if you wish? What is to hinder the Agricultural Department and the experimental farms going among the people in any district, laying out a farm if need be, in order that the rotation of crops may be demonstrated, that buildings may be laid out so as to afford the best ventilation and the greatest economy and other information of this kind may be afforded so as to make farming and the home attractive, so as to fasten the people on the soil, for this is the safeguard and the security of the virtue of the country in the future.

We find that in France and Germany, and recently in England, they have added to the curricula of these institutions what they call farm mechanics. A large warehouse is provided where they have all kinds of farm machinery for the inspection and use of the students. They are educated as to the method of working and taking care of these implements. This all adds to that great asset, the production of the farming community. That might be done by the Minister of Agriculture, he might add to the curricula, as I say, rural engineering or farm mechanics and thus secure credit for something new under the sun during his regime.

I do not say that professors, that scientific men, are exactly all that is needed, but I do say that if you take the history of England, going back to the first half of the 19th century, you will find that there was a combination of agricultural experts, scientific societies and prominent men in England who got together and undertook to do something for agriculture; they gave such an impetus to agriculture that England raised enough wheat to feed 24,000,000 of her people. How many people in England are fed to-day by wheat raised there? Four and a half millions. It shows what is possible and it shows further on what a precarious position the products of a country may be. If the price is raised the world over, to such an extent that it drives the people in England back to the land, England would raise enough wheat to feed within ten millions of her full population.

This country should be on the alert as to the wishes of the great agricultural interests. It is well to have science but I am afraid the Minister of Agriculture has failed to get down to the struggling masses and to learn the philosophy of their experience. You cannot overlook the hard-headed farmers in your calculation, they cannot be dictated to. The minister should take these people into his councils, he could consult with them and should deal with those problems which confront this country in the interests of the people generally.

We want to show the importance of the farming interest. If this matter is properly handled by the federal and provincial governments it will be of untold advantage. I have here an extract from a report given by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to the President, Senate Returns, vol. 3, 1903-4:

During the last fourteen years there was a balance of trade in favour of farm products, without excepting any year, that amounted to $4,806,000,000. Against this was an adverse balance of trade in products other than those of the farm of $865,000,000, and the farmers not only cancelled this immense obligation but had enough left to place $3,940,-

000,000 to the credit of the nation when the books of international exchange were balanced.

I want to show you that notwithstanding the adverse balance of trade in that country when you take all industries except agriculture, the great agricultural industry of that country overbalanced that and put to the credit of the nation in eleven years $3,940,000,000. The report continues :

These figures tersely express the immense national reserve-sustaining power of the farmers of the country under present quantities of production. It is the farmers who have paid the foreign bondholder.

Now, Sir, that is the position that this country should occupy, and until the efforts of the Agricultural Department are directed with that object in view, they will fall short of doing their full duty to the people. It is possible to teach the people of this country that the great farming agricultural interests of this Dominion are paramount to every other one interest in the country and we ought to teach our boys and girls that there is no more honourable vocation, no occupation which requires a more varied and intelligent idea of what is required, than the pursuit of farming. There is room for the most varied intelligence in that occupation. The boy cannot go astray if he knows chemistry; he wants bookkeeping, he wants reading, he wants to be a thinker, and I say that the encouragement that ought to be held out by the Department of Agriculture should lead towards placing the people on soil in the interest of the future prosperity of this Dominion. I say to the government that the game of this great country's future cannot be played with the old cards. We must have men standing up with broader patriotism, free from provincialism, men standing as patriotic Canadians to build up this country in the interest of the future and in the interest of the world.

On motion of Mr. Guthrie, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 1, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

### CRIMINAL CODE—AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 140) to amend the Criminal Code, respecting injuries to persons due to motor vehicles.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. LEWIS. The Bill which I have the honour to introduce deals with a special class of bodily injuries caused by a class of vehicle which, at the time the Criminal Code was enacted, was not in common use ; I refer to automobiles. The Bill provides :

Section 284 of the Criminal Code of Canada is hereby amended by adding the following subsection thereto:

284a. The owner and driver and person in charge or owner or driver or person in charge of any motor vehicle, commonly called an automobile, which causes a horse or horses to run away or bolt or shy and thereby occasions bodily injury to any person or persons is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment.

Section 285 of the Criminel Code of Canada is hereby amended by adding the words 'motor vehicle, automobile or other' before the word vehicle in the third line of said section.

Section 284 refers to accidents caused by persons driving too rapidly on the streets and roads. Clauses 273 to 290 in the Code refer to special classes of accidents caused by explosives on railway trains, by wantonly endangering the safety of persons on railways, &c. Section 284, to which the section will be appended, provides :

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment who, by any unlawful act, or by doing negligently or omitting to do any act which it is his duty to do, causes grievous bodily injury to any other person.

I can readily understand that there is an objection to special clauses of this nature, but we already have legislation providing for the punishment of persons having charge of carriages or vehicles causing bodily harm to any person under certain circumstances. I have included here the minimum penalty provided under the existing sections which imposed punishment ranging from imprisonment for life down to two years.

There is a strong feeling in the agricultural portion of Canada in reference to accidents caused by automobiles. It is true that the provincial governments have entire control of the roads, but this has reference to bodily injury. To illustrate this feeling I shall, with your permission, read one letter of many that have been received, and I know that the hon. member for North Perth has also received letters upon this subject. This letter is as follows :—

Goderich, March 24, 1908.

E. N. Lewis, Esq.

Dear Sir,—I note with pleasure the stand you are taking against some of the existing evils of the country. There is one great evil about which you have said nothing, that is the automobile nuisance. It is all very well to protect the man who goes out hunting, but he does not have to go hunting. What about hundreds of people who have to travel on our

country roads, who take their lives in their hands every time they go on their own road to do any business in the towns? You want to get after the automobiles right sharp and put them off the country road. While parliament——

This I presume refers to provincial parliaments.

—is fooling with the question there are scores of people being injured and frightened off the roads by these automobiles. Now if parliament will not take some action in the matter then the people will take the law into their own hands and treat them as they deserve. There are some who will slow up and let you by, but the majority will dart past and when you are tangled up in the ditch with a frightened horse you are not in a shape to take down the number of the machine. The argument that the farmer will soon be using them is all rot. It will be a sorry day for the country when the farmer takes to the automobile. The argument that horses will get used to them won't hold good as one of the main sources of revenue of the farmer is to raise horses, and as soon as they are matured sell them and break in younger ones. In our case all our horses are young except one. I could say a great deal more about the blooming nuisance but will stop for this time.

Yours sincerely,
THOMAS C. NAFTEL.

I looked up the figures in reference to the horse raising industry in Canada and I find that there are to-day 1,530,515 horses in Canada. The farmers are the mainstay of Canada and should be protected when using their own roads made by themselves for themselves. I trust that if the government do not see fit to allow this Bill to go through or to take it as one of their own the Minister of Justice in amending the Criminal Code will add to it a clause covering the provisions of this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## QUESTIONS.

### INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY RATES.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens)—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Are the rates on the Intercolonial Railway increased during the winter season on freight to and from Prince Edward Island?
2. If so, when did the change in rates take place in the fall of 1907?
3. If increased, what is the amount of increase over the summer rates?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Excepting as explained below there is no change in the rates.
2. There was no advance in rates in 1907, over those of the previous year.
3. The following explanation affords the best answer: During summer navigation, the first-class rate from Halifax to Pictou on Island business is 20 cents. Winter rate Halifax to Pictou for the same business is 24 cents. From Truro the first-class rate summer and winter to Pictou is 16 cents. From Amherst the rate is the same both summer and winter. In the summer the business for the Island from Moncton goes entirely via Point du Chêne, and when Point du Chêne closes it goes via Pictou. The summer rate, Moncton to Charlottetown, via Point du Chêne is 32 cents; and when navigation at Point du Chêne closes the rate via Pictou is 44 cents. After Charlottetown is closed and business goes by the winter steamer via Georgetown, the rate to Charlottetown, is 52 cents per 100 pounds first-class. It will thus be seen, that owing to the conditions of the different seasons, there are three rates necessary between Moncton and Charlottetown during the year. The Intercolonial Railway gets no benefit of the advance; the highest rate of 52 cents is divided allowing the Intercolonial from Moncton to Pictou 28 cents, steamer 10 cents, Prince Edward Island Railway 14 cents. On the 44 cents rate of Charlottetown, direct from Pictou, the Intercolonial Railway gets 34 cents as against 20 cents, when the high rate is charged.

### WHALING LICENSES.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens)—by Mr. Martin—asked :

1. To whom in British Columbia have whaling licenses been granted, (a) when were they granted, (b) for what waters, (c) for what term of years, (d) upon what terms and conditions, and (e) what moneys were received from such licenses in 1905, 1906 and 1907?
2. Are any moneys now due from such licenses? If so, from whom and how much?
3. What penalty was provided for not making use of privileges granted and what steps has the government taken to ascertain if the conditions have been complied with?
4. Can licenses be cancelled in case of non-user?
5. Have any applications for whaling licenses in British Columbia been made to and refused by the government? If so, from whom, for what waters, and why were they refused?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Pacific Whaling Company, 5th of May, 1905, annual license; Pacific Whaling Company, 11th of December, 1905, annual license; Pacific Whaling Company, 7th of December, 1906, annual license; Pacific Whaling Company, 7th of December, 1906, annual license; Dr. Francis Hall, 23rd of July, 1907, annual license; Pacific Whaling Company, 17th of September, 1907, annual license; George A. Huff, 7th of March, 1908, annual license.

(b) The licenses cover the operation of factories ashore and do not essay to cover water areas.

(c) Annual license.

(d) Under the terms and conditions of section 9 of the Fisheries Act, chapter 45 of revised statutes, 1906.

(e) 1905.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. $1,600
1906.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 2,600
1907.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 3,800

2. No.

3. Unless factory is in operation within two years of granting first license, license will be cancelled. The supervision of the inspector of fisheries for the district.

4. Yes.

5. Yes. B. F. Pearson, of Halifax, Nootka Sound; C. H. Lugrin, of Victoria, Virago Sound, Rennell Sound and Tatsoo Harbour, Queen Charlotte Islands; Andrew Halcross, of New Westminster, Maculay Island; J. P. Livingstone, of Ottawa, Galiano Island; George Mackie, of New Westminster, Aristazable Island; Peter Birrell, of Annieville, B.C., Sooke Inlet; Alex. Ewen, of Lion Island, Cape Beale; G. D. Brymer, of New Westminster, Skidegate; W. W. Forrester, of New Westminster, Takush Harbour; Michael Hays, of New Westminster, Campbell Island; E. A. Jakes, of Vancouver, Gulf of Georgia.

Applications not supported by fees and other necessary requirements.

J. O. Townsend, of Victoria, Campania Island, Captain Magnesen, of Vancouver, Virago, Queen Charlotte Islands.

Required distance did not obtain from nearest location licensed.

SALMON FISHING LICENSES.

Mr. CHISHOLM—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

1. Have any salmon fishing leases or licenses been granted for taking fish from Seymore narrows, Johnston's straits, Massett inlet, Kildalla and Virago, British Columbia? If so, when, to whom and upon what conditions?

2. Have any applications for fishing leases or licenses in Johnston's straits, British Columbia, been applied for and refused by the governement? If so, when, by whom, and for what reasons?

3. Have any fishing leases or licenses been granted for the waters of Barclay sound, British Columbia? If so, when, to whom and for what term of years?

Hon. L. P. BORDEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Unless a motion for a return is made, I could not give all the information sought for, but if it is sufficient for the purpose that the honourable member has in view I may give him the information now for the current fiscal year. For the fishing season of 1907, the following fishery licenses have been issued for these waters:

| Licensee. | Kind of License. | Location. | Date of Issue. |
|---|---|---|---|
| F. W. Rudge | Drag-seine | Virago Sound | January 4, 1907. |
| H. A. Rudge | " | Massett Inlet | " 4, 1907. |
| J. A. Rudge | " | " | " 4, 1907, |
| Frank Burnet | Purse-seine | Seymour Inlet | " 2, 1907. |
| George Young | Drag-seine | Massett Inlet | March 2, 1907. |
| Thos. E. Atkins | Purse-seine | Johnston Strait | " 4, 1907. |
| J. H. McLae, H. M. McRae | Drag-seine | " | " 4, 1907. |
| Wallace Bros | " | Kildela Arm | January 4, 1907. |
| Johnston Fish Company, Clayoquot Sound | Purse-seine, three | Barclay Sound | February 12, 1907. |
| Canning Company | Drag-seine | " | May 22, 1907. |
| Alberni Packing Company | Purse-seine | " | August 9, 1907. |

These licenses permitted salmon fishing operations to be conducted with the kinds of nets specified during the legal season of 1907 under the conditions provided by the fishery regulations.

2. Not during 1907.

3. None in addition to those mentioned in the answer to question No. 1.

INVERNESS PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. Is there a public building erected or in course of construction at Inverness town, Cape Breton?

2. If so, when was the work of construction commenced, is work going on there at the present time, and when will the work be completed?

3. How much has already been expended on the building, (a) for land, (b) for construction, (c) for inspection, and (d) how much more is still to be spent?

4. Who is the inspector of the work, when was he appointed, is he still in that position, how much does he receive per day, and how much has he been paid to date?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.

2. (a) Work commenced 16th of August, 1906; (b) Yes; (c) Date of completion of contract, November 1, 1907. Original contract completed; fittings and furniture now being supplied.

3. (a) Land. $1,100; legal expenses and survey, $97.92; (b) Construction, $13,379.21; (c) Clerk of works, $1,602; (d) About $10,000.

4. (a) D. McIsaac; (b) August 15, 1906; (c) Yes; (d) $3 per day; (e) $1,602.

## ST. BONIFACE PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. When was the land purchased for the site of a public building in St. Boniface, Manitoba?

2. When was the building commenced, when finished, and what was its cost?

3. How much money has been paid over to date, and to whom?

4. Is the government aware if the contract was sublet? If so, to whom?

5. Have the fittings been ordered? If so, at what cost, and when will they be placed in the building

6. Will the building be opened to the public immediately after the fittings are placed therein?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. January 31, 1906.

2. Building commenced April 19, 1907 ; not yet completed.

3. J. McDiarmid & Co., contract, $14,410 ; J. Bourgeau, site, $4,500 ; S. Paquette, superintendence, $639 ; C. H. Royal, legal services and commission, $103.90; C. Goddard, survey, $25 ; advertising, $242.92.

4. Not to the knowledge of the department.

5. No ; plans are now being prepared.

6. Yes.

## LITHGOW, GIROUARD AND CONGDON.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What positions have been held by J. V. Lithgow, J. E. Girouard and F. F. Congdon in the Yukon under the government?

2. What was the date of appointment of each, and what was the salary and living allowance, respectively, each year during his incumbency of office?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

J. V. Lithgow and F. F. Congdon have never been employed in the Department of the Interior, but probably J. T. Lithgow and F. T. Congdon are the persons referred to.

1. J. T. Lithgow, comptroller ; J. E. Girouard, registrar ; F. A. Congdon, legal adviser and commissioner.

2. J. T. Lithgow, appointed 14th July, 1908.

| Fiscal year. | Salary. | Living allowance. |
|---|---|---|
| 1898-1899 | $1,447 58 | ..... |
| 1899-1900 | 1,999 97 | 900 00 |
| 1900-1901 | 1,959 56 | 1,200 00 |
| 1901-1902 | 2,640 04 | 615 81 |
| 1902-1903 | 3,000 00 | 1,800 00 |
| 1903-1904 | 3,000 00 | 1,800 00 |
| 1904-1905 | 3,000 00 | 1,100 00 |
| 1905-1906 | 3,000 00 | 1,200 00 |
| 1906-1907 | 2,250 00 | 900 00 |
| 1907-1908 (to Jan. 31, 1908) | 2,500 00 | 1,000 00 |

J. E. Girouard, appointed 27th July, 1898.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1898-1899 | $1,849 47 | ..... |
| 1899-1900 | 3,500 00 | $ 900 00 |
| 1900-1901 | 4,000 00 | 921 13 |
| 1901-1902 | 3,999 96 | 1,800 00 |
| 1902-1903 | 4,000 00 | 1,800 00 |
| 1903-1904 | 4,000 00 | 1,800 00 |
| 1904-1905 | 4,000 00 | 1,500 00 |
| 1905-1906 | 3,999 96 | 1,800 00 |
| 1906-1907 | 3,000 00 | 1,125 00 |
| 1907-1908 (to Jan. 31, 1908) | 3,333 30 | 1,250 00 |

F. T. Congdon, appointed legal adviser 13th March, 1901, resigned 30th September, 1901, appointed commissioner 1st March, 1903, resigned 31st August, 1904, re-appointed legal adviser 20th May, 1905, resigned 3rd April, 1907.

| Fiscal year. | Salary. | Living allowance. |
|---|---|---|
| 1900-1901 | $1,505 35 | $ 410 00 |
| 1901-1902 | 1,249 98 | 450 00 |
| 1902-1903 | 2,000 00 | 2,000 00 |
| 1903-1904 | 6,000 00 | 6,000 00 |
| 1904-1905 | 2,000 00 | 2,000 00 |
| 1905-1906 | 5,577 88 | 1,673 37 |
| 1906-1907 | 3,750 00 | 1,125 00 |

## DR. HORACE RHINDRESS.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. What salary does Dr. Horace Rhindress receive as port physician at North Sydney?

2. How much was paid last year to boats or steamers for conveying Dr. Rhindress to steamers entering the harbour?

3. How much was paid up to date for providing apartments for Dr. Rhindress at North Sydney?

4. How much was paid within the last year for putting in grates, bath tubs, furnishings, furniture, &c., for Dr. Rhindress' rooms or offices at North Sydney, and to whom paid?

5. Who owns the building in which such office or apartments are situated?

6. At whose request was such expenditure made?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. This department has no knowledge of Dr. Rindress having any position as port physician at North Sydney, but pays him $1,400 per annum as quarantine officer of the port and harbour of Sydney. The station is at Point Edward.

2. $2,300 per annum, the contract price for use of steamer for quarantine purposes. This is one half of an amount paid equally for the use of the boat by this department and the Department of Customs.

3, 4, 5 and 6. This department has no information.

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems the last three questions may possibly pertain to my department. I would ask that they be allowed to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. The last three questions allowed to stand on the Order Paper.

## IMPORTS OF UNITED STATES HORSES AND CATTLE.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

Does the government intend to take any steps, by regulation or otherwise, to prevent the importation of cattle and horses from the

United States, which are being brought in and sold in such large numbers as thoroughbreds for breeding purposes, but which are not in reality eligible for registration in the Canadian Herd-books?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

The regulations for the entry of cattle and horses for the improvement of stock have continued the same as when established by order in council in 1887.

These regulations do not require animals for the improvement of stock to be eligible for registration in the Canadian Herd-books.

The question of amending the regulations is and has been under consideration.

## GERALD P. DILLON.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS asked:

1. Did Gerald P. Dillon, veterinary surgeon, enlist in the Northwest Mounted Police? If so, in what capacity, and when?
2. When was he promoted, and to what rank?
3. Did he act as quarantine inspector at St. Mary's, and what was the amount of fees earned by him for services as inspector? Who collected these fees and did the government receive them?
4. Was Mr. Dillon paid for his services as quarantine inspector at St. Mary's, and did he receive any pay over and above his regular pay as a member of the police force?
5. Is not Mr. Dillon entitled to receive the fees earned by him for inspecting stock entering at the port of St. Mary's? If not, why not?
6. Were not Staff-Sergeants Mitchell, Poett and others paid extra for similar services?
7. Will the hon. minister have the records of the police office at Regina examined as to these payments, and as to the fees collected at St. Mary's while Mr. Dillon was inspector?
8. Did Mr. Dillon ever agree to do quarantine inspection for the pay of a staff-sergeant?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. Gerald Pigott Dillon joined the Mounted Police on the 30th April, 1894, as constable.
2. He was promoted to corporal on the 4th May, 1894; to sergeant on the 5th May, 1894; and to staff sergeant on the 1st August, 1894.
3. In connection with his general duties as a veterinary staff sergeant of the Mounted Police he also acted as quarantine inspector of St. Mary's. The Mounted Police Department has no knowledge what fees were collected by him for services as quarantine inspector, they would in ordinary course of routine go to the Department of Customs.
4. So far as the Mounted Police Department is concerned Mr. Dillon received no extra fees as quarantine inspector, nor did he receive any pay over and above his regular pay as a member of the police force.
5. The inspection of stock was part of his duty, and did not entitle him to extra remuneration.
6. Staff-sergeant Poett died in April, 1895. His estate received $109. Staff-sergeant Mitchell and other veterinary sergeants were paid an allowance of $100 per annum for quarantine service. These payments were made by the Department of Agriculture, but all were subsequent to the service of Mr. Dillon in the Mounted Police force.
7. Statements of fees collected at St. Mary's, are on record in the Department of Customs.
8. Yes, he joined the Mounted Police on the distinct understanding that he would perform any duties required of him in the veterinary branch of the service.

## GOVERNMENT LAND, BRITISH COLUMBIA, SOLD TO J. W. PATTERSON.

Mr. J. D. REID asked:

1. Were any government lands near New Westminster, British Columbia, sold to one J. W. Patterson? If so, by what department of the government?
2. If lands were so sold, were they Indian or military reserve land, or either of them?
3. What price did Mr. Patterson pay for said lands, if any were sold to him?
4. What date was such sale, if any was made?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). No sale made by the Department of Indian Affairs, nor by the Interior Department.

Mr. J. D. REID. The question I have put has not been answered fully.

Mr. OLIVER. The Interior Department handles the military reserve lands as well as the land administered by the Interior Department. It handles the lands not actually in use under the name of ordnance lands.

Mr. J. D. REID. I want to know definitely whether any government land has been sold.

Mr. OLIVER. Let the motion stand as a motion for a return.

## CLAIMS AGAINST THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). My hon. friend from St. John asked a question the other day which was afterwards changed to a notice of motion. Every object can be served by answering the question in a new form, and I would ask my hon. friend to put it on the Order Paper as a question. It would read:

How many claims for damages to property or for personal injury or loss or damage on the Intercolonial Railway have been settled since January 1, 1908?

I would ask my hon. friend to put it on the Order Paper in the form of a question for the next day.

Mr. DANIEL. I will put it on as a new question.

## CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—SUSPENSION OF OFFICERS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, it is my duty to inform the House what action has been taken by the government on the report of the Civil Service Commission. The House is aware that on two previous occasions I stated that the report, in so far as it concerned the Department of Marine and Fisheries, called for consideration and action by the government. My hon. friend who is in charge of that department has been engaged for some time, as far as his other duties would permit him, investigating his department so as to determine in what respect it could be reformed. In the discharge of that duty, one of the officers of that department was suspended by him some few weeks ago. Since the report of the commission has been laid on the table, my hon. friend and colleague has come to the conclusion that he should also put under suspension two other prominent officers. It is only just to the deputy minister of that department that I should say in this connection that on two previous occasions he tendered his resignation to the minister and this morning again pressed his resignation, and that matter is in the hands of the minister for consideration. The House is aware that the report made certain very grave statements with regard to the honesty of the officials in that department. The matter is of such a serious character that the minister did not think it advisable for him to deal with that part of the report, but he has thought it advisable to recommend that a Royal Commission should be issued to deal with that part of the report of the commissioners, in order to have the state of facts which they say exists in the department properly investigated. It has pleased the administrator of the government to accede to this view and to appoint as commissioner Mr. Walter Cassels, judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada.

Now, the report is a very broad and general one. I may simply remind the House that last year, the government being aware that the civil service question was one which engrossed the attention of the country generally, thought it advisable to appoint a commission of men whom they had reason to believe to be absolutely impartial and disinterested to look over this question and give them the benefit of their views. The House is aware that this commission has made a report which is pretty general and broad. It is the intention of the government to deal, as soon as possible, with the various questions brought to the attention of the country in this report. I cannot say that, during the present session, it will be possible, perhaps, to go very far. Having sat now for something like four months, and all being more or less anxious to get to the blessing of a prorogation, if such a thing can be effected during the year 1908, at all events, it is the intention of the government to proceed as far and as speedily as it is possible to go during the present session. There is the broad question of civil service reform as it is generally understood. I understand that the commissioners have made a general representation upon that point—though, so far as I am concerned, I must say I have had no opportunity to read the report except as I have seen it in the newspapers—but there is this general recommendation. But everybody has noticed that, while the members of the commission have made a recommendation on that line, they have not embodied their views in the shape of a Bill as they did on the question of superannuation, for instance, and, therefore, the idea having been brought here without more specification than this, it may require some time before a Bill can be prepared on that line. All I have to say at this moment is that it is the intention of the government to deal with the question and all the questions brought up by the report of the commission as speedily as it is possible to do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I would like to ask whether the Royal Commission which has been issued to Judge Cassels is to deal with the department generally or is to deal solely with the matters which have been discussed in the report of the Royal Commission? I am referring, of course, to the Department of Marine and Fisheries to which the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) alluded. So far as the question of civil service reform is concerned, I would like to inquire whether or not the government have come to the conclusion that, as a matter of policy, they will adopt the system of competitive examinations by an independent commission?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With regard to the first question of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden), the best way to answer it is to bring down the order in council. This I hope to do before the end of the present sitting. With regard to the other question, I think it better that, before the government make any announcement, the House should have the benefit of having the report before it.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Have all the documents, notes and memoranda upon which was based the report of the Civil Service Commission been laid upon the table of the House? There are several of the most important conclusions arrived at by the commission which are based upon memoranda and notes, and I do not think that these documents have been laid on the table——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They have—everything received from the commission.

Mr. MONK. It seemed as if some were missing, and I thought, that perhaps in the hurry with which the report was brought down some of these notes had been mislaid.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When the report of the commission was placed in our hands, we noticed that certain memoranda alluded to in the report had not been received. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) asked Mr. Courtney, president of the commission, to have these included. Mr. Courtney sent a certain bundle of papers. These things have been all placed on the table and they are now in the hands of the printer.

## PRIVILEGE—MESSRS. BENNETT AND FOWLER AND 'LE CANADA.'

Mr. W. H. BENNETT. I desire to call attention to an article published in 'Le Canada' of Montreal of this date. There is a half column of adulation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur)—I have no quarrel with that myself——

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand this is a question of privilege.

Mr. BENNETT. What I object to are certain words referring to myself. The article says :

This, in any case, does not constitute a charge against Hon. Mr. Brodeur, whose honesty is uncontested, except, perhaps, by tainted persons who have boodled in the funds of the Foresters,—like Geo. E. Foster, G. W. Fowler and Bennett.

I wish to make this statement without equivocation, and fully and roundly : I have never had any dealings of any kind or nature with the Independent Order of Foresters. I am not even a member of that association. The statement contained in this paper, therefore, is a deliberate untruth.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (Kings and Albert). I wish to say the same with respect to myself. I have never had any dealings with the Independent Order of Foresters, and the statement made in this paper, so far as I am concerned, is an absolute lie.

## PRIVILEGE—MR. PRINGLE AND THE CANADIAN BANK OF COMMERCE.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Stormont). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On the 2nd March last I spoke to a resolution relating to certain amendments to the Banking Act, and in doing so I made certain statements. I spoke generally in regard to the strong position of our Canadian banks. I did, however, in advocating certain amendments to the Banking Act, which I hope to have the pleasure of advocating when the adjourned debate on the motion is again taken up, make certain statements in regard to a particular bank. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) handed me a copy of a letter which he will, no doubt, give to the House, a letter addressed to him by Mr. B. E. Walker, president of the Canadian Bank of Commerce. I understand from this letter that Mr. Walker takes exception to my statement in regard to the Bank of Commerce being a gambling bank. I should regret exceedingly doing an injustice to the Canadian Bank of Commerce or any other bank. Mr. Walker in his letter states :

The criticisms you refer to which were made on the floor of the House are, we hope, due only to a misunderstanding of facts and not to malice, but they are in any event absolutely without foundation.

I may say, Sir, that I was not actuated by any malice. My relations with the Bank of Commerce are most friendly, in fact I have no business whatever with the Canadien Bank of Commerce. But while I was not in any way actuated by malice, I cannot altogether accept the alternative that my remarks were due to a misunderstanding, except to this extent : I have looked more carefully at my speech and I may have said that the Canadian Bank of Commerce is the biggest gambling bank in the Dominion of Canada. When I was looking into the material in connection with my proposed amendments I had occasion to read the evidence that was given before the Royal Insurance Commission, I had occasion to read the report, and I found in that report that the president of the Bank of Commerce, the general manager of the Bank of Commerce, the Bank of Commerce itself, and others, formed a pool in 1903 for the purpose of dealing in Dominion coal stocks. Upon that report I based my statement that the Canadian Bank of Commerce was gambling. Mr. Walker does not for one moment say that my statement is untrue, because quite properly he could not say so because his name and the name of the Hon. George A. Cox, and the name of the Bank of Commerce are shown there as being members of that pool. But I have to say that I am pleased to hear that that was the only time that the Canadian Bank of Commerce indulged in stock speculation. But it has been explained to me, and I am bound to accept the explanation in perfect good faith, that it was a very critical time in the finances of Canada, and it was felt by Mr. Walker that they were perfectly justified at that time in purchasing the large blocks of stock which they did in the month of April, 1903. He further says :

On the basis of three actual transactions in purchasing shares, the reasons for such purchases being unknown to him, Mr. Pringle calls the bank a gambling institution.

I am free to admit that the reasons were not known to me at that time, the reasons are known to me now, and it is not for me

to judge whether it was wise for the Bank of Commerce to purchase the stock as they did at that time. Now I may say that I have always had a high regard for Mr. Walker as being one of the ablest and cleverest men in Canada, and it struck me as being rather peculiar that Mr. Walker should have been one of the syndicate, and also been a party to the purchase of these shares of stock, and it was for that reason I made the statement I did. But I now say that I am pleased to hear, by the communication sent to Mr. Kemp, that the Bank of Commerce, except on that isolated occasion, have not in any way been dealing in stocks. Now in a further part of his letter he says :

Mr. Pringle conveys the impression that we charge enormously high rates of interest in the west, and he refers to a certain lawsuit in evidence.

I did refer to the case of the Canadian Bank of Commerce vs. Donald, in which twenty-four per cent was charged. I am quite satisfied with Mr. Walker's explanation that that was in the Yukon where they had to get very high rates of interest, and I only referred to it to show that there should be some restriction as to the contractual rates that banks may charge throughout this country, and I am not now satisfied that some of our banks are not compelling their customers to contract for a higher rate of interest than they should. There are one or two other matters I desire to say a word about. He also goes on to say in his letter that I make a comparison between the Canadian Bank of Commerce and other banks as to the amount of assets, or rather to put it in exact language, the ratio of assets to liabilities to the public. I stated that the proportion of the Bank of Commerce was 117 per cent. I am glad to see by Mr. Walker's letter that I was quite correct and that the proportion of the assets of the Bank of Commerce to the public liabilities is 117 per cent. He gives also the proportions of other banks, which are exactly in accord with the statement I made. It is only fair to say that such proportion is not always a criterion of the strength of a bank, because as a bank's business increase and its liabilities increase, the ratio sometimes diminishes. Then he says :

Perhaps the least excusable statement is that we have been losing deposits in some peculiar degree. This winter, for the first time in many years, all banks have found that depositors, especially ordinary business depositors, have drawn from their balances in a much closer manner than when money was easier.

I did refer particularly to the amount of deposits that were being lost by the Canadian Bank of Commerce. It is only fair to say that other banks have been losing their deposits, owing to the great stringency in the money market. Now, Sir, as I have said, I would regret exceedingly that any remarks of mine should be misconstrued. I know that the Hon. Geo. A. Cox is not now president of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, and it was the Hon. Geo. A. Cox who was being dealt with more particularly by the Royal Insurance Commission. I know that Mr. B. E. Walker is now president of the Canadian Bank of Commerce ; I did not know that the change was made, but the change has been made ; and Mr. Laird is the general manager of the Bank of Commerce. We know that it has a very strong board of directors composed of some of the best business men in the city of Toronto. We know that the Bank of Commerce has a paid up capital of $10,000,000, and a rest of $5,000,000, and I am bound to take Mr. Walker's word for it that there is no gambling. That is all I desire to say in regard to this matter. I do not take back anything that I have said in support of my amendments. If I have created an impression that the Canadian Bank of Commerce is now a gambling bank, I want to correct that impression, because I am bound to take the statement of Mr. Walker that they are not now indulging in the practice of buying and selling stocks in the public market. At a later date I hope I will have an opportunity of urging my amendments.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). I do not intend to make any remarks with regard to the subject which has been introduced by the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Pringle), but I think perhaps this House is entitled to know the nature of the correspondence which the hon. gentleman referred to between myself and Mr. Walker; and all I intend to do is to read this correspondence with the indulgence of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the House permits it.

Mr. KEMP (reading) :

March 27, 1908.

Dear Mr. Walker,—Your attention has likely been called to a debate which took place in the House of Commons a few weeks ago upon a resolution which I may say had been upon the Order Paper for several weeks previous, dealing with the question of banking.

In the course of the debate certain statements were made, as you doubtless are aware, by the mover, Mr. Pringle, which appeared to reflect upon certain transactions, specifically mentioned, of the Canadian Bank of Commerce.

I have not observed any reference, on behalf of the bank, to these statements which were made in the House of Commons, either through the public press or elsewhere, and believing, as I do, that the Bank of Commerce conducts its affairs on strictly conservative banking principles, would say that if you think it advisable to make a statement

in reference to the part of the debate dealing with your bank, I shall be pleased to bring the same to the attention of parliament.

I remain,

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) A. E. KEMP.

Byron E. Walker, Esq.,
President Canadian Bank of Commerce,
Toronto.

This is the reply :

The Canadian Bank of Commerce,
Head office, Toronto, March 31, 1908.

Dear Mr. Kemp,—I have to thank you very sincerely for your letter. It is true that we have heretofore preferred not to reply to criticisms which are clearly due to misapprehension or based on errors as to facts, and which are sometimes also clearly meant to be unfriendly.

The criticisms you refer to which were made on the floor of the House are, we hope, due only to a misunderstanding of facts and not to malice, but they are in any event absolutely without foundation.

On the basis of three actual transactions in purchasing shares, the reasons for such purchases being unknown to him, Mr. Pringle calls the bank a gambling institution. He even suggests that important events in this bank's history, such as the absorption of other banks, were brought about as part of a policy of speculation in stocks. These statements are all utterly unfounded. The Canadian Bank of Commerce does not now and never has at any time made a practice of buying and selling stocks in the public markets or otherwise. It does not now nor has it ever speculated in stocks, and its history and reputation as known throughout Canada and in foreign countries are such as to entitle it to immunity from criticism of the nature of that in question.

Mr. Pringle also conveys the impression that we have charged enormously high rates of interest in the west, and he refers to a certain lawsuit as evidence. The case in point, however, occurred not in the west but in the Yukon, where the prices of food, rent, wages and everything else were on an enormously higher level than in any other part of Canada, and higher interest rates were therefore unavoidable.

He also makes a comparison between the Canadian Bank of Commerce and the newest of our banks, in order to show that we have a less percentage of assets in proportion to our liabilities to the public than the bank just started. But surely any one who gives the matter a moment's consideration will understand the fallacy of such a comparison. Any new bank on this basis is making its position worse with each addition to its customers. The figures properly used are the strongest evidence of the esteem in which the Canadian Bank of Commerce is held, because they really indicate the extent to which the people of Canada do business with this bank. In order to illustrate what I mean I give you below the proportion of the assets of several banks to their public liabilities as at the end of January:

| | Per cent. |
|---|---|
| Canadian Bank of Commerce.. .. | 117 |
| Bank of Montreal.. .. .. .. .. .. | 119 |
| Dominion Bank.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 124 |
| Merchants Bank of Canada.. .. | 126 |
| Bank of Nova Scotia.. .. .. .. .. | 127 |

Perhaps the least excusable statement is that we have been losing deposits in some peculiar degree. This winter, for the first time in many years, all banks have found that depositors, especially ordinary business depositors, have drawn upon their balances in a much closer manner than when money was easier. All banks have experienced the same natural result from the greater scarcity of money, but this bank has had no experience different from other banks, and the statement referred to was wholly foundationless so far as it was intended to apply to this bank alone.

You are at liberty to use this information in any manner you may think best.

I am, yours sincerely,

B. E. WALKER,
President.

A. E. Kemp, Esq., M.P.,
Toronto.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. As the Minister of the Interior is not present, I desire to ask the First Minister or the Minister of Finance about a return which I moved for on February 26, regarding some lands in the Peace river district.

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of the Interior is not present at the moment but he desired me to say that the return is in course of preparation and will be brought down within a few days.

Mr. FOSTER. I gave the Prime Minister a memorandum the other day with regard to two or three papers which are wanted, has he had a chance to look them up?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, I have given orders to have it attended to. I think one of them, the report with regard to finances, is hardly included with the others.

Mr. FOSTER. That was an independent return ordered by the House, it happened to be in the same memorandum, I would be very glad to get it.

## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. CLEMENTS.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). Before the orders of the day are called, I desire to rise to a question of privilege and to refer to an item which appeared in the Chatham 'Daily News' of last Saturday, in reference to a meeting held by the hon. Mr. McKay the leader of the opposition in Ontario. I regret that I cannot read the article because twenty minutes after this newspaper was placed upon the file this morning, the two pages I wanted were torn

out, but my reference is to certain remarks which were made by my hon. friend from East Kent (Mr. Gordon) at that meeting. In fairness to the hon. gentleman I should say that I do not believe he made his remarks with any wrong intent, but I want to point out he was misinformed. Speaking of the original document question which was debated in this House some few days ago, he said that Mr. Clements had also to make an apology to the House for having held for a number of months an original document belonging to the House. I want to say, as I stated in the House a few days ago, that I never had any original documents; that the return with which my name was connected was simply a return of the imports and exports that any member of this House could have got in twenty minutes if he wanted to have got it himself. I may say that the return was left on my desk and disappeared a few minutes after I left it there just as the two pages I wanted to refer to in this newspaper disappeared this morning.

## WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding, 'That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.'

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington). Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer some remarks upon the question which has been occupying the attention of the House for a number of days past, and in rising at this stage of the debate I do not do so with the idea that I may succeed in impressing either my opinions or my conclusions upon hon. members opposite, but more for the purpose of justifying the faith which is in me and of giving what appears to me to be good reasons for the support which I propose to give to the general financial administration of the present government. The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) remarked in regard to the speech of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Schell) that the hon. member was apparently talking for the benefit of 'Hansard' and for his own constituents. I do not know that there is any great impropriety in such a course, even if that were his only object. I find and I have no doubt the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) and many of the rank and file on both sides of the House have found, that it is very difficult to bring those sitting opposite us to our views or our conclusions in regard to many of the political questions which are debated in this House. It is very difficult also for the rank and file of either party to obtain anything more than a very brief notice in the newspaper press of the country; so that if our constituents are to know our ideas on the various subjects, if they are to know our reasons for holding theses views the only means of giving them that information that I know of, is by delivering speeches in this House expressing those views in order that they may become matters of record.

The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) waxed warm on the contents of a well worn greasy looking pamphlet which he held in his hand, and which I think is a pamphlet called 'The Deeds of the Other Fellows,' published by the Conservative association and purporting to set forth the electoral misdeeds of the Liberal party in both local and federal by-elections throughout Canada.

Mr. BRODER. Does the hon. gentleman dispute the statement I read from that pamphlet?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not dispute your statement. I had always given the member for Dundas a good deal of credit as a man who was inclined upon all occasions, to make a very fair and not a one-sided statement to the House. Last night, however, I think he was fired by some particular zeal or nettled by some statement which had been made by the hon. member who preceded him on this side (Mr. M. S. Schell). He waxed eloquent upon the electoral misdeeds of the Liberal party in provincial matters, in the by-elections in West Elgin some eight or nine years ago, and also in the election in South Oxford at about the same time. Bearing the reputation which he does for fairness and candour in such matters, I think it would have been better had he made some like reference to similar matters that have transpired on the other side of the House. Why should he refer at such length to the misdeeds of Liberals in West Elgin and say nothing whatever about another matter mentioned by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. M. S. Schell), the colossal election frauds perpetrated by the Conservative party and known as the Manitoba election frauds of 1896? Why should he bring forward the electoral misdeeds committed by Liberals in South Oxford, and not be fair enough to say a few words upon the Conservative misdeeds in South Ontario a few years ago? Why should he refer in such scathing terms to one Jackson of South Oxford and say nothing whatever of one William Smith, ex-Conservative member of parliament of South Ontario? Why should he give us comments of the late Mr. Justice Street upon the Jackson case and say nothing of the comments of the late Mr. Justice Ferguson upon the Smith case? Why does he tell us that the Liberal party and the Liberal government have given Jackson some minor office in the service of the government, forgetting to inform the House that the great Conservative party made Mr. William Smith its standard bearer at the Dominion election after he had been found guilty? I mention these matters not that

I think we should gloat over what we know to be election corruption upon whichever side of the House it may happen to be, but merely to emphasize the fact that if there is any real idea, any conviction, that something should be done at once if possible to stamp out electoral corruption and dishonesty as it has prevailed throughout Canada in the past, then it can be done and can best be done by joint action of both sides, and that the cause is not advanced one whit by pointing to the political misdeeds of the other fellows and drawing a blanket over the misdeeds of your own side.

In reading the excellent memoir of Sir John A. Macdonald, written by Dr. Parkin, a most excellent work and a tribute to a great man, my attention was again directed to a scandal that has become notorious in Canadian political history. The only blot, the only drawback the only cloud in that whole biography is referred to by Dr. Parkin in language which can only lead one to feel that a most gigantic political fraud was enacted by the Conservative party in 1872, in the case of the Pacific scandal. Then we know of another gigantic political fraud which was committed by that political party in Ontario. Instead of going to the constituencies to buy up the electorate they went into the legislative halls of Ontario to buy up with cold cash sufficient members of the Liberal party to upset the government of the day.

Mr. BRODER. You do not pretend that that was done by the Conservative party ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I say it was.

Mr. BRODER. It was done by an American lumberman.

Mr. GUTHRIE. And I will not take back one statement. I say further that leading members of the Conservative party were arrested and tried on the charge and through a political jury were acquitted. We hear in this House and in the country and read in the press charges levelled against the Liberals on account of the expending of public money on what we maintain are necessary public works, but what hon. gentlemen opposite are inclined to say are constructed simply on account of the influence they may have on this, that or the other constituency throughout Canada, through the expenditure of that money. Hon. gentlemen opposite state in this House and out of it that this is nothing more nor less than a bribe to the constituency affected. I submit that that is not fair treatment nor do I think that it lies in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite, simply because they are opposed to this government on political lines, to say that any government or any great party in this country would be guilty of deliberately spending large sums of money of the people for the purpose of bribing a constituency. But, if they do say that, what a terrible example has been set them by their own leader in the last few months in the course of his memorable tour of the west ! What do they think of the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), when in British Columbia last fall, boldly telling the people of British Columbia that if he were returned to power he would see to it that increased subsidies were granted to that province from the federal treasury ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the hon. gentleman's authority for that statement ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Merely newspaper reports.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No such report, to my belief, ever appeared in any newspaper, and if it did, it is absolutely false.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I accept, as I am bound to accept, the denial of the leader of the opposition. I do know, that in the public press from one end of the country to the other that statement was repeated and I have never heard it denied until to-day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No such statement to my knowledge was in any paper; certainly it was not published by the press of the country generally or I would have seen it. The statement which I did make in British Columbia was that if the Conservative party came into power they would grant a commission to ascertain whether or not the special conditions in British Columbia would justify consideration of the claims of that province.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think I was fairly within the limits——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I feel that I fairly stated the case in the language which I have used. I shall go further and say that in the statement which the hon. member makes of what he did say in British Columbia he did precisely that which hon. members opposite say this government should not do. He held out special inducements to a single section of the country. I think, however, that there is this mitigating circumstance about that statement of the leader of the opposition that should be taken into consideration, that it was a rather safe statement for the leader of the opposition to make, for he is not able to deliver the goods. I do not think that such statements will have very much effect upon the people of British Columbia, who are a knowing and shrewd people, and, unless they possess the faith of Abraham and the patience of Job, nothing will come of it. I merely mention these things for the purpose of showing that if there is a real desire on the part of hon. members opposite—I know there is on this side of the House—that a better condition of affairs should exist in regard to the means and methods whereby elections are conducted in

this country, the sooner we get together, and calmly discuss the question and take hold of the work, with the intention of improving those conditions, the better.

The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) who preceded me, directed his remarks particularly to agricultural questions. I should gather from the general tone of his remarks that he himself is not a farmer, but an agriculturist. In the county of Wellington from which I come, and where we are presumed to know a good deal about agriculture, the people draw a sharp distinction between a farmer and an agriculturist. They say that a farmer is a man who works a farm and an agriculturist is a man who works the farmer.

Mr. BRODER. What about the present Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think the speech delivered last night on agricultural questions by the hon. member for Dundas places him fairly within the definition of an agriculturist as understood by the people of Wellington. I could not follow his argument, although I tried to do so. He undertook to prove by the Year-book, which he said was of no use to anybody, and by the recent census statistics of the Northwest Territories, that the agricultural population in Canada was actually decreasing. I have not endeavoured to verify the figures which he gave, but I accept them. On the other hand, he said that the administration of the Department of Agriculture of this government has been costly and has been a failure—that instead of helping agricultural interests, it has hurt them. On the other hand, the hon. gentleman must realize that if there are fewer farmers in Canada to-day, through some influence they produce more than double what the greater number of farmers did ten or twelve years ago when the hon. gentleman's friends were in power. There must be some reason for that. I submit that the real reason is to be found in the administration of the Department of Agriculture, administered as it is for the first time by an educated, practical and progressive farmer. I do not wonder that hon. members laugh at that statement, but it is a fact nevertheless. It was not so in their day. They thought the Department of Agriculture should be presided over by a practising physician and surgeon for some time, by a lawyer at another time, and for many years by a western Ontario brewer. Is it any wonder that hon. members do not like the statement that that policy was changed, and that a practical farmer was put at the head of that department, and has introduced into it modern business methods? Is it any wonder that if the number of agriculturists in the country has decreased, the products of the agriculturists have more than doubled in ten or twelve years. Lastly, the hon. member for Dundas must have imagined that the hand of the clock had passed the hour of midnight on the 31st of March, when he held up Russia as an example for this great Dominion of Canada, and that he must have reached the 1st of April.

Mr. BRODER. I think my hon. friend adjourned the debate just as the clock struck twelve.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I am well aware that it was only the 31st of March when he made the statement, but I am afraid that he thought he was making it on the 1st of April. He speaks of Russia as a modern progressive country, and he gives statistics to show the condition of the peasants there —darkest Russia, the land of serfdom, the land of ignorance, the land of degradation, the land of wretchedness and misery; yet the agriculturist member for Dundas says boldly in this House that the people of Canada should take Russia as their example, and must look out in the near future or Russia will be their chief competitor in the markets of the world. I have nothing more to say in regard to the speech of the hon. member for Dundas.

And now, Mr. Speaker, rising as I do somewhat late in the debate that has been going on for some time, and in which a number of very able and exhaustive speeches have been made on both sides of the House, I recognize that it is very difficult for any one who desires to make a connected and concise argument, to avoid some repetition of the cardinal facts and figures with regard to the general standing of the country or the financial policy of the administration. I shall endeavour, however, to make my remarks as brief as I can in regard to these matters of repetition. This is called the Budget debate, which I understand originally applied only to questions of fiscal policy and the financial administration of the government. Latterly, both here and in England, the greatest latitude has been given to members to discuss in this debate almost any subject. I merely wish to say that silence on the part of hon. members on this side of the House in regard to a great many of the matters which have been discussed by hon. gentlemen opposite, must not be construed as any recognition of the statements or arguments which they have made, or of the conclusions which they have been able to draw on any of the irrelevant questions which they have seen fit to discuss in the course of this debate. Our omission to notice such matters must not be construed into an admission of the correctness of their statements or their conclusions, which it would take up an enormous amount of the time of the House to deal with or to categorically deny. One cannot do so in the course of an ordinary speech, and I do not propose to attempt it on this occasion. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in an able and exhaustive speech, made reference to a great many matters which I have neither the time nor the desire to discuss. I do not think this is the proper oc-

casion on which to discuss such matters as the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, which the hon. member for North Toronto discussed at considerable length. That is a matter that has been thoroughly threshed out on more than one occasion in this House.

I do not think it necessary to touch upon the Yukon Railway or the administration in the Yukon to which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) gave his attention. I shall say nothing upon the question of the Crows Nest Pass Railway, the Drummond County Railway or perhaps the National Transcontinental, nor shall I concern myself, as did the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) with the question which seemed to exercise him considerably, as to whether one Donald Fraser is in the employ of the Customs Department and whether he has or has not been prosecuted. Nor shall I attempt to discuss another question raised by that hon. gentleman regarding the Autonomy Bills and the lands in the new provinces or the question as to whether there was or was not a controverted Elections Act governing the new provinces when they were created. Nor shall I follow him into a discussion of the question of clover seed. These are matters which are all fit subjects for discussion if brought up in the proper time, but I submit they are not matters which ought to be dealt with on a debate on the budget. I have no doubt however that in proper time satisfactory answers will be given on this side of the House to all the charges contained in the various matters I have just enumerated.

There are many important matters however which have been brought up, and properly brought up, in this debate and to which I propose to devote the time at my disposal. In the first place, I propose dealing for a few minutes with some of the statements made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I regret that he is not in his place, but I am not responsible for his absence and cannot be expected to avoid a discussion of the points brought up by him because he does not happen to be present. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) occupies to some extent a unique position in this House. He is greatly admired and much respected by a large section of the Conservative party occupying as he does a very important place in the counsels of that party, and being looked upon as a sort of financial oracle by his followers and the Conservative newspaper press. Every statement and utterance of his therefore, whether serious or trivial, is given the greatest prominence throughout the press and on the platform; and I have no doubt that when he delivered his exhaustive five and one half hours speech at the opening of this debate, he attained the purpose he had in view, namely, that of producing a sort of political guide book or manual of tactics for the Conservative party in the ensuing general election. I desire to comment particularly upon some of the statements he made. After using a good deal of diligence and time, I have been entirely unable to verify these statements in the public records, can only characterize them as artificial, inaccurate and misleading. This prophet and oracle of the Conservative party, the real if not the titular head of that party, is never tired of informing the House that the Liberal party gained office at a time when the country was in a very fair condition as regards trade and finance. His object of course is to detract from the achievements of the Liberal administration. Let me point out, in the first instance, that the statements made by the hon. gentleman regarding the condition of Canada in the few years prior to the advent of the present government are entirely erroneous and misleading. The statistics he gave are the result of special selection and arbitrary rule, under which the hon. gentleman selects the lean years when they suit his purpose and the fat years when it suits him better to quote them. Talking of the conditions prior to 1896, he said on page 5332 of 'Hansard':

> Take some comparative statistics. The fall from 1890 to 1894 in the exports of Great Britain amounted to £47,000,000; in France, £19,000,000; in Germany, £8,000,000; in the United States, $140,000,000; in Australia, £19,000,000. The fall in the imports of Great Britain in that time amounted to £12,000,000; in France, £13,000,000; in Germany, £10,000,000; in the United States, $170,000,000, and in Australia, £19,000,000. But, Sir, in that period when trade was falling both in imports and exports in all these great countries of the world Canada came through that period in what way?

This is particularly what I wish to draw attention to:

> She came through with an import trade just about stationary and with an increase of exports in that period of $17,000,000. Her savings increased in that period by $46,000,000; the mileage of her railways increased 2,700 miles; there was a largely increased business in passengers of 1,100,000; in freight of 750,000 tons; there was an increased shipping return in and out (excluding coasting) of 640,000 tons; an increased coasting trade of 2,700,000 tons. Industries were well sustained; the imports of raw material in their principal parts were very nearly doubled in that time. The exports of manufactured goods increased in that time 35 per cent; the exports of agricultural products were $22,000,000 in 1890 and $36,000,000 in 1895, an increase of 65 per cent, and in agricultural and animal products there was an increase in the exports in that time of 35 per cent.

Why did the hon. gentleman select for comparison the years 1890 to 1894? His first allegation is that during that period the imports of this country remained practically stationary, and the figures he gave are substantially correct. But if the im-

ports to-day remained anything like stationary, one would not say that they were stationary but that trade was stagnant or that retrogression had actually set in. But on the other side of the page, he said that our export trade increased during that period by $17,000,000, showing an annual increase in four years of $4,500,000. Why did he stop at 1904? Because in 1895 the imports did not remain stationary but fell down some $13,000,000 and the exports did not show an increase but fell off $3,000,000. One may well wonder why so experienced a parliamentarian, so capable of critic and so great a leader, should lay before the House such artificial, specially selected figures in proof of a statement which he knew, when he gave it, could only be misleading.

Take his next allegation :

Her savings increased in that period by $46,000,000.

That is correct approximately. The amount of the deposits in the chartered banks did increase in those four years approximately $46,000,000, which would be an average annual increase of $11,500,000. Well, I heard the hon. member for North Toronto make that statement in those days and it then sounded like a pretty substantial increase in the deposits of the people ; but judged in the light of modern experience, if the hon. gentleman should to-day give an increase of $46,000,000 in four years in these deposits as an evidence of the prosperity of the people hon. members on both sides would be inclined to laugh at him.

Let me give the House a statement of the increase during the Liberal administration give an increase of $46,000,000 in four years in deposits from 1890 to 1894. In 1896 the deposits in the chartered banks of this country were, in round numbers, $183,000,000. The following figures show how those deposits increased during the first five years of Liberal administration.

Deposits by the people in the chartered banks since 1896.

| Year. | Deposits. | Increase. |
|---|---|---|
| 1896.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $183,769,992 | $17,371,696 |
| 1897.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 201,141,688 | 70,000,000 |
| 1898.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 227,063,343 | 25,921,655 |
| 1899.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 258,402,340 | 31,338,997 |
| 1900.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 277,256,716 | 18,854,376 |
| 1901.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 315,775,429 | 38,518,713 |
| Average from 1896 to 1901.. | | $25,401,085 |

This is the average increase for each year during this first five-year period. Now, take the next period of five years of Liberal rule:

| Year. | Deposits. | Increase. |
|---|---|---|
| 1902.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $344,949,901 | $29,174,029 |
| 1903.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 378,937,458 | 33,987,557 |
| 1904.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 423,574,030 | 44,930,572 |
| 1905.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 468,571,648 | 44,697,618 |
| 1906.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 536,769,519 | 68,197,931 |
| Average from 1902-1907.. .. | | $44,190,143 |
| 1907.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 589,456,889 | 52,690,370 |

Mr. GUTHRIE.

Thus we see, in the second period of Liberal rule, there has been an increase of over $44,000,000 each year as against the $46,000,000 in four years, which was deliberately announced in this House by so great an authority as the member for North Toronto as an evidence of the great prosperity which Canada enjoyed for some years prior to the advent of the present administration.

I turn now to the next statement. That statement was that the railways of Canada had been increased by 2,700 miles. That statement is approximately correct. The next statement was that there was a largely increased business in passengers of 1,100,000. These figures are substantially correct, as showing the increase in the passengers in four years. But that would scarcely account for the number of people who took the train and left Canada during that period. The next statement is, I think, the most appalling one of all, to be formally and deliberately made in this House and spread abroad throughout this country—that there was an increase in freight of 750,000 tons. I was thunderstruck when I heard that statement and afterwards looked at 'Hansard' to see if I correctly understood the hon. member. I had understood hitherto that his statistical statements might well be taken without particular inquiry. But, on this occasion, I deliberately made some inquiry about it. I find in the report of railway statistics up to June 30, 1907, in the tables on page 13 and page 15, the figures printed there in plain, bold, black type show that from the year 1890 to the year 1894 there was not an increase of 750,000 tons as the hon. gentleman said, but an absolute decrease of 66,000 tons in the railway tonnage of this country. I say I was amazed at the hon. gentleman's statement. I could not understand it, and I do not understand it yet. I looked at the schedules given to the House by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in the budget speech, and find that the figures I give are substantially correct and the figures given by the hon. member (Mr. Foster) are entirely misleading and erroneous—I cannot say more concerning them within the rules of this House.

Now, I pass to the next statement, which is to the effect that there was an increase in the shipping. These figures either as to coasting or as to ocean shipping I have not inquired into, but I think they are substantially correct. The hon. gentleman goes on:

Industries were well sustained; the imports of raw material in their principal parts were nearly doubled in that time. The exports of manufactured goods increased in that time 35 per cent.

That, I submit, is a wholly misleading and unfair statement. When an hon. member sets out to give figures, and then deliberately departs from that system and gives percentages without the figures, he does so only for the purpose of misleading and because the figures are not satisfactory to him. In

this case the figures are not satisfactory to the hon. gentleman. What meaning is conveyed by the statement that there is an increase of 35 per cent in exports? If there were an export of $100 one year and of $135 next year, there would be an increase of 35 per cent. I remember an instance in my own city of Guelph. I asked the American consul there what poultry trade there was between the port of Guelph and the United States. He gave me the answer: 1 pair of game chickens, value $5. A year or two after I asked if the poultry trade had increased. He said: 'Yes, I have reported to my government an increase of 120 per cent—2 pairs of game chickens, price, $11.' So, a statement giving only percentages may mean something or nothing. It is given here as a percentage because the figures would not warrant giving it in any other way. But what are the figures? I take the figures from the trade and navigation returns. These returns show that the export of manufactured goods in 1890 amounted to $6,388,064, and, four years later, in 1894, they amounted to $8,336,312—an increase in four years of $1,948,248—not 35 per cent, but 30 per cent, but in four years, less than $2,000,000, or less than $500,000 a year during those four years. And these same exports of manufactures to-day, after ten years of Liberal administration, have reached the splendid total of $28,000,000.

Now, I come to another of these statements which I cannot fathom, the difference between us is so great. In taking the unrevised 'Hansard' I feel somewhat insecure, but I consulted the revised 'Hansard' and I find no difference. I would not like to charge the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) with making a false statement—I could not charge him with doing so—but I seek for my own information to know what the difficulty is. He said:

——the exports of agricultural products were $22,000,000 in 1890 and $36,000,000 in 1895, an increase of 65 per cent.

In the first place, why does not he stick to his comparison of 1890 and 1894? Why did he start off with a four-year period to avoid the lean year 1895, and, when it comes to agricultural products, make his comparision not with 1894 but with 1895? Is that fair and honest dealing with the House? Is it honest to make such statements for the purpose of having them go to the press of the country and furnish the hon. gentleman's followers with campaign arguments which are unfounded? I do not know where he got his figures, I am giving my figures as the government got them up.

Mr. SPROULE. If 1895 was a lean year, that would tell worse against them.

Mr. GUTHRIE. That is a point I cannot fathom. I took my facts from the Trade and Navigation Reports for those years, and these Trade and Navigation Reports were prepared under the Conservative administration of that day. For greater certainty I will give the exact references. For the year 1890 the exports of agricultural products were $17,245,575; that will be found in the Trade and Navigation Report for 1890, at page 784. For the year 1895 the total exports of agricultural products were $18,992,503; that will be found in the Trade and Navigation Report for 1895, at page 520. The figures show an increase in these five years of $1,746,928, and the hon. member for North Toronto, in his speech, shows an increase of $14,000,000. It may be that he has taken something else into his calculation, perhaps the products of the forest, the products of the mines, or the products of the fisheries. He may have had some way of calculating that I am not aware of; but I know his figures are $13,000,000 or $14,000,000 out of the figures which the Department of Trade and Commerce in his own administration, gave to the people of this country, and which I submit are correct. Then his next statement is equally misleading; you cannot place your hand on it, you cannot verify it. He says in the next place,

In agricultural and animal products there was an increase in exports at that time of 35 per cent.

No one knows better than the hon. member that there is a clear separation, in all the reports and statistics of this House, between agricultural products and animals and their products; and the hon. member for North Toronto cannot crawl out of the difficulty by saying that he has mixed animal products and agricultural products together. He is too old a hand at statistics to do anything of the kind. The last point I want to make with regard to his statement is this: He has endeavoured to bolster up his case by an authority on political economy which he quotes with great approval; he quotes from the writings of the Hon. David A. Wells, late of Connecticut and New York, and now deceased. He says that Mr. Wells is probably one of the greatest writers on economic subjects, and he quotes a paragraph from a published article of Mr. Wells in the 'Forum' of 1904, to the effect that in the Dominion of Canada there were better conditions than existed for some years prior to 1894 in the United States. Mr. Wells so stated in his article in the 'Forum,' and the reason he gives is that we had no disturbing money question on this side of the line. Mr. Wells' opinion was that the question of bi-metallism was then and for some years prior had been a disturbing question in the United States, which was aggrevated by the agitation for the unlimited free coinage of silver; and that these causes had created distrust among the financial institutions in the east, and led to a tightness of money.

That, he alleges, was the real cause of the financial disturbance in the United States. But he says that in Canada, on the other side of the line, we were not bothered with these questions. Now, while Mr. Wells was a very high authority upon economic questions, I would like to say to the hon. member for North Toronto, if he were in the House, that it might be well for him to read some of Mr. Wells' theories, arguments and conclusions in regard to what is known as the balance of trade between imports and exports in regard to the question of shipping, of mercantile marine, and of high protection. If the hon. member is willing to quote with approval Mr. Wells' opinion in regard to financial questions in Canada and the United States in 1894, I trust he will quote with the same approval those articles to which I refer in the other writings of Mr. Wells. I had the pleasure on one occasion of meeting Mr. Wells, on another, of hearing him speak; and I think I have read pretty much all that he has ever written on these subjects, at all events a great many of his works, to some of which I intend to allude. Now if we are to find a starting point for the purpose of making comparisons, or for the purpose of ascertaining whether this government has or has not well and ably administered the affairs of this country in the interests of the people, we must strike upon some ground which is not controverted, and the only ground that we can select is the public records and documents of this country, which settle these facts for all time. I am willing to go with the member for North Toronto at any time and take those records as the starting point for an argument upon that subject. Of course he may speak of surrounding conditions, he may speak of special circumstances but these are matters we cannot establish by statistics. Now if my recollection of the years preceding the advent of the Liberal administration in 1896, if my recollection of that gloomy, dismal and distressful period, is to be put side by side with the somewhat glowing picture which the hon. member for North Toronto always sees fit to draw of that same period, and if this House is to decide between my recollection and his of that period, then I must remind the House that his testimony is in the nature of the testimony of an accessory and an accomplice, for he himself was one of the chief actors in that melancholy drama, almost a tragedy, which was enacted throughout Canada. But there is a common ground upon which we may start, and I defy the hon. member for North Toronto or any other hon. member, to controvert the figures which I give, and the references which I make in regard to those figures.

Now I state at the outset that the few years, the three, four or five years, as you like to choose, preceding the change of government in 1896, were years of falling revenue and of rising expenditure; page 20 of the Public Accounts will demonstrate the proof of that statement. I state, secondly, that the years preceding the change of government in 1896 were years of annual deficits; page 21 of Public Accounts will demonstrate the proof of that statement. I state in the third place that during those years which immediately preceded the change of government, the government of this country received annually in revenue a sum equal to $7.20 per capita for every man, woman and child in the country, and expended money at the rate of $7.26 per head upon the estimated population which that government made of 5,086,061 souls. In the fourth place, I say that those were years of heavy annual increases to the public debt; page 18 of the Public Accounts will prove that fact. In the next place, I say that those were years of absolute trade stagnation. We had descended into a state of chronic trade stagnation, and but for the change of government we might have suffered in this country from an attack of acute retrogression instead of stagnation. To verify the truth of that statement turn to page 1414 of the December, 1907, Trade and Commerce Report. I say those years were years of heavy business failures, and for larger amounts than in previous years; they were years of higher taxation than the taxation we now have. These are facts which I propose to establish, if necessary, by exact references to the various blue-books and reports of the House.

Let me at the outset, and as quickly as possible run over the financial condition of the country as we had it in the past and as we have it now. I have prepared these figures and I am willing to stand by them, and when I speak in round numbers I do not pretend to speak in exact figures, but where I do give exact figures I mean these to be exact in every respect. Here are the figures as I have tabulated them:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT.

| — | 1896. | 1907 (9 mos. to Mar. 31). | 1908 (Estimated). |
|---|---|---|---|
| | $ | $ | $ |
| 1 Net debt. .... | 258,000,000 | 263,060,000 | 275,000,000 |
| 2 Revenue C.F.. | 36,618,000 | 67,969,000 | 96,500,000 |
| 3 Expenditure C.F ..... | 36,949,000 | 51,542,000 | 77,500,000 |
| 4 Deficit.... .. | 330,000 | *16,427,000 | *19,000,000 |
| 5 Population.... | 5,086,061 | 6,153,789 | 6,863,500 |
| 6 Debt per capita | 50 82 | 42 84 | 40 65 |
| 7 Revenue per capita ..... | 7 20 | 11 04 | 14 05 |
| 8 Expenditure per capita... | 7 26 | 8 37 | 11 30 |

* Surplus.

Now, we find that during the present year the government has made a capital expenditure of $17,750,000 upon the National Transcontinental railway. This is a great work which has been adopted and approved by the people of Canada in a general election. It is an extraordinary expenditure of the government it is a capital expenditure, and if any expenditure can be considered extraordinary in any sense of the word this expenditure surely is. Had we not had to expend that $17,750,000 this year the actual record up to the present time of the Liberal government with regard to the finances of this country would have shown a net decrease in the public debt of Canada of $5,750,000 instead of an increase of $12,000,000.

I want to say a word, and I shall make only a brief reference to it, as to what we know as capital expenditure. There is a misapprehension in this country and I have many times been spoken to about it, and even by members of this House I have been asked questions as to the manner of book-keeping pursued by this government and by former governments of Canada. I do not desire nor shall I attempt to educate the members of this House as to how government book-keeping is done or should be done but I make this statement: That the system so far as the principle goes, is the same system precisely as is adopted by any ordinary citizen, or any private individual, or business man. It is the system adopted by every private corporation, by every municipal corporation, by every province and it has been the system in force here since confederation at all events. The system is simply this: That all the revenue in the nature of annual revenue which comes into the treasury of this country is put to an account which is called Consolidated Fund Revenue Account. The recurring annual expenditure of the country is put to another account called Consolidated Fund Expenditure Account. One side of the ledger is revenue and the other expenditure. Then in addition to this we have the great expenditures on public works which are not annual expenditures. If the government desire to build a railway they do not tax the people for the total cost of that railway in a single year. If we have to build the Georgian bay canal the government would not ask the people of this country to pay up $100,000,000 in any single year. These are works which do not recur but which are put to capital account as permanent improvements to the country; the money is borrowed in the money markets of the world and the interest upon the borrowed sum is an annual expenditure of the country. Now when the expenditure is not as great in any one year as the revenue, we have a surplus, and when in any one year the expenditure is greater than the revenue we have a deficit. And when the Liberals say in the newspapers and on the platform that they have spent $127,000,000 in capital expenditure and they only added $17,000,000 to the debt of the country in the last ten or eleven years some people ask, how could you have done that? It is done in this way: Take the whole period during which the Liberal administration has been in power and you will find that they have had surpluses aggregating from $110,000,000 to $112,000,000. All that money has been applied in permanent improvements in this country in expenditure on capital account, and $17,000,000 has had to be borrowed making the total capital expenditure by the Liberals $127,000,000. Apart from the $17,000,000, all the rest has been saved by a judicious expenditure on a bountiful revenue, the difference being the surplus which has given us the money to create many of these great public works. Now, I know that the government has been criticised because it treats the bounties which we pay on iron and steel and binder twine as capital expenditure, whereas the late Conservative government treated these bounties as annual expenditure. A good deal is to be said in favour of each system and much is to be said against each, but rather than take up the time of the House in arguing for one system or for the other, I think it is better to give the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and his friends the benefit of their contention and simply to say: Take all the bounties which we have paid since 1896, amounting as the hon. member (Mr. Foster) says to between $10,000,000 and $12,000,000, take them all from the surpluses, and instead of having a surplus of $110,000,000 or $112,000,000 we will have a net surplus of about $100,000,000 for the ten or eleven years the Liberal government has been in power. Whichever way you look on it the showing of the present government on the financial side of the page has been a magnificent showing. And nothing proves the sterling quality of that administration so well as when it is put in comparison with the experience of this country under preceding Conservative administrations. The Conservatives spent largely in regard to capital account as well as the Liberals, but there is this difference between the two —during the last eleven years of Conservative rule in this country they spent $80,000,000 in permanent works, but where did they get the money? Why, they went to the money market in London and borrowed on the bonds of Canada $62,000,000 and the other $18,000,000 they secured from their annual surplus. Now, during the past eleven years the Liberal government has spent $127,000,000 on permanent works and up until the present year it only had to go to England to borrow $5,000,000. Compare the records of the two governments in that respect.

Then, let me point as another comparison to the question of the net debt of the

country. A good deal turns on the question of the net debt of the country and a good deal turns on just what particular way you view that net debt. It is argued by many people that instead of spending $127,000,000 in permanent works and improvements in this country, that money should have been paid in reduction of the debt. Well, that is one way of looking at it. If you had applied that $127,000,000 which you spent in public works towards reducing your debt your debt would have been just that much less than you will find it to-day, but you would not have had the public improvements and the permanent works which this government has erected in Canada. You cannot both have your cake and eat it. How has the debt increased? What has been the record of the two parties in regard to the public debt?

Between 1878 and 1896, while the country was governed by the Conservative party, the net debt of Canada increased by $118,000,000, an annual increase of $6,500,000.

From 1897 to 1907, during ten years of Liberal government, the net debt of Canada increased by $5,000,000 or an annual increase of $500,000. In the whole eleven years of Liberal administration the total increase has been $17,000,000 and the annual increase $1,545,000, less than $1,500,000. That is the record of the two parties in that respect. The Conservatives had an annual increase in the public debt of $6,500,000 while the Liberal government have had an annual increase in the public debt including the heavy expenditure on the National Transcontinental Railway of less than $1,500,000.

One point always strikes me as peculiar when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) discusses the budget. He has never failed, so long as I have been in the House with him—and I have been here for some time when he was not here for reasons best known to him and to the electors of New Brunswick and North Ontario—he has never failed in speaking on the Budget to refer with great particularity and great anxiety and concern, to the maturing obligations of Canada. I notice that on the present occasion he not only questioned the Finance Minister in the course of the Budget speech on that particular point, but in his own speech he dealt to a considerable extent with the question of our maturing obligations, and demonstrated quite conclusively that between now and 1911 this country will be called upon to pay in round numbers $100,000,000 of borrowed money. When you pause to think that the hon. member for North Toronto is the man who, as Finance Minister of Canada, borrowed every dollar of that money and spent it, you must wonder at the peculiar amount of concern and anxiety he expresses as to how another is to pay his debts. This is not the first occasion on which Conservative obligations have been met; during the past ten years the Minister of Finance has met them on many occasion, some to pay, others to arrange, others to extend, others to convert, and I think the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster? may let his head rest on his pillow quite calmly at night in the belief that the Finance Minister who has piloted us safely through the last ten years will successfully care for that $100,000,000 of Conservative debt maturing during the next few years.

I beg to call attention to certain trade figures, as they are to be found in the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce in regard to the rate of taxation. On all goods entering Canada for home consumption, the average rate of duty in 1896 was 18·28 per cent and in 1907, 15·73 per cent, a reduction of 2·55 per cent, or in other words a reduction of $2.55 upon every $100 worth of goods entered for home consumption in this country.

On dutiable imports, the average rate in 1896 was 29·97 and in 1907, 26·33, a reduction of 3·64 per cent, or $3.64 reduction upon every $100 worth of goods imported.

On the total imports in 1896 the average rate was 19·12, and in 1907 it was 16·03 per cent, a reduction of 3·09 or $3.09 on every $100 worth of goods that entered into Canada in those years.

In the face of these figures it is a far-fetched argument to declare that this government has increased the rate of taxation. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) referred to a phrase, used I think by Sir Richard Cartwright, in speaking of the Conservative taxation, that the people of the country had been bled white with taxation, and he said that if there was occasion for the use of that expression in the Conservative days, there was much more occasion for it to-day. Do the facts bear him out? The rate of taxation is actually lower by from $2.50 to $3 on every $100 worth of goods imported into Canada in the present year of grace as compared with 1896.

Any one will realize why we have more revenue; it is because the people are in a position to buy more goods, they want more goods, they have more money with which to buy them, and as they buy them they pay more taxes into the revenue. It is idle for any one to attempt to argue to-day that the Liberal party has, in the slightest degree, increased the rate of taxation in Canada.

I intended discussing the statements or misstatements that have been made in regard to the cost of the construction of the National Transcontinental Railway, but I waive that as it has been so fully dealt with by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. There is, however, one point on which I wish to speak, that is that portion of the argument of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) which I think is entitled to be called an argument, a very fair and candid expression of his own opinion upon the somewhat involved and difficult problem which we all understand by the expression

'balance of trade.' I listened with great interest to what he had to say in that regard while I am unable to come to his conclusion, if he expressed any—and I do not think he did express a definite conclusion—still I do think, and I say it with all respect to his great ability and experience, that from his point of view, he argued the question very carefully and fairly. The hon. member starts out with the proposition that we are face to face in Canada with this problem, that we are importing annually $104,000,000 worth of goods more than we export. He says that this is not a good trade condition for any country to experience, and that the $104,000,000 of difference has to be met by this country in gold when the balance is struck. That is the theory of a modern school of high protectionists and it has been argued very well by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster); but unfortunately that theory has not shown to any advantage in any country in the world, so far as I am aware, unless it be under special circumstances and conditions in the United States. Taking his figures of $104,000,000 of excess of imports over exports, he must deduct from that such items as settlers' effects. I think he will agree with me in that. This year they amounted to $9,340,000, last pear to $5,500,000. Nine million dollars worth of settlers' effects come into this country and no money goes out in return. We are that much richer so that instead of increasing our exports by $9,000,000 to offset this we should double the $9,000,000 in arriving at the balance of trade and make it $18,000,000. We spend nothing for that $9,000,000, the wealth of the country is increased by that amount. In order to get any fair idea of how our trade is made up and how the balance should be struck, it would, I think, be necessary to go through practically every item in the imports of this country.

A serious factor in this question is raw material, how is that to be treated? We import, in round numbers, between $40,000,000 and $50,000,000 a year of raw material, or what is to the manufacturer raw material, that is material which is actually raw, or a partially finished product used in the factories of Canada as raw material. The heavier items are made up of such articles as cotton, sugar, bituminous coal, linseed, flax, partially manufactured iron and steel and metal ores. Then, we must also give special consideration to those goods which are not produced here, and which will never be produced here. The item of foreign fruits runs into heavy figures; anthracite coal runs up to nine or ten millions; Indian corn runs up to about five millions and three-quarters. I am well within the mark in saying that from fifteen to twenty-five millions of the imports of the country are in goods which we do not, cannot and never will produce. Another observation which I have to make, and it is a very important one, is that if you take a statement of the total imports and exports of Canada for the last twenty years, divided into five-year periods, you will find that conditions, as to industry, trade and progress in every respect, have been better in those periods in which the imports have been largely in excess of the exports. On that point I give the following statement, which I have prepared with considerable care :

| From | Exports. | Imports. | To Balance. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | $ | $ | $ |
| 1887 to 1891.. | 464,074,423 | 580,837,676 | 116,763,253 |
| 1892 to 1896.. | 584,705,331 | 608,748,466 | 14,043,135 |
| 1897 to 1901.. | 849,382,196 | 802,344,008 | 47,038,188 |
| 1902 to 1906.. | 1,110,914,747 | 1,273,817,354 | 162,902,607 |

I think I am within the mark when I say that the most progressive period in the history of this country under Conservative administration was in the five years from 1887 to 1891, when the imports exceeded the exports by $116,000,000, and the worst period was in the next five years, when the exports and imports were almost equalized, and that the best period, the most progressive and richest, under the Liberal administration has been the last period, when the imports have exceeded the exports by $162,000,000. There is another way of looking at the facts. If you take the total exports of Canada from the year of confederation down to the close of the year 1907, that is, during a forty-year period, you will find that they were $4,257,000,000 in goods and $120,000,000 in gold coin and bullion. During the same period we imported into Canada a total of $5,000,000,000 worth of goods and $150,000,000 in gold coin and bullion. During that period, while our imports exceeded our exports by the enormous total of $473,000,000, we received from other countries $150,000,000 in gold coin and bullion as against $120,000,000 in gold coin and bullion that we sent out. These figures, I am free to say, involve the question very much, and make it one of great difficulty. I agree with the statement made by the hon. member for North Toronto that we cannot find any rule in regard to the question of the balance of trade that is applicable to all countries. It is all very well for the hon. member for Wentworth to affirm that the old doctrine of the balance of trade, as expounded in England forty or fifty years ago, is only to be found in musty books and is entirely superseded now, but when you come to study the question, you will find that it is surrounded with some of the greatest economical problems in regard to commerce among the nations of the world.

I have looked into the figures to see how the matter stands with respect to other nations, and I would like briefly to give the result. Before doing so, I want to say in re-

gard to the statement made by the hon. member for Wentworth that, after searching with due diligence, as I assume he did, and after taking the same record, as I have no doubt we both did in regard to the trade of Japan, Mexico and the Argentine Republic, I find in regard to Japan that the figures do not bear out his contention. Japan show a great excess of imports over exports, and still the hon. member for Wentworth pointed to Japan as a modern, up to date, progressive and successful nation. But in regard to the Argentine Republic, in which he said the conditions compared very well with the conditions in this country, the exports considerably exceed the imports, and any one who knows anything about the Argentine Republic knows the reason why. I have a good many friend there, and I have discussed the question with a great many people who were born and bred and live there. For many years a number of the better class of Argentine people came to the agricultural college at Guelph for their education, as many as thirty or forty being there at a time.

From my conversations with people acquainted with that country and articles I have read, I know something of the conditions existing in the Argentine Republic. Its people are a people of very simple habits and tastes, who live very simple and inexpensive lives. They do not import or manufacture very much but live largely upon their own agricultural products. They have their own weaving looms and wear their own homespuns. Their great industry is cattle and sheepgrazing and the raising of wheat so that when we find that their exports of cattle and sheep and wheat comprise pretty nearly all their exports ,we are not surprised. Their imports are comparatively small, and the balance shows a large preponderance of exports. That is not therefore, a fair comparison, the conditions there being so very different from what they are here. But take other countries. The only other country of any account which shows a balance of exports over imports is the United States, which has an annual balance of exports over imports of $522,000,000. Take Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Great Britain and France. Every one of these countries shows a heavier import than export trade, Great Britain especially showing a tremendous balance in favour of imports. True in Russia the figures are the other way, but I do not like to give Russia as an example, especially in view of what I said regarding her in the beginning of my remarks. Russia is one of the most impoverished countries in the world. She is a tremendous debtor in every money market of the world to-day yet her export trade considerably exceeds her imports. But I refuse to take Russia as an example regarding the question of balance of trade, as I have refused to take her as an example in the matter of agriculture. But let me give the figures as we find them in other countries:

| — | | Imports. | Exports. |
|---|---|---|---|
| United States | 1906 | $1,226,562,446 | $1,743,864,500 |
| Belgium | 1905 | Francs 4,426,400,000 | Francs 3,849,700,000 |
| Denmark | 1905 | Kroner 622,526,000 | Kroner 533,543,000 |

In France the conditions are peculiar. Up to 1906 her imports exceeded exports very largely but for the year 1906 the figures are as follows. With regard to goods of French origin and imports for home consumption—the unit being a million francs—the imports were 5·229·4 and the exports 5·043·6. They are almost equal. General commerce, 6·061·5 imports, and 6·302·3 exports.

| — | | Of French origin and imports for home consumption. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| France—Home consunption | 1906 | (Million fr.) 5,229·4 | 5,043·6 |
| France—General commerce | 1906 | 6,061·5 | 6,302·3 |
| Germany | 1905 | (1,000 Mks.) 7,436,263 | 3,841,817 |
| Italy | 1905 | Lire 2,078,380 | 1,707,368,000 |
| Netherlands., | 1905 | 2,584,000,000<br>12 Gulders to £1 | 1,994,000,000 |
| Norway | 1905 | Kroners 312,236,300 | 217,960,100 |
| Switzerland | 1905 | Francs 1,458,321,700 | 1,007,822,756 |
| Sweden | 1905 | Kroners 582,084,457 | 450,211,733 |

In Austria the figures are a little the other way. They are given in units of one million florins. Imports 1905, 1,073.1; exports 1,121.9. Lastly Great Britain, 1906, total imports £607,987,893 sterling; exports £460,836,304 sterling, showing a heavy balance of imports over exports.

How does the system work out? The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says that every three, six, nine or twelve months, the balance of trade has to be paid in coin. Well, that is not the conclusion at which political economists of some repute have arrived. They argue that the system is a continual one, that the balances are self adjusted, and that where the exports exceed the imports there must have been some anterior obligation. The balance, they say, is self adjusting, and the payment is not made in coin or bullion at all because the system is a continuous one. Take the figures given by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) regarding conditions in Canada. The hon. gentleman quoted from the work of Mr. David A. Wells. Let me draw his attention to the opinion of that writer on the subject I am discussing. On page 13 of his work entitled 'Ships and Bounties,' the first portion of which deals with the decay of the American mercantile marine, he makes the following statement regarding the United States:

But in thus shutting out the products of other nations, we have at the same time necessarily shut ourselves in. For all commerce —foreign and domestic—is simply the exchange of products; so that he who won't buy can't sell, and he who won't sell can't buy.

The attempts to invalidate these conclusions seem almost puerile; but, nevertheless, as they continue to be made by respectable journals, it is expedient to notice them. It is asserted, for example, that it is not necessary to import in order to export. But that is equivalent to saying that a nation can or will go on selling to other nations without receiving pay for what it sells, which ignores the economic axiom, that in the long run the exports and imports of every nation must pay for each other, or the trade will cease—a fact that would practically appear in every national trade statement, but for the circumstance that imports, as in the case of England, are often made for the purpose of paying interest on foreign investments which represent long antecedent exports; or obligations of the indebtedness (in the shape of bonds) are exported in the place of merchandise to pay for imports, as is often the case with the United States.

Again at page 19 of the same work, the learned writer says:

The evidence is thus complete, that so long as we maintain a commercial policy that seeks to restrict or prevent commerce with other nations, so long ships will not come back to us; for opportunity for their employment would be limited, even if they were placed as free gifts at our wharfs.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) rather sneered at the statement made on this side early in the session that by means of barter and exchange, the wealth of the country was increased. He said you take your ship from London to France and from France to Egypt and so around the world, the old theory is exploded of an increase in the value of the goods. Well, I commend to my hon. friend the doctrine and argument laid down by the authority he himself has quoted and to which I have just referred, and he will come to the same conclusion, namely, that it is barter and exchange which really results in increasing the wealth of any nation.

Now, as to the export of scenery. That question is dealt with by economic writers; it has some effect, no doubt, on the balance of trade. The statement made by the hon. member for North Toronto is that, while the imports to Switzerland exceed the exports, yet Switzerland is a most prosperous country, but, in order to account for this prosperity of Switzerland, the hon. gentleman says that they export scenery among the many tourists from the United States who spend millions of dollars there, thus adjusting the balance. It is all very well to speak of spending millions, but I am satisfied that I am within the mark when I state that the tourist trade from the United States to Canada exceed in the ratio of 5 to 1 the tourist trade of Switzerland. Take the conditions in Canada as we know them to be. Look at the activity of our railways and shipping lines and summer hotels during the tourist season, not in one part of the country alone, but from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The whole shore of Nova Scotia is crowded; Prince Edward Island is crowded; St. John, N.B.,—I have been there in summer when you could not get into the hotels on account of the number of tourists; the shore of the St. Lawrence attracts many; we know how it is in the northland of Ontario and in the Thousand Islands; and out in the west and British Columbia the same is true. I believe I am well within the mark in saying that $5 is spent by American tourists in Canada for every $1 spent by American tourists in Switzerland. If the export of scenery is to be taken into account in the case of Switzerland, the same must be done in our case as well. My conclusion, the only conclusion I can come to, after examining the case as carefully as I can, is that we are safe in going on at the present ratio. No harm has come to us in years when there has been a heavy excess of imports. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) laughs at my statement. If he can show me, from the figures of this country or any other country save the United States, that the contrary is the fact, I shall be prepared to take his statement.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) a question? Has

he ever found a year since confederation equal to the past year for excess of imports over exports ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. And I do not think our export trade has ever been so good as in the past year.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Our exports have fallen and our imports have increased by $100,000,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE. But what I submit is that there is a self-adjusting balance in all these cases, and, while it may fluctuate, it will settle itself and trade will balance trade. That is the experience of every country in the world, the figures of which I have given. The most pointed remark I can make is that when there has been the greatest balance of trade—adverse balance they call it—we have ever had in Canada, no matter what government is in power, we have enjoyed the greatest prosperity, and when the figures are most nearly equalized, we have found ourselves in the greatest financial adversity we have ever known.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Will the hon. gentleman say this is the most prosperous year we have ever known ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Does the hon. member refer to last year?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. What about the stringency?

Mr. GUTHRIE. The stringency—I had intended to say something about that and I will deal with it now. I am willing to admit that there has been a stringency within the past few months in Canada. But, in addressing the Canadian Manufacturers' Association within the past few months, the brother of the hon. member for Brantford, who is president of the association, stated at the annual meeting that, notwithstanding the stringency, there was greater prosperity in the industries of Canada than ever before. But that is not the point. There are reasons and very good reasons why we should suffer from stringency. The stringency has been caused, if we may believe so high an authority as Mr. Clouston, of the Bank of Montreal by too much prosperity. The argument is that, enjoying too much prosperity, the people have become reckless in regard to money. There has been over speculation, there has been over production. But that which has been the real cause of stringency in this country is beyond the power of any government to prevent, and it is that Providence has not favoured Canada with its average annual yield from the great plains in the west and the province of Ontario. You may talk of over-speculation and financial stringency and of artificial causes of the stringency at the present time ; but, getting down to the root of the question, getting down to the bottom of the matter, you will find that the real cause of the depression, if depression we have in Canada to-day, is that we are so many millions of dollars short in the crop of this country ; and, until we have a revival, until Providence is more kind to the country, as I hope he will be this year, I do not look for any great revival in trade. Talk as we like of prosperity, Canada's great natural source of wealth is agriculture. We are all glad to see the strides that manufacturing has been making ; we are glad to know that the manufacturers have added greatly to the wealth of the country and the value of their own products during the last few years, but we know that they can prosper only so long as the great wheat fields of Canada yield their grain and so long as other agricultural pursuits are well rewarded.

I do not know that it is necessary to say anything more about the stringency. But I would point out that only one member of this House on the opposition side, so far as I know, continually harps upon the question of the unemployed and their condition, and that is the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). I have heard that hon. member say that the Toronto 'Globe' has done the same thing and that that newspaper has printed in large letters the condition of the poor people of Shacktown. There is this distinction between the statements of my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) and the statements of the Toronto 'Globe,' that the statements of the Toronto 'Globe,' were made in the cause of charity, and were made successfully in that cause, and the hon. member's statements are made solely, only and directly for political cause and to gain a political advantage.

But I will give one or two more comparisons which I have and then will allow some one else to continue the debate. Take the case of our railways, which was mentioned by the hon. member for North Toronto. Here are some figures concerning them :

Railways.

| | 1896. | 1907. | Increase. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Miles in operation .. | 16,270 | 22,452 | 6,182 |
| Tonnage .. .. | 24,266,000 | 63,866,000 | 39,600,000 |
| Earnings.. .. | $50,545,000 | $146,738,000 | $96,193,000 |

There is another statement, which, I think, perhaps, better illustrates the condition of the country than any other that one can give and that is the statement of the banks. I have here some figures showing the progress made by our banks since 1891 :

Banks—Capital invested.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1881.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $59,000,000 |
| 1891.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 60,000,000 |
| 1907.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 96,362,000 |

Deposits.

| | 1896. | 1907. |
|---|---|---|
| Chartered banks .. .. | $183,769,000 | $589,459,000 |
| Govt. Savings banks.. | 61,259,000 | 90,264,000 |
| Total. .. .. .. .. .. | 245,028,000 | 679,723,000 |

Now, what are the increases? There has been in that period an increase in the deposits of the people in the chartered banks and the savings banks of $434,000,000. What is the average deposit per capita? In 1896 the average per head for every man, woman and child was $48.80, and for a family of five, $244. In 1907 the average deposit for every man, woman and child was $110.40, and for a family of five, $551. Look at the question from another point of view, and see what you could do with that money. You could pay the entire debt of Canada at the present moment and leave for every man, woman and child in the banks $67.56 per head on deposit. If you had attempted to do that in 1896 you would have wiped out every dollar of deposits in the chartered and savings banks of Canada and still have a net debt of $13,000,000. There has been tremendous progress also in the industrial progress of Canada. The figures given by the interim census cannot be too much emphasized. They show that in the year 1906 the number of factories in Canada was 15,796; the number of employees, 392,000; capital invested, $846,000,000; wages paid, $165,000,000; value of product, $718,000,000. In the year 1900—to show the progress that has been made—the average wages paid to employees was only $334 a year; during the year 1905, or five years later, the average wages paid was $422, or an an increase in the average wages paid to ever mechanic and every artisan, including boys and apprentices, of $88 a year. Take the number of factories employing 5 hands or over. In 1900 those factories employed 339,173 hands; in the year 1905 the same factories employed 385,920. In 1900 in these factories there was paid in wages $113,249,000; in 1905 there was paid in wages $162,155,000. But the point of the matter is that, that during those five years, while the number of employees has increased but 13 per cent, the increase of wages has been at the rate of 43 per cent, showing better than anything else what has been the actual condition of the great industrial producing classes of this country.

Now, I have a last reference to make, and I make it in deference to the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), who I believe is to follow me, and that is in regard to the Post Office Department. I do not know that I can tell him anything in regard to that which he does not already know, but if he will look up the figures in regard to the Post Office Department he will find perhaps the greatest achievement of the Liberal administration of this country, or of any administration in any country, in the short space of ten and three-quarter years. In the year 1896 the revenue of the Post Office Department was $2,964,000, and the expenditure $3,665,000. But they were short in their accounts or had a deficit of between $700,000 and $800,000; I will put the figures at $700,000, for the purpose of my argument. Well, what were they to do? They could not make the Post Office pay for itself; they spent more than they received, and finally they quietly went to the member for North Toronto, then Minister of Finance, and told him that they must have more money, and he quietly went to England and floated the bonds of this country and borrowed money to pay the adverse balance in their running of the Post Office Department. How do the figures stand now? In the year 1907 the total revenue of the Post Office was $5,061,728 and the expenditure $3,979,000, showing a surplus of $1,082,171, and I believe that for the present year which closed yesterday the surplus will be well nigh a million and a half dollars. Now, how has that state of things been brought about? The great point I wish to emphasize is this, that while the post office service has been increased, while a great number of new post offices have been established, while the salaries of all the country postmasters and postmistresses have been increased, and in many instances more than doubled, while new mail routes have been established in every portion of the country, while the domestic postage has been reduced one-third, from three cents to two cents, and the imperial postage from five cents to two cents, notwithstanding the increased expenditure and the reduction of postage, the Postmaster General is able to come down to the House in this year of grace with a surplus of nearly a million and a half to the good, as against an adverse balance of $700,000 in the year 1896. Now, it may be argued by my hon. friend who will follow me that the Conservative party could have done that too. Well, if he will turn to the 'Hansard' for the year 1894 he will see how they view it. I have not got the page of the 'Hansard,' but it can be found in the discussion of the Postmaster General's estimate for that year. Sir Adolphe Caron, then Postmaster General, was asked in the House if he would consider a reduction in the rate of postage from three cents to two cents, and what was his answer? No, the government has no intention of considering the question; if we make the reduction, he said, we will lose by it $700,000. That would have made a deficit of $1,400,000 instead of $700,000.

Now, the hon. member for Lambton is one of the gentleman who professes to be greatly taken with that plank in the Halifax platform of the opposition known as free rural mail delivery. I had the pleasure of listening to the hon. gentleman when he made his speech on the address at the opening of the present session, and I listened with great attention to the statistics he gave upon that occasion. But I do not think his material was complete by any means, though I commend him for his industry and for the statistics which he presented. I have myself for a long time looked into the question with a great deal of care and have given it a great deal of thought, and while I am

in favour of the government adopting the policy, to some extent at least, I realize the importance of the question and the tremendous expenditures in which it might soon involve the government. But believing it as I do and feeling that the day for it will eventually come, I cannot consider it a matter of so vital, of so paramount, of so transcendental importance that I should vote want of confidence in the government on account of it. The hon. member for East Lambton moved a resolution in this House by way of amendment to the reply to the speech from the Throne, which was a want of confidence motion in the present administration. Now, when he brings that matter forward by a want of confidence motion, I will frankly say that, strongly as I am in favour of such a measure, I shall not vote want of confidence in the government on account of it. I will not discuss the subject at greater length to-day, as I believe there will be another opportunity during the present session when the question of rural mail delivery, whether free or partly free and partly paid, will come up for discussion, and I will reserve any further remarks until that opportunity arrives.

Now, that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is in his seat, I will make one more reference, because his face on this occasion recalls to my mind the cheerful countenance he presented in the city of Guelph in the month of May, 1896. It is in regard to the total exports and imports of Canada that I desire to speak. I wish to give the total figures in regard to exports and imports under the Liberal administration and under the Conservative administration. From the year 1897 to the year 1907 the total export and import trade of Canada, increased, in round numbers, by $360,000,000. It was $257,000,000 in 1897 and $617,000,000 in 1907. For the last ten years of the Conservative administration, from 1886 to 1896, it had increased by $50,000,000, but taking the whole period of Conservative administration from the year 1878 down to the year 1896 it increased by $66,000,000. Now, what I want to point to is this: That there was a general election impending in the month of May 1896, and I remember at that time attending a meeting in the city of Guelph where the speakers were the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale). The meeting was held in the Opera House. At that time as now I considered myself to be a good Liberal while I listened with very great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for North Toronto, and upon that occasion (though he does not seem to cling to that opinion now he tried to persuade that audience of whom I was one, that trade in Canada at that time was really in a prosperous condition. He not only gave to the people upon that occasion the figures in regard to the deposits in chartered banks in Canada, but he gave them a dissertation upon the question of export and import trade. And he told the people of Canada that during the eighteen years of the Conservative administration they had increased the export and import trade of Canada by $66,000,000, and we wondered at him and some of us cheered him and thought that a tremendous increase, and he gave that as one of the evidences of the satisfactory condition of Canada at that time. Take the figures as he presented them, take the figures as they are to-day. In eighteen years of Conservative rule the increase of our export and import trade was $66,000,000 or an average annual increase of $3,600,000. Under Liberal rule there has been a total increase of $360,000,000 or an average annual increase of $36,000,000, an average monthly increase of $3,000,000, an average daily increase of $100,000 for every day of the year Sundays and Saturdays included from the day the Liberal administration took power in 1896 down to the present time. Now, if the argument of the hon. member (Mr. Foster) meant anything then, how much more does it mean to-day than it did then? But I remember that last year when discussing the budget the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) took other grounds. If I remember his speech correctly (and I always pay attention to his speeches when I can), if I remember his speech correctly the ground he took then was this: That the export and import trade is not a fair index of the condition of the country; that at all events it is not a true index. He stated in effect that you could build up an export and an import trade and still have ruinous conditions at home, and I agree with him. He says. If you export all you produce and import all you consume you will have an enormous foreign trade but you will not have a healthy condition in trade matters at home. Now, has that been the experience of Canada for the last ten years? Have we had an enormous foreign trade and nothing doing at home industrially? Has that been the experience of Canada? No. Why, during the past five or six years the industries of Canada, every one of them almost, have been gradually enlarging and increasing from year to year both in capacity, in employment of labour, and in the output of manufactured goods. We have had a greater home trade, a greater interprovincial trade than ever was dreamed of in the melancholy days which preceded the year 1896. But, at the same time we have had a tremendous foreign trade built up of exports and imports, and when you combine the two together; when you look to your railway tonnage to see that it is not a case simply of increasing values but of increased commodities; when you look to your bank statements to see that it is not mystical figures but a real increase which shows in the deposits of the people in the chartered banks, then surely one must say that look at it

from where you will and how you will there is only one conclusion to come to, and that is that after ten or eleven years of Liberal administration in this country, the fiscal conditions of the country, the whole financial administration of the government of the country, the trade and commerce of the country are in a condition so eminently satisfactory that they are practically beyond criticism. I think that this is now the opinion even of hon. members opposite, I think that is their conclusion honestly. And in order to get away from the facts, in order to avoid facing these facts at the coming general election, whenever that election may come, they have set out upon another tack in another direction in the hope that they may excite the public mind either rightly or wrongly by a number of so-called scandals, allegations, insinuations and the like, to keep the mind of the people from the real facts which should be presented to them when an appeal is made. I am now going to summarize what my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) gives in the course of his speech in connection with this matter. It would appear that the hon. gentleman on the occasion of the budget speech, thought he should deliver a sort of political compendium, a code book or hand book, a manual of field drill for the election armouries of the Conservative party at the next election, and in that compendium he has picked out the following choice articles as matters which he thought worthy of comment in the course of his reply to the budget speech. He referred to what is known as the Arctic scandal and he put it down at $400,000; he referred to what is known as the North Atlantic Trading Company, and he put it down at $370,000; the wharf at Grande Vallée, $80,000; Chicoutimi piers and booms, $50,000; St. Joseph's wharf $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. No, wrong; $17,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Very well we will take it at that. He referred to the purchase of property at Kentville, and if I understand his argument he put that down at $42,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Twelve thousand dollars and a little more.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Then he referred to the cost of the Pearson purchase for the Intercolonial Railway, and I cannot find from reading 'Hansard' just at what he charges the government with being extravagant there, but I take it that it is about $28,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Then he puts down the Lodge transaction at Moncton at about $8,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Too low, it is more.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I will put any figure the hon. gentleman pleases to put on it; I will double it if he likes.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be too much.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Then on the question of the Merwin purchases he put it at $400,000, and on the question of the Falconer accounting, if I understand him correctly he says that about $42,000 too much was paid, and totalling these various items which I have taken from 'Hansard' I find that the grand total amounts to $1,438,500.

Mr. LENNOX. What about the Quebec bridge, is that not there?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I did not know that was referred to as a scandal.

Mr. LENNOX. I think it is.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Perhaps it will develop into a scandal between now and election time. Anyhow the aggregate of the amounts mentioned by the hon. member (Mr. Foster) was $1,438,500. But, I do not think the hon. member (Mr. Foster) would for a moment say that all this expenditure was extravagant; he says that part of it certainly was extravagant, and he says that there has been too much paid and allowed as commission to middlemen. Well, his first item is the 'Arctic,' $400,000. But that is the total cost. I was not in the Public Accounts Committee, but I have heard the question of the 'Arctic' most fully discussed in this House, and I am prepared to deny in toto that there was any extravagance, and to argue from that standpoint. But, I am willing to take the figures of hon. gentlemen opposite in that respect. What does the hon. member say? Was it all extravagance? I take what was said by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) last night in referring to the Merwin purchases, and he does not put that $400,000 as being all extravagance; he says, take 25 per cent off it. How much will you take off the 'Arctic'? Will you take 10 per cent or 40 per cent or 50 per cent or will you take it all off; I care not which for the sake of my argument.

In regard to the North Atlantic Trading Company, the whole question at issue seems to have been; To whom was the money paid? The real question was whether the money was earned or not earned; if it was earned and properly earned, it matters not one whit, so far as I can see, to whom it was paid, so long as there was no breach of the Independence of Parliament Act. The amount involved there is $370,000. How much of that is excessive or extravagant? Let us wipe it all out. Let us wipe out the whole amount of the cost of the wharf at Grande Vallee, $80,000, let us wipe out the Chicoutimi piers and booms, $50,000, although I do not know how much of that the hon. member challenges, let us wipe out the whole amount of the cost of the Kentville property, $42,000; let us wipe out the amount of the Pearson purchase for the Intercolonial Railway, $28,000; let us wipe out the Lodge transaction at Moncton, $8,500; let us wipe out Merwin's purchases, $400,000; let us wipe out Falconer's account,

$43,000, and assume for the sake of my argument that they were all extravagant. Now, how does the matter stand? Since the Liberal party came into power in 1896, there has passed through their hands and been paid out by them on current expenditure about $650,000,000 of the people's money. In addition to that there has been paid by the government on capital account $127,000,000, making a total payment of money passing through the hands of the government and paid out by them of something like $750,000,000 or $800,000,000, and of that tremendous amount of money, about $1,500,000 has been challenged by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Not that he says there has been a dollar paid corruptly or dishonestly, but he says it has been paid extravagantly and that middlemen have been allowed too much commission. Wipe it all off and what is the percentage? It simply means that the hon. member has challenged about $1.25 or $1.50 out of every $800 spent by this government. Apply that method to the business of any municipal, railway or other corporation in this country; go to any township council that has $800 to spend, and if it spends all of that but $1.25 or $1.50 in the interest of the people, if they have had value for all but $1.50 of that amount, then I submit the people have been well served. It would be a very different question if it could be shown that the money had been dishonestly or corruptly spent, that would place an entirely new face upon the situation. If it could be shown that ministers of the Crown or members of parliament had been guilty of receiving portions of that money, the whole situation would be changed, and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to mark this, that when the Liberal party were in opposition and charged gross wrong-doing by the Conservatives then in power their charges were based not upon extravagance or upon commissions to middlemen, but upon actual dishonesty that had taken place.

I leave these figures just as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) left them with the House. I presume he has raked the whole matter from top to bottom. We all respect the hon. member with his great eloquence, his great powers of endurance, his great political experience both in office and out of office. I may tell the hon. member that he has more than one admirer on this side of the House, although I do not think he actually courts admiration from this side.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very fond of it.

Mr. GUTHRIE. And there are many members on this side who can respect him. I always listen with interest to what he has to say. I like to hear him argue a question, particularly when he pretends to argue.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE. But I cannot take and hereafter and particularly I do not propose to take all he says, especially when he deals in statistics, except 'cum grano salis.' But as one who can speak to him as an admirer and a man who respects him, I would say, that he is a very difficult problem for me to size up. I look upon him as a sort of political paradox, if I may be permitted to use the expression, as a sort of political Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. While in office in the late Conservative government a sort of political Mr. Hyde, and while in opposition in the present House, the bland, genial smiling well-mentioned, well-intentioned Dr. Jekyll of Robert Louis Stevenson's famous book. Mr. Hyde, of course, was an assassin and did murder, kill and slay—although we do not charge the hon. member for North Toronto with anything of the kind——

Mr. FOSTER. I am not so sure of that.

Mr. GUTHRIE—but in order to carry out the simile I may say that we do charge him with perhaps having been guilty of some attempted political assassination in his time.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not do it under the shadow of a Royal Commission.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I know the hon. member has trained his tongue very glibly to pronounce the words 'political faith,' 'political good faith,' 'political honour;' but I know that when he was in the Conservative administration he was one of the guilty participants in a conspiracy of very bad faith and very bad political honour towards his own leader in the House of Commons in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps my hon. friend does not know as much about that as the actors in it.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not, but I think I know a gentleman who now sits in the upper chamber who does know all about it.

Mr. FOSTER. Doctors will differ.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Another passing strange thing to me is the facility with which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) seems to be able to adapt his principles and his opinions to the peculiar situation in which he finds himself for the moment. It is rather odd that in no measured terms, in very strong and cutting language, he should condemn members of this administration for doing what he says is a great wrong, for drawing money from one account in one department in anticipation of the actual vote of the House of Commons for payment of expenses or something of that kind. I think he spoke of this with reference to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and I thought his language very cutting, needlessly harsh. What then must I have thought, as an ad-

mirer of the hon. member, when a few moments afterwards I heard that he himself, when in power had done the very same thing.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman ought to get at the facts of the case.

Mr. GUTHRIE. In the absence of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) during the earlier portion of my remarks, I got at a good many of the facts of the case and I was sincerely sorry he was not here to throw some light if possible, upon some of the facts that I could not get at.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the hon. member a question? Following out his argument as to a small percentage of, we will say, laches in the conduct of a large amount of business, granting he said that $1,000,000 and more had been wrongfully administered, that it had been open to worse than that term, it was only the small percentage of a very vast expenditure. Would he take up either of two positions:

1. That the small proportion of which he speaks, which had been brought out under very great difficulties, was all that could be inferred to have been wrongly administered in that very large amount? or,

2. Suppose a bank manager had passing through his hands a bank business of several million dollars in the course of a year and he only wasted away or worse wrecked twenty per cent of it? You consider that he had a good case for not being dismissed from the management of the bank?

Mr. GUTHRIE. These questions, Mr. Speaker, are so long and so involved that I would probably have to refer to 'Hansard' to-morrow to answer them. I thought it suddenly struck the hon. member for North Toronto that this was the 1st of April, and he was trying to play a joke on me. But, if I understood the first question aright, I would not infer wrong-doing unless I had more facts from which to draw an inference than I have in anything that has been up to the present before the Public Accounts Committee or before this House. In the next place, if the shortage or mismanagement was the result of carelessness or error and not of dishonesty, I would not consider it a good cause for dismissing an otherwise competent official. If it was the result of dishonesty or improper dealing, I would think otherwise.

I do not know that I will pursue the subject further. I have spoken at very much greater length than I intended; but when one starts at accumulating figures, one hardly knows where one will land. For my part, I think the people of Canada will be very well satisfied with the administration of the present government during the last ten or eleven years. The hon. member for North Toronto, whom I place high in command of the Conservative party in this House, whom I call the real leader though not the titular leader of the Conservative party of Canada, may never be the titular leader, greatly as he is admired and esteemed by his friends. If he were made the titular leader of the Conservative party, I believe the first question that would be asked throughout Canada would be: Who is this man? Have we not had him before? The leopard has not changed its spots, and we will have no more of him. While, by reason of his experience, parliamentary knowledge and ability as a debater and critic, he is probably entitled to the highest place that the Conservative party can grant to him, still on account of past performances I am satisfied that the people of Canada would not entrust to him any very great further responsibility in the administration of their affairs.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate, and I appreciate the fact that it is an important debate. The Minister of Finance can take very little comfort from the facts that have been brought out by the last speaker and others in regard to the present condition of the finances of our country. When we have to face a greatly reduced revenue, as he assured us we shall in the coming year, with an increasing expenditure and a large increase in the public debt, we cannot look to the future with the bright hopes that the hon. member who has just taken his seat wishes us to do. The furnishing of ways and means is a very important part of the functions of this House, and when we consider the extravagant expenditure of money in the different departments of this government, we cannot criticise too severely their management of those departments. The members of this House who have been defending this government have had a very difficult task to perform, and in listening to them one cannot help coming to the conclusion that they are merely trying to talk in the way of bluff and bluster instead of dealing with the facts as they exist. I cannot help thinking that that has been the course of the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Guthrie). Generally speaking, we have regarded that hon. gentleman as one who discusses in a reasonable way the questions that come before the House; but today he has given us an exhibition of a style that would be naturally used by a member who is making a bid for a seat in the cabinet. He goes back to the year 1872 for a good deal of his information. Mr. Speaker, we are not living in the year 1872. Let the hon. gentleman come down to the present time, and talk of the extravagance in every department of this government, and of their corrupt acts, and he will find sufficient to convince him or any reasonable man that this government is the most corrupt that has

ever entered the halls of this parliament. When the hon. gentleman was called to account for the statement he made in reference to the leader of the opposition, and the leader of the opposition got up and denied the statement, the hon. gentleman did not take the manly course of withdrawing the statement and saying that he was sorry for having made it, but I was surprised to see him try to wiggle out of it by every possible means. Then he referred to the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) and rather made fun of the men who are trying to promote the interests of the farming industry of this country. If the hon. gentleman will take that speech of the hon. member for Dundas, and examine it carefully, he will find that that hon. member gave us a lot of valuable information in regard to the development of the great agricultural industry of our country—that it was full of splendid suggestions to the Minister of Agriculture. During the eleven years that the Minister of Agriculture has been working for the farmers, what has he done? If I had time to go into the subject, I could show that he has not been carrying out the wishes of the people in developing that great industry as it should be developed; but I do not intend to discuss that subject to-day. The hon. member for South Wellington devoted considerable of his time to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I do not need to defend the hon. member for North Toronto in any way; but the hon. member for South Wellington was unable to point to any part of the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto, in regard the corrupt dealings of this government in many departments and in the handling of the finances, that was not absolutely true. The hon. member also dealt with the speech of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) in regard to the agricultural interests of the country. The speech of the hon. member for Wentworth was full of statistics which are most condemnatory of the present administration of the Depart- of Agriculture. In referring to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) I cannot help thinking that the hon. member for South Wellington was also most unfair. However he took a great deal of comfort out of the theory, in connection with the balance of trade, that the imports should exceed the exports. But he was very careful not to cite the statistics of some countries which are situated very much like our own. Let me call his attention to a few statements which are to be found in the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the year 1907.

| | Imports. | Exports. |
|---|---|---|
| Australasia.. .. .. .. | $206,000,000 | $274,715,138 |
| New Zealand .. .. .. | 69,608,700 | 86,823,017 |
| British South Africa.. | 145,317,067 | 206,377,880 |
| British India.. .. .. .. | 363,188,874 | 512,500,492 |
| Newfoundland and Labrador.. .. .. .. .. .. | 10,125,190 | 11,910,007 |
| Argentine Republic .. | 260,521,553 | 282,024,945 |
| Brazil.. .. .. .. .. | 144,775,176 | 216,668,088 |

Take Japan, the country in which he tried to convince us the balance was on the wrong side, that they were importing more than they were exporting, had he looked at the reports for 1907 he would have found that the imports were $208,078,515 and the exports $208,754,060. He made a comparison between Canada and Great Britain and Germany and some of those other countries which are large importers and which have large shipping and commerce whereby they gather the money, large quantities of which they expend in foreign countries, so that the income from these expenditures have grown to enormous sums and add materially to the general advancement. That is particularly the case with Great Britain which is the largest lender of capital. But the hon. gentleman was not fair in that comparison. Let me refer him to the Argentine Republic, which in population, climate and resources very much resembles this country. They imported $205,000,000 and exported $322,000,000, showing $117,000,000 on the right side of the ledger. But what was the contention of the member for South Wellington regarding that country? He gave us to understand that its people were not progressive, that it had not many cities, and that it was not being developed to any great extent. But what are the facts? Why, he will find in the Argentine Republic the city of Buenos Ayres, with a population of 1,000,000 souls, and one of the most progressive cities on the continent. That country exports $7,189,254 worth of living animals; $133,793,732 animal products; $5,584,308 agricultural prepared products, and $3,462,672 agricultural residue, or a total of $311,000,000 of agricultural products exported out of a total export of $322,000,000. Compare that with the Dominion and see the small amount of agricultural exports that we export. And in 1895 the population of the Argentine Republic was 3,900,000, whereas to-day it is over 6,000,000.

The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) talks about the prosperity of this country, but he did not tell us about the many unemployed who are walking the streets of our towns and demanding assistance and work from the mayors and the charitable institutions.

Talking of the scandals, he said that those which this government have been guilty of are small, that they only amount to about $1,500,000 all told. But, Sir, when we come to investiagte we find that instead of these scandals only amounting to $1,500,000, that represents but a small portion of the scandals which have been unearthed in this House from time to time.

I just want to spend a few moments referring to the remarks of the hon. member

for South Oxford (Mr. M. S. Schell). He argued that the British preference was a means of prosperity to our agriculturists, that it was the means of putting into the pockets of our people over $30,000,000 every year. He contended that by reducing the tariff one-third on the imports from Great Britain, we were able to bring back into the Dominion $30,000,000 and put that into the people's pockets. Why then did he not advise taking off the whole tariff between Great Britain and Canada and bringing back $90,000,000 and putting it into the people's pockets? The hon. gentleman would no doubt close up many of our factories and have thousands of men put out of employment, but that would not matter so long as he could bolster up an argument in favour of the free trade policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. In dealing with the British preference, I wish the House to take notice of this particular point, that a large portion of the goods brought into Canada from England come from Germany. All that the tariff requires, to entitle an article to the preference, is that 25 per cent of its workmanship should have been done in Great Britain. The other 75 per cent may be done in any foreign country. Well, the Finance Minister was compelled to admit last session that a large portion of the goods coming to Canada, under this preference, are made in foreign countries but shipped through British channels of trade and sent into Canada by middlemen.

Now, we cannot but believe that a large portion of the increased trade of Great Britain coming into the Dominion of Canada is owing to the goods being manufactured in Germany, sent into Great Britain and so finding their way into Canada under the British preference, the people of Great Britain deriving no great benefit from their manufacture. In 1896 this government said: Put us in power and we will open up the market of the United States so that you may not be confined to your own people, but may have the market of the 85,000,000 people to the south. But we find that they have been unable to redeem this promise. Even in relation to Great Britain they have given us only a jug-handled preference. It is not, as many of the people would like to believe, a free trade preference, and does not advance in the direction of free trade doctrine, but is opposed to it. It actually restricts our movements, compelling us to trade in one market, so that we are unable to secure the benefits we could secure in the markets of the world. The adoption of the preference was a distinct violation of the most favoured nation clause. When this government came into power we were a favoured nation in the eyes of Germany and most other foreign countries, but you find our position in the German markets to-day most humiliating. Germany with its 60,000,000 of people imports $1,800,000,000 worth of goods, including over $200,000,000 of agricultural products such as Canada is producing, and yet we are unable to get into that country with any fair proportion of our products owing to the surtax levied by Germany. On the other hand, these gentlemen tell us, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. M. S. Schell) told us the other day, that we have a wonderful advantage in the British market over any foreign country. Let the hon. gentleman attempt to sell our goods even on sympathy on the British market, and he will soon find that the consumer there will frankly tell him that he is concerned with quality and price and that sympathy has nothing to do with it.

We had a few words from the hon. member from South Grey (Mr. Miller). That hon. gentleman is always ready to defend this government, no matter what their dealings are. There is no steal too big for him to defend, no corrupt act of this government too bad for him to uphold. Day after day we find him ever ready and willing to devote his best energies to defending even the most corrupt acts of which this government has been guilty. He simply says, in effect, as did the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie): Sail on, you great Liberal party; plunder and plunder as much as you like; take from the people their rights in their timber lands and other resources and we will stand by you, we will defend you in all your notorious acts, no matter what they are. The hon. member for South Grey told us that a large portion of our goods were going to the old country in a wonderfully advantageous manner. He told us that practically every package of perishable goods we were sending to Britain was going in cold storage chamber. I asked him a question in order that I might make sure of his statement. When I turned up 'Hansard' of 1905 I find that in reply to a question I asked it was shown that only a small portion of the goods go in cold storage. For instance, here is the showing what was done in 1904:

| — | In cold storage. | In cooled air. | In ventilated (ordinary) storage. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cheese....Boxes. | ..... | 102,238 | 1,908,867 |
| Butter....Pkgs. | 487,182 | ..... | 2,516 |
| Eggs.....Cases. | 1,000 | ..... | 78,625 |
| Bacon ... " | ..... | 18,072 | 68,720 |
| Apples..... Brls. | 5,450 | 1,521 | 321,749 |
| Apples ...Boxes. | 827 | 1,003 | 21,478 |

So, the great bulk of the perishable products of this country are not going under the cold storage system. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has tried to lead the people to believe that his wonderful

cold-storage system has brought about a revolution in our methods of transportation. Let him investigate and he will find that the transportation facilities for our perishable products are not satisfactory. He will find that, though he has expended tens of thousands of dollars in attempting to improve the service on railroad and steamship, he is powerless to effect an improvement. The reason is to be found simply in the blunders he has made in years gone by when he entered into contracts with the different steamship companies for the transportation of these perishable products. He did not compel the transportation companies to enter into a contract in which a certain temperature should be maintained in cars and in boats crossing the Atlantic. In the same reply from which I have quoted the minister makes this statement:

The bulk of the butter discharged from each steamer is removed within a reasonable time, but the balance is allowed to remain for days before delivery is taken.

Let the hon. gentleman investigate and he will find that our transportation facilities are not what they should be and are not at all equal to those of the Argentine Republic or New Zealand or Australia. They carry perishable goods from Argentine, 6,000 miles, and from Australia, 12,000 miles, and deliver them in the British market in perfect condition. Let the hon. gentleman investigate and see the demoralized condition of this service at the present time. Let him investigate practically every part of the great industry of which he is the head and he will find that his management has been of no great advantage to the development of this great agricultural country.

Well, the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) did not tell us about some of the wonderful things that the Minister of Agriculture has attempted to accomplish. If I had time I could tell about his chicken fattening stations, his scissors policy, his meat regulations that are not being carried out, and his Fruit Marks Act that has been the means of putting our fruit in the markets of the old country in a damaged condition. Practically every undertaking the Minister of Agriculture has gone into has proved a detriment to the agricultural industry rather than a benefit. The hon. member for South Grey said that we were getting more for our apples in the old country than the United States exporters were getting for some of their apples. He did not take into consideration the fact that the United States barrel is much smaller than ours; had he done so he would have found that instead of our apples being sold at a price greater than those of the United States, they are bringing a lower price.

Now, I must hurry along and pay some attention to the speech of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). I admire the demand made by the hon. gentleman for civil service reform. The House is acquainted with the exposures made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House of corrupt acts in various departments of this government. I believe the time has come when we should have a thorough investigation into all charges of corruption, we should have a commission that will not only investigate the charges against the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but against every other department of this government. The time has come when we feel it our duty as members of His Majesty's loyal opposition to urge upon this government the necessity of a thorough overhauling of all the departments. The member for Brandon referred to the Department of Trade and Commerce, and suggested a new department in connection with the trade and commerce of this country. I do not see any need for a new department, but I do see a need of changing the methods of conducting the present department. For years the opposition has been calling upon the Minister of Trade and Commerce to give us more information regarding foreign markets, and regarding the trade and commerce of foreign countries. It is true that to some extent we have succeeded in getting more information than was formerly granted us, and that is particularly true of the report for the last year. But it does not begin to go far enough. What we want is a complete change in the method of administering the Department of Trade and Commerce. I have here a few suggestions which I would like the Minister of Trade and Commerce to take into his serious consideration:

1. The department of Trade and Commerce should include officials conversant with every country with which Canada has any trade, men who are thoroughly posted on the commercial conditions existing in those countries, and who would be competent to give advice on all questions relating to foreign tariffs, &c. Further, these men should be fitted to participate in government commissions appointed to negotiate commercial treaties, and capable of furnishing practical advice and information to the business men of the country.

2. There should be a division of the Department of Trade and Commerce devoting its entire attention to foreign tariffs, trade reports and commercial relations. This information gathered carefully should then be given all possible publicity so that business men in general might benefit thereby.

3. Boards of trade throughout Canada should be required to make regular reports to the department covering all matters of trade pertaining to their district. In return for this the boards of trade should be supplied with the fullest information as to trade openings abroad, as well as all changes in tariffs, &c., and each member should receive a copy of weekly letter. In this way every business man in Canada could be kept well informed on trade affairs. In exactly the same way, the agriculturist could keep in touch with the world's markets. These reports would be issued weekly, and would con-

tain the greatest amount of information relating to foreign trade.

Now, I do not suggest any such reports as are contained in the weekly letters that we are getting. Few of us can find in the letters that come to us week after week anything of very great advantage, not only to ourselves as containing information about foreign countries, but to the manufacturers in Canada, who I believe are not satisfied with them. The press of this country will bear me out I think in saying that they get in these letters very little information that is useful to the public. I believe further that the day is coming when no government will be permitted to select a cabinet minister from a body such as the Senate, whose members are not in close touch with the people. I will not go further on this point than to say that I believe this is one of the chief causes of the present condition of the Trade and Commerce Department. What confidence can we have in men like Preston and Jackson as representatives of this great country in foreign lands? Yet we find this party, who would like to be called a party of purity, sending men over to Europe who are not fit to represent us in any particular, let alone pretending to represent the Trade and Commerce Department of this country.

Now a few words in regard to mutual preference. I am glad indeed that the leader of the opposition has seen fit to place in his platform a plank to the effect that the Conservative party stands by a mutual preference. We cannot too strongly emphasize the fact that Canada stands for a mutual preference; let that be well known both in Great Britain and in this country. What would a mutual preference mean to the Dominion of Canada? There is no doubt in the mind of any man who has investigated this subject that mutual preference would mean increased value to every farm in the Dominion, and increased prosperity to every industry and every trade. There is no doubt that under an improved immigration policy immigrants would voluntarily flock to our shores by the thousands, and we would not be obliged to pay any bonus at so much per head to induce them to come. In addition to that, we would be able to exercise more effective supervision over the class of men coming to Canada. For the past eleven years this government have been trying to deal with the question of mutual preference, and those of us who have followed the course of this government in Great Britain at the colonial conferences can come to no other conclusion than that these gentlemen have not put forth any great effort to bring back to Canada a mutual preference. Anybody who makes a thorough investigation of the last colonial conference will find that the Prime Minister of Canada did not make a reasonable effort to obtain a mutual preference for the Dominion, while on the other hand the premiers of all the other colonies did their utmost to obtain such a mutual preference for their colonies.

On motion of Mr. Armstrong, the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the House adjourned.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 2, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 141) to incorporate the Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank—Mr. Guthrie.

### BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. AYLESWORTH moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 142) to amend the Bills of Exchange Act. He said: The purpose of this Bill is to correct a clerical error which has crept into the present statute in the section relating to the effect of the endorsement of a Bill. The law is declared to be that the endorsement of a Bill precludes the endorser from denying the validity of the Bill to his immediate or a subsequent endorsee. As the statute has been printed it reads: 'endorser,' an 'r' being substituted for an 'e' and this Bill is to correct the error.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

### QUESTIONS.

#### INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—'THE OCEAN LIMITED.'

Mr. FORGET—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. On what date, in 1907, did the 'Ocean Limited' begin to run, and on what date did it stop running?
2. How many trips were made between Halifax and Montreal, and how many between Montreal and Halifax?
3. How many times did it arrive on schedule time in Montreal, and how many times in Halifax?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). My hon. friend had better allow this to stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

#### DR. SPENCER'S REPORT ON NIAGARA.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What has been the cost to the country of publishing the report entitled 'The Falls of Niagara,' by Doctor Joseph William Winthrop Spencer?

2. Who authorized the publication of this report?

3. Was the report carefully examined by the Minister of Mines before sanctioning its publication?

4. Was the report submitted to Dr. Low, Director of the Geological Survey, for his opinion upon it? If so, what was his opinion?

5. Was the opinion of Mr. Brock, the present acting director, asked as to the expediency of publishing the report? If so, what was his opinion? If not, why not?

6. Was the editor of the geological survey publications authorized to revise the manuscript, or to report upon Doctor Spencer's paper? If not, why not?

7. Has the government seen the following criticism upon the report from the 'Mining and Scientific Press'?:

The public that reads technical literature is often imposed upon by having to digest half-baked productions likely to cause mental dyspepsia. In recent years nothing quite so bad as Doctor Spencer's report has been published. We marvel that such a volume of cool egotism, muddy thinking, and wretched writing should have been issued from the office at Ottawa, for we believe that the regular editor of the Canadian survey was a mining engineer of some repute, possessed of an excellent literary style, and the necessary good taste in matters of this kind. The book is well printed, and beautifully illustrated; in fact, the manner of it is disproportionate to the matter. As a warning and example of bad writing we quote seven paragraphs.

The history of Niagara river is only the expression of that of the lake region in all its complicated parts. The investigation of one feature imperceptibly leads us afield until we pass the bounderies of our original topic; thus it is here. But the new observations react and more fully explain the phenomena.

In a general way the recession of the falls depends upon three factors—their height, their volume, and the character of the rock formations, which are being channelled by the stream. The falls have retreated across a very level country underlaid by almost horizontal rock formations, having a great degree of uniformity as was noted even so long ago as 1789.

Few people have supposed that the recession was not uniform; fewer still would think that the story had not all been told concerning a commonly known natural feature. The history had been partly anticipated in the discovery that the volume and descent of the water have not always been the same, and that some of the features have changed to a degree.

The old floor of the park is so nearly 180 feet above the river in the channel below, or 280 feet above lake Ontario, that this height may be taken as effective in the excavation of the gorge with the river at present level, thus making allowance for its increased velocity.

The thickness of the underlying shales is constant. As I have found the character of the falls during the middle portion of this long stage, these corrections will approximately cover the case although their precise amounts are not determined more closely. I do not believe that the apparent error will ever be found to reach ten per cent, with the rainfall during the recession being approximately the same at present.

The age of the Falls of Niagara, which are post-glacial, is one of the great questions of geology having a world-wide interest. The complexity of their history, which meets one on investigation, disappears in applying precise methods and carrying them sufficiently far. It was principally due to a failure in understanding the nature of the differential uplift of the land, and tilting of the water-basins, so as to change the height of the falls and their volume; and to previous failure in making the determination of the work of the falls at the different stages in their history.

There need be no suspicion that underlying hypotheses have been developed as I have none to uphold, except what might come from the facts inductively. The problem has been a long one to solve, so that no one who has not at least examined the investigations is entitled to call in question the features of the falls, gorge, &c., as to their furnishing evidence in bringing us near the age of Niagara, even though he may be bewildered by the great mass of facts brought out by methods that had to be specially developed for this solitary problem.

This is the delit our trimmings of scientific literature; as you read it you wonder if you have lost senses, you suspect the Welsh rabbit (not rare rabbit) of last night and you vow to stick to mineral water in future. Yet we would be disinclined to be so severe, if the author had not put himself on a pedestal. According to him, all previous writers on Niagara were fools, although we remember a modest pamphlet by G. K. Gilbert, who managed in 29 years to give more facts, and to have illuminated them better, than Doctor Spencer in his 490 pages. Surely the geological survey of Canada can use its funds to better purposes than to issue scientific balderdash sumptuously printed. One purpose the book can fulfil: It illustrates every kind of error in arrangement of evidence, in sequence of thought, in connection of sentences. If you want to write an essay on a scientific subject, you can at least learn what to avoid by reading 'The Falls of Niagara.'

8. In view of the adverse criticism of the 'Mining and Scientific Press' and other scientific publications upon this work, is it the intention of the government to suppress it?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Mines):

1. The cost of printing and publishing the report on 'The Falls of Niagara' has been $5,148.69.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Dr. Spencer was engaged to study the falls and write a report for the survey embodying the results of his investigations which the survey was to publish. This agreement with Dr. Spencer was made in 1905 by Dr. Robert Bell at the time acting director of the Geological Survey. When Dr. Low became director in 1906 the advisability of publishing the report was questioned, but it was found that it had been agreed upon that the result of the investigation should be promptly pub-

lished. Dr. Low was therefore of the opinion that the survey was in honour bound to publish the report. The report was handed to the editor of the survey on being received, who found it could not be revised without the presence and co-operation of the author. Owing to the absence of the author in England and other causes this was not found practicable and finally the author undertook to have it put into good English and properly published, agreeing to absolve the survey from any criticism as to form and matter by inserting the following sentence after the contents bill 'The author assumes responsibility for the statements, opinions and phraseology in this report.' The Minister of Mines examined the report and in consenting to its publication in its present form gave due consideration to opinions of several hon. members expressed in this House that the report should be published without delay and in Dr. Spencer's own form. The report was in print before Mr. Brock became acting director.

7. Yes.

8. It cannot be suppressed, and in addition no matter what criticisms may be offered it does contain some valuable information.

## INDEX CARDS FOR ARCHIVES.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. During the years 1906-7 and 1907-8 what quantity of index cards were purchased by the Archives Department?

2. From what firm or firms were such cards purchased, and what were the prices per thousand paid by the department?

3. Were tenders asked? If not, was there competition of any kind? If so, what?

4. Under what items of the Auditor General's Report for years mentioned do payments for such cards appear?

5. About how many of such cards are required annually in the Archives Department?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. About 206,000 index cards have been purchased by the Department of Agriculture for the Archives Branch, ordered in lots of 25,000 as required.

2. They were purchased through the Government Stationery Office from L. W. Hutchison, E. R. McNeill, the Office Specialty Company, the Library Bureau and Geo. W. Miller & Co.

The price varies in accordance with the size and thickness of the cards. The average cost is $2.51 per thousand.

3. No. Tenders are not asked by the Stationery Office for amounts under $100. No competition. Cards purchased at regular wholesale prices.

4. Auditor General's Report, 1906-7, page 8—D ; 'Stationey Office, Ottawa, sundry books and stationery, $3,784.10.' The cost of the cards is included in this item. The Auditor General's Report part 'T,' pages 9, 10 and 11 also gives details.

The amount paid for cards purchased 1907-8, will be included in the expenditure of the Stationery Office in the Auditor General's Report for that year when issued.

5. The number of cards required annually by the Archives Branch will depend upon the progress made with the classification. The documents are indexed on paper and when the final clssification is made the index is typewritten on cards.

It is estimated that during the present year from two to three hundred thousand cards will be required.

## FISH ISLAND LIGHTKEEPER.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Who is the present lightkeeper at Fish island, entrance of Malpeque harbour, what date was he appointed, and what is his salary?

2. Who was the previous keeper of above light, what was his salary, when did he cease to be keeper, and the reason therefor?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Patrick Gould. Appointed temporarily 7th December, 1906, at $200 per annum.

2. William Sinclair, $250. Dismissed because he left Prince Edward Island without leave, sub-letting his work as lightkeeper.

## POSTAL PRIVILEGES AT ARTHABASKA.

Mr. LOUIS LAVERGNE asked :

1. Is it true that application was made for the privileges of the mails by a newspaper called 'La Gazette d'Arthabaska'?

2. Were such privileges granted, and to how many copies of the above named paper?

3. Is the department aware that the postmaster of Arthabaska has been granting the privileges to the whole issue of the paper, regardless of instructions or the law regarding such privileges?

4. If the department is aware of such violation of the regulations, what action does it propose to take as regards the postmaster?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Yes.

2. Yes, to 21 copies addressed to subscribers.

3. Yes.

4. The question as to why the postmaster granted the privileges of the mails to this paper illegally is now being inquired into, and the treatment to be accorded the postmaster will be decided on when the necessary information is available as a result of the inquiry now being conducted.

## MR. JOHN E. SCOTT.

Mr. LALOR asked:

1. Has John E. Scott, deputy superintendent of the Welland canal at Dunnville, resigned?

2. Has the government accepted the resignation of John E. Scott?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). No.

INSURANCE COMMISSION.

Mr. FOWLER asked:

1. Were any copies of the evidence taken by the Royal Commission on Insurance sold by any official of the government for his private profit?

2. If so, what is the name of the official, and to which department does he belong?

3. Were such copy or copies, if any, sold before or after the evidence was laid on the table of the House?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). No.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. Before the orders of the day are called, I would ask the permission of the House to correct, or perhaps, rather, supplement an answer which I recently gave to an inquiry concerning the Quebec Bridge Company. In the course of the budget speech one or two questions were asked which I answered off-hand. The hon. member for North Toronto, having asked me what was the amount of the bank's claim, I stated it at $5,016,453, to which interest was to be added. That amount had been stated by the bank as their claim against the bonds, upon payment of which the bonds would be delivered to the government. It appears, however, that apart from that, the bank advanced $155,000, which went into bridge construction. Certificates covering this and other outlay on the bridge were issued by the chief engineer of government railways with a view to the government making advances as contemplated by the Act of last session. But, as the bridge disaster occurred immediately afterward, further action was not taken on these certificates. The additional amount mentioned remains due to the bank.

The rate of interest, as to which I spoke with some uncertainty, was 5 per cent.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would draw the attention of my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), to some papers which are lacking in a return brought down regarding the construction of a branch canal from Balsam lake to the head of Gull river waters. To my personal knowledge, as far back as 1891, there were surveys sent in to the department by engineers, and I cannot find any reference to them in any sense in the return. I call the attention of the hon. minister to this, so that he may have these brought down.

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall look into the matter.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MR. JUSTICE CASSELS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask my right hon. friend the First Minister whether or not Mr. Justice Cassels has accepted the duties proposed to be imposed on him by the order in council which has been laid on the table, and also why the three officers, mentioned yesterday as having been suspended, were so suspended, having regard to the fact that no particular officer was mentioned, so far as I am aware, in the report of the Royal Commission. The report of the Royal Commission was a condemnation of the department as a whole, including, as I would understand, not only the officials but the head of the department. Therefore we ought to know for what reason the government have selected certain officers, whose names have not been given, for suspension.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I may say that one of the officers was suspended some time ago and his suspension had no reference at all to the report of the commission. As to the two others, Mr. J. F. Fraser and Mr. Gregory, I made some investigation myself, as was stated yesterday by the First Minister, and I found that some orders which I had given had been disregarded by those officers. That is the reason why I suspended them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then they were not suspended as the result of the report of the Royal Commission, but on the minister's own independent inquiry.

Mr. BRODEUR. I started that inquiry immediately after the report of the commission, and in studying the files of the department, I found that certain instructions I had given had not been carried out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman have any objection to laying on the table copies of the instructions which were disregarded?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I will get all the papers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As regards Mr. Justice Cassels, I received a communication from him just as I was coming to the House and have not taken the opportunity of reading it. I will give communication of it to the House to-morrow.

Mr. BLAIN. How many copies of the Royal Commission report will be available for distribution to each member? There is a very great demand for them, and it is important that a large number should be printed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The printing has been going on as the manuscript has been received. I cannot tell my hon. friend how many copies have been ordered.

Mr. FIELDING. The matter is rather under the control of the Printing Committee. We have given no special orders since concerning it.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that would be due to the regulation requiring so many copies of each public document to be printed for each member.

Mr. FIELDING. Whatever is the usual rule I presume will apply. We have given no special orders.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to the fact that there are a very large number of inquiries for this report, and I hope he will see that a sufficient number of copies are printed for distribution.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not the practice of the government to give the order; but attention having been drawn to the matter, no doubt the Printing Committee will consider it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) permit me to ask him just one other question? He has given the date of the suspension of two officers and he told us the other was suspended some time ago. When was he suspended and what were the grounds?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember exactly the date when Mr. Owen was suspended, but it was about two or three weeks ago. He was suspended on account of his conduct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was it?

Mr. BRODEUR. I would not like to prejudice him. He has written me a letter alleging the mistake he had made. I do not know what interest would be served by giving the reasons. If my hon. friend wants them privately, I have no objection to giving them to him. As to the others, they were suspended the day before yesterday.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to call attention to the return I moved for on February 18, 1907, regarding W. W. B. McInnis, ex-Commissioner of the Yukon. That return has not been brought down.

## QUEBEC TERCENTENARY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to inform the House that a joint meeting of the members of the Senate and the House of Commons will be held in the Railway Committee room to-morrow (Friday) morning at the hour of eleven o'clock, for the purpose of considering what action, if any, the individual members of the respective Houses shall take for the purpose of promoting the success of the movement to celebrate the 300th anniversary of the founding of Quebec by Champlain and the reclamation and preservation, as a permanent national park, of the battlefields of the Plains of Abraham and St. Foy.

The meeting will be addressed by several prominent members of each House.

I am asked to request that every member of this House, who can find it convenient to do so, will be present.

## WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). When the House closed at 6 o'clock yesterday, I was calling the attention of the government to the importance of a mutual preference arrangement between Great Britain and Canada. I also made the statement that this government were not putting forth any effort to obtain that preference. In fact the First Minister, at the last conference in Great Britain rather threw cold water on the scheme. These ministers have not taken the active interest in this question that we had a right to expect them to take. In a comparatively short time, probably, the politics of Great Britain will be changed. It is expected that within two years the unionist party will have control of the affairs of that great country; and I believe it is our duty to impress upon the government of Great Britain the necessity of taking up this most important question of granting to the colonies a preference in return for the preference granted to Great Britain. I would like to ask this government, who have been handling this question for eleven years, how it is that in the imperial conference they did not make special effort to obtain for us a mutual preference. These hon. gentlemen often tell us of the benefit the people of Canada have received from the one-sided preference we have to-day. One hon. gentleman says that our people have $30,000,000 in their pockets owing to this preference. As I said a few days ago, if by taking off one-third of the customs duties on goods coming in from Great Britain these gentlemen can benefit the people of Canada to the extent of $30,000,000, why do they not take off the other two-thirds and give the people the benefit of the free trade policy which they proposed. But there is another side to it: as a result of this one-sided preference, over a hundred woollen mills in this country have closed, and thousands of men have been turned out of employment who otherwise would have added to the home market and helped to consume home products. And, after all, how much cheaper are the goods to the consumer as a result of this preference? And why is it that, when the colonies are giving to Great Britain a preference, the goods of other colonies are going into the markets of Germany under the most favoured nation treatment while Canadian goods going to Germany are subject to a surtax? This is a matter which it is the duty of this government to explain. Have they made special effort to put Canada on the same foot-

ing in the German market as other colonies of Great Britain ? There can be no doubt of the fact that the goods of Great Britain and of other colonies than Canada, are going into Germany on the most favoured nation basis while the goods of Canada are subject to the surtax. If the surtax is imposed on Canada because she has granted to Britain this preference in her market, why is it that other colonies that have granted a preference to Great Britain still receive the most favoured nation treatment ? I say it is the duty of the government to explain why we are placed in this humiliating position ?

Let me call attention to the further important fact that, when the preference debate was carried on in the imperial conference, the Prime Minister of Canada (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did not urge upon the conference the necessity for a mutual preference as between Canada and Great Britain. So far as the present government of Great Britain are concerned, I do not believe it is their intention to grant Canada a mutual preference. All we can hope for is to assist in educating the people of Great Britain to the necessity of granting a preference to the colonies. But we must take into consideration some of the statements made at the imperial conference. Let me quote from the remarks of the present acting Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Asquith, who is expected, in a short time, to become Prime Minister.

I would rather refer at a little more length to the other two tariffs which have been brought before us—the Canadian tariff and the proposed Australian tariff. As regards the Canadian tariff, I acknowledge that it has been beneficial to British trade, and particularly, I think, to our textile industries. I think it has been beneficial perhaps more in the way of arresting a threatened decline in trade than by actually increasing the volume of the trade, or at any rate the proportion of British trade to the rest of the trade done with Canada. But I should like to call attention, not in any controversial spirit at all, to the Canadian tariff for the purpose of showng how in framing arrangements of this kind the country which frames them is inevitably constrained to look to its own peculiar local and economic conditions.

Now, referring to this tariff he says :

Thirdly, in regard to the Canadian tariff, if you take all goods, dutiable as well as free, altogether, the average ad valorem rate after allowing for the preference on United Kingdom goods is 19 per cent and on United States goods 13 per cent. In other words it is 6 per cent lower ad valorem on the total importation from the United States than it is on the total importation from the United Kingdom. . . .

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Quite right.

Mr. ASQUITH. Even with the tariff constructed in that spirit and with that intention and by such skilled hands the net result is that we are at a disadvantage as compared with the United States of America, and we are paying 19 per cent import duty as compared with only 13 per cent.

I will quote also a few words from the closing of Mr. Asquith's address. And, if any one will take the pains to read that address, he cannot but come to the conclusion that, so far as Mr. Asquith is concerned, and so far as the party he represents is concerned, they have not the first intention of granting to this country a mutual preference. He closes his address with these words :

I can assure you, and I am speaking quite sincerely, that it is a most thankless task for a minister in my position to combat propositions which are concurred in by so large an amount of representative opinion in different parts of the empire. It is not an agreeable duty at all, but it is one I am bound to perform to my colleagues, and to the House of Commons, and to the country.

And I believe it is my duty to place on Hansard a few of the remarks of Sir Wm. Lyne, Minister of Trade and Commerce of Australia :

Sir WM. LYNE. Lord Elgin and gentlemen, I have listened with attention to the speech which has just been delivered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and, from his standpoint, I must admit that it was an able speech, and affords food for reply; perhaps not reply on the instant but I feel when it sees the light of day—I do not know when it will—it will be replied to pretty vigorously. I cannot help saying, my lord, that the whole tenor of that speech, if I may be allowed to use the term, and I scarcely like to use it, was alien to Britain's colonies, it was treating the British colonies on a par with foreign nations. When one remark was made regarding the desire on the part of Great Britain to be allowed to deal with her tariff as she desired and to deal with her domestic questions as she desired, I could not help thinking that that was equivalent to saying that the colonies were not on a par or not part of the domestic empire of Great Britain.

This merely goes to show that, so far as the representatives of the British government are concerned, they do not seem to appreciate the preference granted by this country and other British colonies, and they received encouragement, I may say, from the Prime Minister of Canada in the statements he made at that great conference. For, when you come to look at his speeches on the different occasions—and I shall be very brief on making quotations—you cannot but come to the conclusion that he did not put forth any effort but the very opposite to try to obtain for this country a mutual preference. The next resolution is in these words, quoted by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, at that conference :

That the prime ministers of the colonies respectively urge on His Majesty's government the expediency of granting in the United Kingdom preferential treatment to

the products and manufactures of the colonies, either by exemption from, or reduction of, duties now or hereafter imposed.

Then Sir Wilfrid said :

My friend, Mr. Deakin, speaking on behalf of Australia, has proposed to go one step beyond this and to adopt this resolution:

That it is desirable that the United Kingdom grant preferential treatment to the products and manufactures of the colonies.

Is there anything unreasonable or unfair in that proposition? Is it unreasonable for any one advocating a mutual preference to accept a proposition of that kind? But Sir Wilfrid Laurier went on to say:

Perhaps, on consideration, Mr. Deakin would agree with us, that it would be preferable not to force this, but to keep to the resolution of 1902.

The resolution of 1902, when we come to examine it thoroughly, practically means little or nothing. We find further that another part of the resolution that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was asked to accept as Prime Minister of Canada was this :

That the prime ministers present at the conference undertake to submit to their respective governments at the earliest opportunity the principle of the resolution, and to request them to take such measures as may be necessary to give effect to it.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister why it was not possible for him to place before this House the resolution I have just read; I would like to ask him why he did not take a stand in that conference enthusiastically in favour of a mutual preference being granted to Canada. At the close of that great debate we find this recorded :

The following resolution was agreed to by the members of the conference, with the exception of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who was absent, and whose vote was not recorded, of General Botha, who did not support it, and of the representatives of His Majesty's government who dissented:

That while affirming the resolution of 1902, this conference is of opinion that, as the British government, through the South American Customs Union—which comprises Basutoland and the Bechuanaland Protectorate—do at present allow a preference against foreign countries to the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and all other British possessions granting reciprocity, His Majesty's government should now take into consideration the possibility of granting a like preference to all portions of the empire on the present dutiable articles in the British tariff.

I do not think that was an unreasonable resolution to ask the Prime Minister of Canada to give his assent to. I think it is his duty to this country to give some explanation why it was that he did not advocate at the colonial conference in a stronger manner the granting of a mutual preference by Great Britain to Canada. There is no doubt in my mind, judging from his remarks, that he was not taking any step forward in the direction of advocating a mutual preference. Practically he was the only man outside of the premier of the Transvaal, the only representative of the colonies in that great conference, who did not come out boldly and state his position on this important question. We know that he was there and listened to the remarks of Mr. Deakin, the premier of Australia, and of the other premiers, and he knew the splendid records they made on behalf of a preferential tariff being granted to the colonies, but after all these earnest efforts by the representatives of other colonies, we find the Prime Minister of Canada rising up and attempting to throw cold water on the proposition of granting an imperial preference to the colonies. I would like to ask the Prime Minister again, seeing he is now in his seat, why, although other colonies of Great Britain have not granted a preference to Great Britain in their markets they at the same time are allowed to send their goods into Germany under the favoured nation clause? I want to impress upon him the importance of the German market to the Canadian people. The development of this country depends largely on the development of our agricultural products, and when you consider that Germany is the second best market in the world, and that last year she imported over $200,000,000 worth of agricultural products such as we produced in Canada, I cannot understand why the Prime Minister of this country does not take sufficient interest in that great agricultural industry to endeavour to procure for us the same advantage in the German market that the other colonies have. There is no reason, so far as I can understand, except the bungling mismanagement of this government in regard to our commercial relations with Germany; that is the only reason that we have not obtained admission into the German market. If the other colonies are sending their goods into Germany under the favoured nation clause while our goods go in there handicapped by a surtax, is it not reasonable and fair that we should discuss this question in the House, and ask the Prime Minister to interest himself in regard to it and endeavour to secure an arrangement under which our agricultural products may enter Germany on a better footing than they do at present. Last year $66,000,000 worth of wheat went into Germany from outside countries, $34,000,000 worth of barley, $17,000,000 worth of rye and $5,000,000 worth of fruit, the very products we are raising in this country, and would it not be of great advantage to the people of the Dominion to get access to that market? But instead of getting a share of that $200,000,000 market you find us to-day only getting $1,000,000. Last fall we saw the spectacle of nearly 60,000 barrels of Canadian apples placed on the British market, with the consequence that the home market was de-

moralized by that large import, while at the same time apples were selling in the German market at a considerably advanced price, but our exporters were unable to send apples into that country.

Now, I have tried to call the attention of the government to the necessity of advocating a mutual preference. At the present time the preference we are granting is not only working to the detriment of Canadian manufacturers, but we find that German goods are being filtered into Canada in large quantities through English middlemen under the eyes of the Minister of Customs. The bulk of the increased imports from Great Britain into this country are largely goods that are manufactured in Germany and filtered in here under the British middlemen. Look at the position we are in. The Finance Minister says that only 25 per cent of the articles has to be manufactured in Great Britain, the other 75 per cent can be manufactured anywhere else, and these are allowed to come in under the preference. The consequence is that when you come to investigate the trade of this country, and find what kind of goods are coming to our shores, you will see that the bulk of the increase in British imports is foreign goods that are manufactured largely in Germany. Now, that is not as it should be. Our goods are shut out from Germany. Instead of our getting access to that market, instead of our agricultural products going in there under the favoured nation clause, as they were when this government came to power, they are now going in there with a surtax placed upon them.

Let us take a glance at Great Britain to-day, and the condition of her trade and commerce. Look at the decline in British trade and see what great encouragement there is for us to constantly devote our time and attention to the upbuilding of our trade with Great Britain, instead of attempting to develop it with other countries. It may be all very well for this government to say: We are doing our utmost with Japan and China to develop a trade for the products of the farm. What I claim is that you have to educate the people of Japan and China up to a taste for such products as we are producing while, here in Germany, is a market already created for the products that we are producing. Two hundred million dollars worth of the very same kind of products that we are producing in the Dominion of Canada in the greatest quantity Germany is ready and willing to buy and is compelled to buy from outside sources. Let us look at the decline in British trade. From 1870 to 1874 the annual per capita average was £7 7 3; 1880 to 1884, £6 13; 1885 to 1889, £6 3 7; 1890 to 1894, £6 2 10; 1895 to 1899, £5 19; 1902 to 1906, £6 13 3. Surely that is not an encouraging position for Great Britain to be placed in. There is not a man in this House who has investigated the trade of the different countries of the world but feels that in so far as Great Britain is concerned she is compelled to change her position in regard to the tariff and the protection of her industries. We hear hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House tell us what preference has done in Canada compared with what it has done in foreign lands because it has increased our exports to and imports from Great Britain to a marvellous extent. I would call the attention of the House to the trade which other countries are doing with Great Britain. Take the Argentine Republic, which is not granting to Great Britain a preference and you will find that the increase in the imports from Great Britain to the Argentine Republic amounted to £7,700,000 in the six years from 1900 while the increase of imports into Canada only amounted to £4,600,000 during the same time. We were able last year to present to the House the reports of the representatives of Canada in Great Britain who distinctly stated in their letters to the Department of Trade and Commerce that in so far as goods coming into Canada under the preference were concerned the bulk of them were coming from Germany and other foreign countries and were being filtered into Canada under the preference.

There is just one more statement that I wish to call to the attention of the House and the right hon. Prime Minister and that is in connection with the intermediate tariff. The statement was made by Dr. Jameson, premier of the Transvaal, that in so far as that tariff was concerned it was likely to cause a great deal of trouble in connection with the possibility of any of the colonies entering into a mutual tariff arrangement with Great Britain. This is what he said.

> I was alarmed, if Sir Wilfrid Laurier will allow me to say so, to see that in the Canadian parliament there is an intermediate tariff proposed.

He goes on to say that in so far as that tariff is concerned, entering into an arrangement such as we have entered into with France in the last few weeks, it is going to materially interfere with the course that can be pursued if any government take advantage of the opportunity to grant our country a mutual preference. Until near the close of the nineteenth century Great Britain was the pioneer in industrial development and in the extension of trade and commerce. We know that her ships were going to every foreign land and that her commerce was greater than the commerce of the whole world. But, what do you find to-day? You find Russia subsidizing her ships, you find Germany subsidizing her ships and railways to carry her products to the countries of the world, you find Japan doing the same, and, instead of Great Britain being in the position that

she was some years ago, she is fighting for her existence upon the seas. It is time for this Dominion to wake up to its position and realize that it is our duty to look after our own interests in connection with the development of our trade with foreign lands. When Great Britain is changing her fiscal system, as I believe she will in the next few years, I wish to urge upon the government the necessity of exerting an effort in behalf of a mutual preference being granted to the Dominion of Canada and the other colonies. We can never get it by the weak arguments that have been used. We are bound together by strong ties which closer trade relations will make still stronger. Great Britain gives to the world a free market of 45,000,000 people, while other nations have their own markets and the British market as well. The United States, for instance, has 85,000,000 people as a market for its manufactures and producers in that country and in addition it has that market of the 45,000,000 people of Great Britain, giving it a market of 130,000,000 of people, while as I say, Great Britain has only a market of some 45,000,000 people. Great Britain gets nothing in return for giving her markets to her rivals. Practically every other country, by subsidies, bounties and regulations has stimulated its exports and by a tariff wall protects its home industries. Nearly every European country has erected restrictions. Great Britain and her colonies purchase in the neighbourhood of $800,000,000 worth of goods per annum. Great Britain alone purchased £565,000,000 last year and would it not be a great advantage to the colonies to have access to that market under favoured conditions such as a mutual preference would grant to them? Just a word in regard to our position with Germany and I am through. I believe it is my duty to call the attention of this government to the importance of the German market. I know that in so far as the Finance Minister is concerned he will take a great deal of delight in telling us that he does not agree with our argument on this question.

I believe it is not only my duty but that it is the duty of the members of this House to take into consideration this important market, for you must consider that Germany, situated as she is, is bound to be for years to come a purchasing country, and that Canada situated as she is cannot be in any other position than that of a large exporter of the raw material. Germany fifty years ago was a weak and poor nation commercially and industrially speaking, but to-day you find her in the front rank of the nations of the world, both commercially and industrially. Fifty years ago Germany was divided into many weak states undeveloped and lacking in enterprise. The fertility of her soil was far below that of neighbouring countries, and her mines were undeveloped and her industrial enterprise practically dead. Germany to-day, is a great unified, powerful empire whose prosperity, great industry and technical skill is recognized by all nations. In the last twenty-five years a revolution has been brought about in Germany, in industry, mining development, the arts and sciences, and trade and commerce. In 1879 Germany abandoned her free trade ideas, protected her industries and assisted her railways, and her trade and commerce to expand. Her population in 1850 was only 35,000,000, while to-day it is over 60,000,000. Germany is and will be a distinctly manufacturing country, she cannot extend in territory like Russia or like the United States, and so she cannot help but be a very large importer of the very products that we are producing in the Dominion of Canada. I believe, Sir, it is well for us not to lose the opportunity of getting into the German market and obtaining some of the advantages of that market, because no matter how soon we get into that market it will take years for us to develop a trade with that country. Then, Sir, on account of the present regulations of this government, within the last eleven years the immigration into Canada from Germany has been little or nothing, and I am sure there is not a man in this House but who realizes the importance of a German community in any country such as Canada. Instead of us assisting immigrants to come from southern parts of Europe it would be well for us to get into better relations with Germany and to obtain at least a reasonable proportion of the immigrants that leave that empire. Germany must be a heavy importer of bread stuffs and raw materials, and Canada has both. Why not get a share of that market ? For a moment let me call your attention to this position that Germany's total production of grain last year amounted to 15,000,000 tons ; that Germany consumed in that year over 20,000,000 tons leaving 5,000,000 tons to be imported and that 5,000,000 tons means over 200,000,000 bushels of grain. And here we are in the Dominion of Canada expanding in the great west, and our prairies are telling us that in the near future we will have hundreds of millions of bushels of grain to be exported, and we hear men on the other side of the House telling us what wonderful advantages Canada will derive from the development of this great agricultural wealth. And yet in the very face of all that this government have not been able to open up trade relations with the second best consumer in the world of the very agricultural products which we produce. This government no sooner came to power than they practically gave a slap in the face to the German people, and instead of our trade increasing with Germany year after year as it certainly would have increased under a favoured nation clause, it has gradually diminished and diminished until

to-day our trade with that country is a paltry million dollars. And when you come to compare our trade with Germany with that of other countries, Canada is in the most humiliating position. Let me call your attention to the fact that the little Argentine republic sent into Germany last year over $48,000,000 worth of goods and $45,000,000 out of that $48,000,000 was practically of agricultural products which were produced in the Argentine republic. Compare that with the paltry few thousand dollars worth of Canadian agricultural products that go into Germany. That is certainly a most humiliating position. But let us look a little further. If the British market were better than the German market for the Argentine republic and its people, why do they not send their goods to the British market instead of sending them to the German market? I would like some of these gentlemen opposite to explain how it is that these countries that are producing just the same kind of raw material that we produce in the Dominion of Canada are sending into Germany such great quantities of it in place of sending it into the British market which is just as free and open to them, and much easier of access to them than the German market is. But what I claim is that so far as Germany is concerned we find from the reports published from time to time that these products are selling to better advantage in the German market than they are in the British market to-day and have been for years past, and that is the reason these countries are trading with Germany to a great extent. Brazil sent $20,000,000 worth of goods to Germany last year, Chili $21,000,000, Australia $28,000,000. How is it that Australia, a British colony sent $28,000,000 worth of goods to Germany and did not send these goods into the British market if they are receiving such a wonderful advantage in the British market? British West Africa sent $10,000,000 worth of goods to Germany, India sent $51,000,000, the United States sent $236,000,000 and Canada a paltry $1,000,000.

Now, Sir, the argument is often used that from the countries from which Germany receives a large portion of her imports Germany is importing her goods in large quantities. I want to point out that the very opposite is the case. Take for instance the Argentine republic that sends $48,000,000 worth of goods to Germany and she only imports from Germany $11,000,000 worth. Brazil which sends $27,000,000 worth of goods per year to Germany only imports $10,000,000 from Germany. Chili which sends $21,000,000 worth of goods a year to Germany only imports from Germany $7,000,000. Australia while sending $28,000,000 worth to Germany only imports $10,000,000 worth per annum. British West Africa while sending $10,000,000 worth of exports to Germany only imports $1,800,000 worth. British India while sending into Germany $51,000,000 worth of goods only imports $13,000,000 worth. The United States sends into Germany $236,000,000 worth of goods annually and she only imports $106,000,000 from Germany. But look at Canada that has only sent a paltry million dollars worth of goods into Germany and she is importing from Germany in spite of the surtax that this government placed on German goods, $7,000,000 worth of goods a year from Germany, again showing the balance of trade on the wrong side of the ledger. I do not believe that this question is receiving the attention of this House that I think it should receive. Canada, without a trade in Germany and with her citizens paying a surtax on these $7,000,000 worth of goods, certainly must feel that so far as she is concerned she is getting no advantage in that market. But as I said before, German goods are coming in under the British preference. After an inquiry made in England, the Minister of Finance had to admit last year that there was practically no examination made to see whether any of the goods that were brought in here under the British preference were not goods coming from foreign countries. Then, Sir, Germany's outside interests are very great. She has invested in foreign stocks and bonds over $5,000,000,000 and her return from that investment last year amounted to over $275,000,000. And when I hear men talking about exports and the balance of trade being on the right side, I fear they do not take into consideration that in these older countries a large portion of the money they receive for carrying on their affairs is brought in from foreign investments.

As I have said, this government for the past eleven years have been dealing with this question in a half-hearted manner. They do not seem to have attempted to negotiate with the great German empire, and to obtain for our people some consideration in that market. I believe it is high time that we should impress upon this government the necessity of dealing with this question and, instead of continuing to neglect it or maintaining the position assumed by the Minister of Agriculture who says that as far as he is concerned, if Germany cares to come and treat with him he will listen to the appeals of that great nation, let these gentlemen deal with it in a broadminded business-spirit, deal with it as if they meant to obtain for the people of Canada some recognition in the German market.

My object in bringing this matter before the House is to impress on the government its great importance and to urge on them the necessity of dealing with it immediately. I believe it is my duty to bring its importance to the notice of the House. My doing so may afford an opportunity for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to call me

unpatriotic and to deal out harsh words in regard to the statements I have made; but these statements are founded upon fact and it is our duty as legislators to deal with these questions in a business-like manner, instead of in the haphazard, careless manner in which the government have been dealing with them for the last eleven years.

Mr. J. B. McCOLL (West Northumberland, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House has made a characteristic Conservative speech and the first observation that I have to make, which will apply not only to the speech just delivered but to the various speeches that have been made by members of the opposition during the present debate, is that although they have indulged in the most adverse criticism of the policy of the government both as to its constructive features and to its administrative features, not one of them has, so far as I have been able to ascertain, suggested what changes should be made to remedy the condition with which they seem to find fault. They criticise the taxation; they say it is too high, but they do not say in what way they would reduce it. They claim that the expenditure is too large, yet they have not, except perhaps by inference, pointed out where that expenditure should be reduced. They have claimed that the balance of trade is very much against us yet they have not suggested any means by which that balance might be turned to our favour.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who is the acknowledged financial critic of the opposition, addressed this House for something over five and a half hours, and although he indulged in criticism of every part of the policy of the government, I was not able to ascertain throughout all his speech one element of what we might call constructive policy or one element of constructive statesmanship. His speech from beginning to end was of an eminently destructive character. He claimed that because the revenue of the country has increased, therefore the taxation of the people has increased. This, I think, is a most transparent fallacy. Hon. gentlemen opposite have claimed that because we now collect a larger revenue than we did in years gone by, therefore the taxation upon the people has increased. I maintain that the true test as to whether or not the taxation of the people has increased is not the gross amount of revenue that we may collect but the rate of taxation that is imposed. They admit that the rate of taxation has been decreased and yet they claim that the people are more heavily taxed than they were under the late Conservative government. One reason why we have in increased revenue is that the present tariff has been placed upon a revenue basis while under the old national policy which they laud so highly on every occasion, the tariff was, as they claim and admit upon a distinctly protective basis. Another reason and the main reason why the revenue which they call taxation, has increased, is that the country is much richer, it is doing a far greater amount of business than it did in days gone by and the people, as my hon. friend has suggested, are relatively much richer than they were.

That brings to my mind the difference between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff and also the question as to whether the present tariff is a revenue or a protective tariff. It is, I suppose, universally admitted that any tariff, however small, even a low revenue tariff, carries with it a certain amount of protection; but when we come to consider whether any particular tariff is a revenue tariff or a protective tariff, we should consider what is the guiding principle, what are the leading features of that tariff and judge it upon that basis. I maintain that the tariff that has been in existence under the present government is distinctly a revenue tariff and not a protective tariff. One proof of that proposition is the results, and I would point out here another difference and a condition that prevailed under the old national policy, that is that while the taxation under the national policy was at a higher rate than it is to-day, the result of that taxation, the revenue from it, did not appear as large as it would to-day because a large portion of that taxation being upon a protective basis would go into the hands of the protected interests and not into the public treasury. That is one reason why even if we had to-day the same rate of taxation as we had before, we yet would not have the same amount of revenue, and according to the contentions of hon. gentlemen opposite, as they base what they call taxation upon the amount of revenue, the taxation would appear to be greater to-day although in fact it is much lower. They have also very strongly criticised the expenditure. A reference to the trade returns shows that in 1896 the total trade of Canada was something less than $240,000,000. In 1907 the total trade of Canada was between $600,000,000 and $700,000,000 and if we add to that the invisible trade, the invisible exports of which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) spoke, I feel certain that if we had statistical information showing the exact amount of all these invisible exports, the total trade of Canada to-day would be at least three times what it was in 1896. What does that mean? That means that we are to-day doing three times the amount of business that we were doing in 1896. Increased business means increased expenditure. That is a proposition which will apply to any private business as well as to the public business. I would like to ask any hon. gentleman who is engaged in business whether, when that business increases, his expenses do not also increase.

Another consideration is this. It is well known that the prices of labour and materials have increased, and that it costs much more to-day to do the same amount of work than it did in 1896. In fact any public work constructed to-day would probably cost 50 per cent more than it would if constructed in 1896. That is another element which should not be lost sight of in accounting for this increased expenditure.

What were the reasons for increasing our expenditure? When this government took office, they found the public services of the country in a starved condition. I know particularly that was the case in my own riding. But since that time, these public services have been very much improved, which entails increased expenditure. But while the opposition have greatly criticised this increased expenditure, there is one thing which has occurred to me and it is this, namely, that the true test of the sincerity of their criticism is whether they ever objected to any of the items. Take all these different expenditures, how many of them did they move to have struck out or reduced? I have been a member of this House since 1900, and I do not recollect one instance in which any member of the opposition ventured to move that an item of expenditure be struck out. That, it appears to me, is a true test of their sincerity and a fitting reply to their objections. Then considering the fact that we are doing three times as much business now as we did in 1896, would it be surprising if the expenditure had increased three-fold? As we all know however, although it has increased materially, it has not increased in proportion to the increase in business.

Then comes the question of the adverse balance of trade. In that connection the first point that occurs to me is whether there is really against Canada an adverse balance of trade. Because the trade returns show that we import more goods than we export, hon. gentlemen opposite argue that the balance of trade is against us and that, if such a condition continues, it is only a question of time when we shall become involved in great financial straits. But when we look around the country and when we find that in every line of trade the country is prospering and has been prospering during all the years this balance of trade has been against us, it occurs to me that in reality the balance of trade is probably the other way. There are some elements which enter into consideration of that question that have been referred to by other speakers. My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) referred to the fact that settlers' effects brought into the country should not be considered in determining that question, and he gave the figures. In my opinion, when considering whether the balance of trade is against us or not, we should only take into consideration that portion of our yearly imports which are actually consumed in that particular year. Any imports that become the capital of any concern should not be considered, because we have them as an asset. Such imports are not consumed in that particular year, and the same distinction should be made with regard to them as we make between capital and ordinary expenditure in other matters. Suppose a manufacturing concern brings in any class of goods that are not consumed in the particular year but become a part of its stock or capital asset, they should not be considered in determining this question. Then there is another element. If we had the statistics to show what that amounts to, I feel certain it would have a very important bearing indeed on the question of balance of trade and would help us to determine whether the balance was really against us or not. Reference has been made to our tourist trade. When referring to Switzerland, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said that they exported their scenery. If I understood his contention aright, it was that a large number of American tourists were attracted to Switzerland by its scenery, and while there they expended a large amount of money, and that country was the richer to the extent of that expenditure. That contention I believe to be perfectly true, but why did the hon. gentleman not apply it likewise to Canada? If he did, I feel certain he would find that it amounts to a greater sum than we have any conception of at present. Let us see how it works out. Americans come into Canada and bring with them large sums of money. They spend, many of them, not only a few days at a hotel but months—practically the whole summer months here. Many have summer homes in this country which they occupy five or six months every year and which are kept up, not by Canadian, but by American money. That money is expended in consuming our cheese, butter, bacon and other products that would otherwise naturally be exported. If we did not have that portion consumed by that foreign element, we would have that much more for export and it would appear in the trade returns to the credit of our exports. But when it is expended in the way I have indicated, it comes under the head of that class of exports for which we do not get credit in our trade returns.

There is another feature of that trade. These people who come to this country and live here temporarily buy a large amount of imported goods. For instance, there are men who come, year after year, to the town of Cobourg, and who buy practically their whole year's supply of clothing in that town. The reason is that they can purchase in Canada imported goods at much lower prices than in their own country, and when they return to their own country, they take in that clothing as personal wearing apparel free of duty. So, whatever it amounts to,

there is in that way a certain quantity of goods imported into Canada and these goods remain in Canada only temporarily, being imported, not by the Canadian consumer, but, in reality, by the foreign consumer. We have no statistics to show what that trade amounts to; I wish we had. But I feel safe in saying that it would represent a much larger sum than we now have any idea of. When we consider the number of people coming to all parts of Canada—to Niagara-on-the-Lake, Hamilton, Toronto, Cobourg, Port Hope, the Thousand Islands and all along the St. Lawrence, to Muskoka and other northern districts of Ontario, to many places in Quebec and the maritime provinces and also to many places in the West—I say, when you consider this great annual influx of people, you can form some idea of the extent of the trade to which I have referred.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. McColl) a question? Does not he think that Canadians spend as much money abroad as is spent by foreigners visiting Canada?

Mr. McCOLL. Certainly not. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) ventured the opinion that Canadians spend abroad as much as Americans and other tourists spend in Canada. I believe that if the hon. gentleman would inquire into the matter, he would find that he is entirely wrong. I do not believe that the expenses of Canadians in other countries would amount to one-twentieth part of what is spent in this country by the tourists who visit it—an hon. member beside me suggests that it would not be one-hundredth part. Therefore, so far as this question of the balance of trade is concerned, I believe that if all the elements were taken into consideration, if we had the full statistics before us, it would be found that the balance of trade is not against us. Even if it is, then I say that there are no bad results from that cause, for it is an acknowledged fact that we have had for years unprecedented prosperity in this country.

I do not propose to discuss to any extent the policy of the government. The government's fiscal policy was very ably stated by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) The criticisms of that policy have been, I maintain, completely answered by hon. members on this side of the House; and, to enter into a discussion of the points involved, would mean repetition which I do not propose to go into. There is one thing, however, upon which I might venture to say a word. The Prime Minister of Canada (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) before he came into power made the statement that when his party had the direction of the country's affairs, it would not be necessary to quote figures to show that Canada was prosperous, but that the people would know it from the jingle of the coin in their pockets. I maintain that that prediction has been literally fulfilled, for it is undeniable that we have in this country, and have had ever since this government came into power, unprecedented prosperity.

But, while I do not propose to follow that matter any further, I do propose to discuss for a short time the fiscal policy of the opposition since 1896, or since they became in opposition. And, on that point, the first remark I have to make is that the whole fiscal policy of the present opposition has been a combination of contradictions and inconsistencies. When the Fielding tariff was first brought before parliament in 1897, what criticism was made of it by the then leader of the Conservative party, Sir Charles Tupper? I propose to read the words delivered by him on that occasion. He said:

> The result is that this tariff goes into operation and the hon. gentleman knows that the industries of this country are already paralyzed in consequence, while hon. members gloat over the destruction of Canadian industries. I was reading the wail, the sorrowful wail, of those industries in the Montreal 'Gazette,' where one manufacturer after another declared that those industries were ruined, that their mills must close, and that they saw staring them in the face a return to the deplorable state of things that existed when the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House was in charge of the fiscal policy of this country. I say that a deeper wrong was never inflicted upon Canada.

And he goes on:

> I feel that, so far from rejoicing at it from a party standpoint, I deplore from the bottom of my heart the ruin that is going to be inflicted upon the best interests of Canada and upon its great industries. Still, I unhesitatingly say that, from a party point of view, the hon. gentlemen are doing our work; they are showing the people of this country that no reliance can be placed upon the most solemn declaration that they make either in the House or out of it; they are showing the people of this country that, having obtained power, which was all they wished for, they are now prepared to abuse that power at a cost of a sacrifice of the industries of Canada.

The Fielding tariff went into operation. Instead of the dire calamities falling upon us which were predicted by Sir Charles Tupper, the very opposite occurred; instead of the dismal wail that he predicted, we heard rejoicing over unprecedented prosperity. When the election campaign of 1900 came around, what position did we find Sir Charles Tupper taking then? Why, when he saw that the country had prospered under the policy of this government, he claimed that it was the old national policy. I myself heard him in the town of Cobourg make a declaration to that effect. Upon that occasion he was accompanied by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr.

Foster), and also by the Hon. Hugh John Macdonald, and Sir Charles Tupper referred to the policy of this government in these words: 'That Sir Wilfrid was then mounted upon his (Sir Charles Tupper's) national policy horse.' Well, Sir, when the elections came on the government was overwhelmingly sustained, the leader of the Liberal-Conservative party went down to ignominious defeat, and when parliament assembled for the session of 1901 a new leader appeared, the hon. gentleman who still retains that position. Then what did we find as one of the acts of this new leader with regard to a fiscal policy? Although the people had so strongly pronounced in favour of the tariff that was then in existence, we find him session after session moving an amendment to the budget and complaining of the unsatisfactory condition of the present tariff. He wound up his resolution by what he was pleased to call a declaration for adequate protection. Now, Mr. Speaker, what that hon. gentleman exactly meant by 'adequate protection' I have never been able to ascertain. However, that resolution was moved session after session. Whatever it meant, the policy of the opposition in 1901 to 1904 was adequate protection. I do not know that the hon. gentleman ever defined adequate protection. I was under the impression that that resolution was framed in an indefinite way designedly to mislead the people of Canada. It was a resolution that he could take to the maritime provinces and say that adequate protection meant one scale of duties; he could go up to Ontario and Quebec and say that adequate protection meant another scale of duties, and he could go to the west and say that adequate protection meant still another scale of duties. I always thought that it might properly be called adequate humbug, or perhaps more properly still, inadequate humbug, because it did not succeed in humbugging the people of Canada. Well, the elections of 1904 came round, and the opposition went to the country on the policy of adequate protection. We know the result; again the government was overwhelmingly sustained, again their leaders went down to ignominious defeat. Since that time what have we seen? One thing is certain, we have not heard anything more about adequate protection. I have not heard during this parliament, that expression used once by members of the opposition. That has been abandoned.

Mr. BLAIN. May I suggest that it is still the policy of the opposition?

Mr. McCOLL. The hon. member says adequate protection is still the policy of the opposition. Well, this is the first time I have heard that statement made during this parliament, and I would like if the hon. gentleman would, at his convenience, give me a definition and publish a definition of what he means by adequate protection. I would like to ask him if he means by adequate protection an increase or a reduction in the custom duties?

I have already referred to the fact that since this parliament opened we have not heard anything about adequate protection, but the policy of the hon. gentlemen has been, from the first session of the present parliament up to the present moment, a policy of slander and abuse of their political opponents, a policy of insinuation, of innuendo and calumny, of slander and detraction.

Last year the leader of the opposition thought it advisable for him to make a tour of the country, and in order to prepare himself it was necessary to construct some sort of a platform upon which he could stand. That platform has since been known as the Halifax platform. Now, when I turn to the fiscal policy of that platform, what does it say?

A fiscal policy which will promote the production within Canada of all useful articles and commodities that can be advantageously produced or manufactured from, or by means of, our natural resources, having due regard to the interests of the consumer as well as to the just claims of our wage-earning population.

Now, I would ask my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) when he comes to give a definition of adequate protection, if he would try and elaborate that plank I have just read and tell me exactly what it means; tell me what scale of duties he would introduce if he had an opportunity. Why, Sir, that plank I have just read is just as indefinite, is just as elastic, as was the old resolution for adequate protection. I think the people of Canada will require them to define it a little more clearly. As I have the Halifax platform before me, there is another plank in it, not applying particularly to fiscal matters, but which perhaps it would not be out of place for me to mention. It is the plank in reference to the reformation of the laws regarding the civil service. That is a very prominent question before parliament and the country. But, Sir, when I first read that plank in this platform, some time during the month of September last, the first thing that occurred to me was the use that the opposition made of the civil service when they last had an opportunity of dealing with it. It will be remembered that after the election of 1896, after the Conservative government had been defeated at the polls, but before they had resigned, they made an attempt to fill all the party offices with their party friends. It will be remembered that there were something like 400 orders in council passed which the then Governor General refused to ratify, but left to be dealt with by their successors. Then in addition to the 400 orders in council appointing their friends to office, there was a considerable number of departmental appointments which they were able to get

through without going before the Governor in Council at all and of which we have no record. In order to make 400 appointments to office there would have to be 400 vacancies provided in some way, or 400 new offices established. The fact is that there were 400 vacancies that were made.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the hon. gentleman including in that number the 300 Queen's Counsel who were appointed at that time?

Mr. McCOLL. I was referring to the orders in council.

Mr. BENNETT. I think they were included in that number.

Mr. McCOLL. I did not know there were 300 included in it.

Mr. BENNETT. Between 250 and 300 were included in that 400.

Mr. McCOLL. But I would ask my hon. friend whether he and his friends ever considered or made any inquiry into the trafficking in offices that took place at that time in order to create these vacancies and to make new appointments. What I say is that trafficking in offices, that constituted a violation of the Criminal Code, took place at that time and I would like to ask the hon. leader of the opposition if, when he framed this platform, he had in his mind that fact, and if one of his reasons for desiring a reformation of the civil service laws is that in future he may be able to prevent or perhaps facilitate what they were unable to accomplish in 1896 ?

I have gone briefly over the Conservative fiscal policy since 1896, and when we consider, in the first place, the predictions of Sir Charles Tupper, his change of attitude within the next three or four years, the uncertain, indefinite and elastic 'adequate protection' resolution, then the indefinite and uncertain policy at present set forth in the Halifax platform, when we consider all these changes and the inconsistent positions hon. gentlemen have taken, at one time claiming that the present government has adopted the old national policy and at another time claiming that it is something entirely different, I think we are justified in characterizing them as the offspring of minds which are a strange mixture of recklessness, presumption and inconsistency with low artifice and cunning. One other matter has occurred to me and that is the difference between a political platform and a political party policy and the definitions I propose to give are based upon the present position of the Conservative party. A political party platform is something placed on paper, arranged into paragraphs, called planks, embodying high ideals, some of which, perhaps all of which, are utterly impracticable and impossible of being carried out. A political party policy is the course of action practised and pursued by that political party. Now, Sir, if we are to make the Halifax platform conform to the policy of the party, as we see it demonstrated in this House, it will require the addition of several planks. In the first place, Sir, it will require a plank involving the principle of unreasonable, silly, parliamentary obstruction. Then, they will require a plank involving the principle of slander, calumny and detraction. Then, they will require a plank involving the principle of hypocrisy and inconsistency, and Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might say that they will require a plank which would be called the pipe stem plank. It will be remembered that not long ago, during the present session the hon. leader of the opposition, standing in his place in this House, made the statement that he would remain there, like a pipe stem, if what he was contending for was not then granted. I have thought that perhaps that declaration was made in a moment of weakness and that upon reflection the hon. gentleman will not, in fact, place that plank in his platform. However, I sincerely hope that he will not. I am sure that it would be a very undesirable spectacle for hon. members on this side of the House to see sitting opposite them a party composed of pipe stems. Now, I do not propose to detain the House any longer and in conclusion I have just one word to say to the opposition.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, go easy.

Mr. McCOLL. It will only apply to certain members of the opposition. I do not claim that it will apply to all but to those to whom it does apply I desire to address these few words. In the language of the beautiful prayer recited by you, Sir, before opening the proceedings of this House day after day, may truth and justice, religion and piety be established amongst those members of the opposition. May they discontinue their silly practice of parliamentary obstruction; may they abandon their policy of slander, calumny and detraction; may they, for the balance of the session, apply themselves to their proper and legitimate duties as members of parliament and thereby to some extent make atonement for the wrong and injustice so far inflicted upon the members of the House and upon the country.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). The hon. gentleman (Mr. McColl) who has just taken his seat is I think a modest man; he certainly does not speak often in the House and I would not have had anything much to say in reference to what he has said were it not that in my opinion the language that he has used to-day is such as will not commend itself to members on either side of the House. I think that an hon. gentleman in addressing this House ought not to attribute motives to as honourable men as there is in the House, and I am sure that the respected leader of the opposition bears as high a character amongst members on both

sides as any man who has ever been in this parliament. And yet the hon. member (Mr. McColl) accuses the leader of the opposition with intentionally trying to deceive the people of the country and being dishonest in his motives. That sort of language is certainly unbecoming from the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. McColl). The hon. member said that we on this side of the House found a great deal of fault with the government but that not one of us ventured to explain how we could reduce the expenditure. Surely if the hon. gentleman has been reading the newspapers lately he would see how the public expenditure might be reduced. If he has read the report of the Civil Service Commission he will find that we have been paying in numerous cases at least 100 per cent more for the goods bought by the government than should have been paid. And he would see that that is the legitimate result of the patronage system, which, in one case in the City of Quebec, was such that only one flour dealer was placed on the patronage list and all flour had to be bought from him no matter at what price. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McColl) would also have seen that a great deal higher price was paid for flour in Quebec than the same flour could be bought for in the city of Halifax. The hon. gentleman might also have discovered had he tried to, that in the city of Quebec, pork was bought for the Department of Marine and Fisheries at $24 per barrel when the same pork was selling in the city of Halifax for $17.50. Here was a difference of $6.50 a barrel on the pork purchased. And who called attention to this? It did not come from this side of the House alone. Attention was called to it by Mr. Owen, a civil servant, and he has been suspended.

Mr. BENNETT. Serves him right for exposing the government.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McColl) will find a great many ways in which the expenditure of the country can be very easily reduced. He can easily see that if the government would only advertise for such commodities as they want and if they refuse to recognize party and political pressure things would be honestly done and a great deal of money saved to the country. I venture to say that the members of this House would buy supplies for their own home, or the merchants in this House who buy merchandise, do not ask their own party and political friends to tender, and exclude every one else from the competition. I think it is the duty of this government as it should be the duty of this government as it should be the duty of every government to do business on business principles. The system of excluding the general public from tendering and confining tenders only to political friends should be at once discontinued. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McColl) proceeded to say that the tariff now in force was not a protective tariff but that it was a revenue tariff. On that question I need only refer the hon. member (Mr. McColl) to the speech of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) who declared the other day in this House boldly, that the present tariff in force was a protective tariff. I wonder if the hon. gentleman (Mr. McColl) thinks that a duty of 30 per cent on boots and shoes is free trade in boots and shoes or a revenue tariff either. Is it not high protection? The hon. gentleman (Mr. McColl) referred to Sir Charles Tupper, and the only wonder I have is that after his long experience Sir Charles Tupper thought the Liberal party was honest. I remember once when I was but a young member of this House walking up the street in Ottawa with Sir Charles Tupper and he said to me: It is a pity that any party should be so long in opposition that they would loose hope, because the Liberals are making statements that they will have great reason to regret in after years, and statements which are detrimental to the best interests of the country. Sir Charles Tupper supposed that the Liberals of that day were honest when they professed to reduce the expenditure of the country. When the right hon. leader of the present government told us that if the Liberals came into power they would give us free trade as they have it in England and when Sir Richard Cartwright said: We will cut the head off protection and trample upon its body; do you think the people of Canada had a right to expect there would be a tariff brought into force which would give an average of 16 or 17 per cent on both dutiable and free goods? Do you think they have any such tariff as that in England? Why it is simply absurd to make any such supposition. What I am astonished at is that Sir Charles Tupper, an astute statesman, did not size up the present government better than he did. He might have known that they had a platform only to get in on, and they had but very little intention of carrying out their promises. My own impression is, but I hardly like to say it because I do not like to make strong statements, but I must say that I think that when these gentlemen opposite made the statement that they would reduce the expenditure of this country three million dollars or four million dollars a year, they were not sincere in their profession. They must have known that this country was developing and that as it developed a larger expenditure would be required. Now, nobody finds fault with a moderate and honest expenditure of public money. Nobody on this side of the House would criticise that. But it is the rascality that is going on: it is the thieving if I may use so strong a word; it is the dishonesty that has ap-

parently permeated the whole service that causes the people all over the country to talk about graft and about the way this government is conducting our affairs, and we have a specimen of it to-day when three officials in one department alone have been suspended. Then we have the spectacle of the government appointing a commission to investigate the report of their own commissioners as it were. Is that not a nice spectacle? Here is a commission composed of straight party men, of men of high standing, men whose ability nobody will doubt, men who occupied high positions and whose fitness to make such an inquiry was recognized——

Mr. FINLAY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Yes, two or three of them if you like.

Mr. FINLAY. Were not these three officials who were suspended appointed in the Conservative times?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I don't know when they were appointed and I don't care.

Mr. FINLAY. That is what I am told.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I don't care by whom an official is appointed, if he is dishonest I would not hold up one finger to keep him in office. What the country wants is honest men, and what I do think is that the conduct of any official will be explained by the conditions with which he has been surrounded. How can you expect a man to buy at the very lowest price if he is obliged to buy what is wanted from just one man who is a party friend of the government. Do you think that he will be able to get goods at bottom prices? The Civil Service Commission points out that the government should no longer buy goods retail but that they should buy wholesale and get the ordinary besiness discount the same as business men do. Does not the hon. gentleman sell at wholesale a great deal cheaper than he does at retail?

Mr. FINLAY. It would depend on circumstances.

Mr. U. WILSON. Would it? I have been in business for forty-five years and if a wholesale merchant tried to sell goods to me at retail prices I do not think he would sell many nor would the hon. gentleman sell many goods to dealers if he asked them retail prices. If he was selling to the present government I suppose he would get almost anything he asked, judging from what has transpired.

The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) yesterday found fault with the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) for talking about scandal, and he said that that hon. member should have referred to Conservatives who had violated the laws and given rise to scandals as well as to the Liberals whom he mentioned. He had not a word to say of the member for South Oxford (Mr. M. S. Schell) who had read a circular whose authenticity had been denied over and over again so far as the Conservative party was concerned. The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder), I think pointed out that it was a private circular emanating from the Liberal party inasmuch as they have liberally carried out what is recommended. More than that, the hon. gentleman himself resumed his seat without finding one word of fault with any Liberal wrong-doer. If we criticise men on one side we should criticise evil doers on the other side as well.

He also criticised the Conservative government because of the kind of Ministers of Agriculture they had appointed; he said that they had a brewer, a lawyer and a doctor, but that this government had made a great improvement by selecting a farmer. It would have been more accurate if he had said an agriculturist, using his explanation of an agriculturist as they understand it in Wellington.

Mr. FISHER. That is just the distinction.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. A man that works the farmers. I wish to say for Sir John Carling that there are perhaps few men in this country who have taken as much interest in farming as he has. While a member of the Ontario government he was the means of establishing the experimental farm in western Ontario and then after becoming a member of the Dominion government, he established all of the Dominion experimental farms except two. The farmers, I think, have little fault to find with men like Sir John Carling who has devoted so much of his time to their interst and has caused the establishment of experimental farms in Canada.

The hon. member referred to conditions in Russia; he spoke of darkest Russia, the land of serfdom, of ignorance, of degradation, of wretchedness, of misery. He should have whispered to the Minister of the Interior that it was not a wise policy to offer $5 a head for these Russians coming to this country who are members of the farming class, farm labourers, carters, stable men, gardeners, railway men and miners. Is it not too bad that this government should continue to offer a bonus to bring in men of the character described by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie)? Is it not too bad to locate them amongst our people and to pay $5 a head bonus upon them? This is sufficient condemnation of the government's policy, so far as it concerns immigration from Russia.

Then Sir, he talked about taxation and like all the speakers on that side of the House, tried to make us believe that we are not taxed so much when we are paying $73,000,000 a year as we were when we paid $27,000,000 a year. That is the theory advanced by my hon. friend, and I am

astonished that any man should take that view. We find the taxation of the people in 1896 and in 1906 was :

| Year. | Taxation. |
|---|---|
| 1896.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | $27,759,285 |
| 1906.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 51,565,585 |
| Increase.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 23,806,300 |

But Sir, there is worse to come, as for the very next year, 1908, the taxation is to be $73,359,108, or $45,599,823 more than it was in 1896, when these hon. gentlemen assumed office. This is the way they have carried out their promise to reduce the taxation on the people and have fulfilled their claim that they would be able to run the government for $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 less than the Conservative government spent. The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), speaking in Toronto, declared that they could administer the government for $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 less but the Hon. David Mills, I think, said over $4,000,000 less.

The hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) said further that the expenditures to which the Conservative opposition have taken exception amounted to only $1,500,000, and that this is a mere trifle, a mere bagatelle, out of $750,000,000, and that any corporation would be satisfied if their expenditure was as well managed as that. I dare say we would be fairly well satisfied if we were getting value, but when we pay 100 per cent and in some cases over 100 per cent more for goods than the current price, we think there is grave ground for complaint. We see this man Merwin, who apparently has had the ear of the Minister of Marine continuously and who seems to have it still, for the government are still dealing with him. Only the other day I saw an account for the use of a tug owned by him. A larger tug was hired by the government for $30 a day including crew and fuel, but Merwin came along and had the government take his tug for $25 a day, the government to furnish the fuel and pay the men, this to include Sundays and days when the boat was laid up for repairs. In one season he received within a few dollars of the amount he paid for that boat. The great Conservative party and that great statesman, Sir John Macdonald, were hounded from pillar to post by the Liberals who talked about his extravagance, his corruption and all his bad deeds. I believe that these gentlemen now feel to-day that they made a mistake, that if they said what they think about him to-day they would declare that he was one of the greatest and most economical statesmen we have ever had in this country. I have here a record for eighteen years showing the amounts to which the Liberals when in opposition objected. These amounts are as follows :

| Year. | Amount. | Vote. | Challenged on motion of |
|---|---|---|---|
| | $ | | |
| 1879..... | 70,000 | Civil Government..... | Sir Richard Cartwright. |
| 1880..... | Nil. | ..... | |
| 1881..... | Nil. | ..... | |
| 1882..... | 8,000 | Damages to steamer 'U. C. Upper'..... | Mr. Mills. |
| 1883..... | Nil. | ..... | |
| 1884..... | Nil. | ..... | |
| 1885..... | Nil. | ..... | |
| 1886..... | Nil. | ..... | |
| 1887..... | Nil. | ..... | |
| 1888..... | Nil. | ..... | |
| 1889..... | ..... | Manitoba Penitentiaries, to be reduced by $10,526.. | Sir Richard Cartwright. |
| 1889..... | ..... | East Pictou river improvement, to be reduced by $500..... | Mr. McMullen. |
| 1898..... | ..... | Expenditure on I.C.R., to be reduced by $200,000.. | Sir Louis Davies. |
| 1889..... | ..... | Department of Interior, to be reduced by $95,748 .. | Sir Richard Cartwright. |
| 1889..... | 50,000 | Immigration account..... | Mr. Somerville. |

The vote that year for immigration was $202,499.26. How does that compare with this year? This year we are asking $920,000 for immigration and nobody has moved to strike any out. But I am strongly of opinion that we are spending altogether too much on immigration especially when we find men starving on our streets and filling our asylums. Then there was a motion to strike out the salary of C. C. Chapman, $2,300 made by Mr. McMullen. These votes all occurred in 1889. In 1890, nil; 1891, nil; 1892, nil; 1893, nil; 1894, nil; 1895, nil; 1896, nil. The total amount that the Liberals moved to strike out of the estimates in eighteen years was $437,074. What would that amount to on an expenditure of $603,000,000? My hon. friend said that all we had moved to strike out was $1.50 on every $800. Well, all that the Liberals moved to strike out in eighteen

years was 58 cents on every $800. How does that compare with the state of things at present? I think this comparison shows very clearly that these people are much more extravagant than were their predecessors in office.

I wish to say a few words with reference to the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Schell). That hon. gentleman made a long speech and absolutely refused to be corrected at all, even if we had the books in our hands to show that he was wrong. The first thing he criticised was the Canadian Pacific Railway. He found fault with the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) because he had said something against this government for having allowed that case to drop after it had been decided by the Supreme Court of Canada. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle thought it should have been appealed to the Privy Council in England. But the hon. member for South Oxford thought otherwise. The reason he gave was that the matter was one which had taken place under the predecessors of this government and he asked why this government should try to get the people out of trouble when the other government got them into it. I do not think that was a good reason. If he had stood up in his place and said that on the best advice the government could get, they found it would be unwise to appeal to the Privy Council, that would have been a fairly good reason.

Mr. LAKE. They delayed too long and consequently were not allowed to appeal.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That puts a different aspect on it. That surely makes this government responsible. They did try to take the case to appeal but they had delayed so long that the time for appealing had expired and the Privy Council would not receive it. Then he found fault with the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He said that we gave them $200,000,000 or $250,000,000. He did not seem to mind a trifle of $40,000,000 or $50,000,000, well, I wish to refresh his memory by just recalling what the Mackenzie government did in that connection. That railway is in the neighbourhood of 3,000 miles long. The Mackenzie government offered 20,000 acres a mile to any company that would build the road. That would be 60,000,000 acres. Then they offered $10,000 cash per mile besides. That would be $30,000,000. Then they offered 4 per cent on an amount to be agreed upon over the $10,000 per mile for twenty-five years. I am of the opinion that a road built on these terms would not be a cheaper railway than the one we got. But the Mackenzie government could not get a taker. They had little faith themselves in the enterprise. I believe that Mr. Blake said that British Columbia was a sea of mountains, and another of their leaders said the railway would never earn axle grease. That probably was what they really believed but they were not well informed. Sir John Macdonald, however, who was more far seeing than these gentlemen determined to build the road and did succeed in having it built on much better terms than they offered.

The hon. gentleman said that this government had only disposed of 6,400 square miles of timber limits since they had been in office while their predecessors had given away or sold 26,000 square miles. That statement is absolutely unfounded, and I can prove its inaccuracy by the statement of the Minister of the Interior himself (Mr. Oliver). It would be just as well if hon. members, when they make speeches in the House, would stick closely to the facts. On the 5th February, 1908, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) asked:

1. Of the timber limits granted in Manitoba and the Northwest, between the 4th of February, 1878, and the 17th of August, 1896, inclusive as per list given in sessional paper No. 66a, brought down on 22nd April, 1904, how many berths were retained by the original grantees or their legal assigns, and

2. What was the total area represented thereby?

To this question the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) replied:

To question No. 1, 80. To question No. 2, 1,720·73 square miles.

That should settle once and for all these reckless statements about the amount of land that was given away to friends of the late government. But on that point, I have this much to say. We might just as well say that we gave away the whole of the Northwest, which is under free grant, because every man who wants to take up a farm on the free grant land can have a farm on condition that he complies with the homestead law. But with regard to these timber limits, there were certain conditions imposed by the late government. People then could not get hundreds of square miles as they do to-day and let them lie there unworked. They had to put up sawmills on them. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has told us how this thing was managed. When the late government parted with any timber limits, the purchaser had to put a sawmill on it with a capacity of 8,000 feet a day.

Then we had the scandals in the west. It is not necessary for me to say anything about the circular which the hon. gentleman read, for my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) has completely disposed of that. He pointed out that the thing had been totally denied, that it bore the imprint of the Liberal party and that they had it in their possession and evidently carried it out.

My hon. friend also said that the Liberals had brought in a new policy. Well, I do not know what it was, unless it was graft. It certainly was not a fiscal policy. If the difference between 2½ per cent or 3 per

cent is free trade, then I do not understand the case. But, an hon. member who is as well qualified to give an opinion on such a matter as any member of this House, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said—and I think he was right—that it was correct to add the bounty paid on the different articles to the duty. And that would make it a little higher than it was in 1896. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Schell also said that the earning capacity of men in those days was about three times what it was in 1896. That does not need any contradiction from me. I think anybody who employs men knows that he does not have to pay them three times the wages he had to pay in 1896. Then the hon. gentleman went on to try to prove that the Grand Trunk Pacific would be built without cost to the country.

Now, I want to take up another matter which is of some interest to me, whether it is to the House or not. I want to show what was said by some hon. members opposite away back in 1893 when they had their convention here in Ottawa. I am glad the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is in his place, because the first quotation I want to give is from his own speech at that convention. He may say, as Mr. Blake once said to a man who was quoting his words, that the quotation is the best part of my speech.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not say that.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) speaking in the Liberal convention of 1893 said :

Under Mr. Mackenzie the city of St. John was swept by a disastrous fire. I assert in your presence, without fear of successful contradiction, that the national policy has done more to injure the city of St. John than the great fire.

If that is true, how does the right hon. gentleman justify his conduct for the last twelve years in maintaining practically the same policy as was in force at that time ? In fact, he has gone in the opposite direction from that which he promised. For instance, he has raised the tariff on boots and shoes by 5 per cent, making it 30 per cent. I protested against it, because I did not think it was free trade. The hon. gentleman said further :

There is, as you know, a universal consensus of opinion among all classes and among all parties in this country, that the tariff that now prevails in Canada is a burdensome tariff, that it is an oppressive tariff, and is known at one time as the national policy, has been found to be a fraud and a failure.

I have several other extracts from the right hon. gentleman's speech, but I do not think it necessary to read them. There is only one, that, as it is very brief, I may give. They say, by the way, that these old books, the report of this convention, have been destroyed, but I happen to have one. At page 33 of that report the right hon. gentleman said :

I say the policy should be a policy of free trade such as they have in England.

I do not think he has ever carried out that policy—and I do not think that anybody else thinks so either. I heard the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) say the other day that since coming into power his party has carried out every plank of their platform except one, and that was the reform of the senate. I heard the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) discuss that question, and he was quite at sea—and admitted it. He thought to reform the senate by putting Reformers in it, but the Reformers did not seem willing to reform. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was at this Liberal convention, and he moved the following resolution :

We cannot but view with alarm the large increase in the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the government that has been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

Though they demanded it then, they don't seem to demand it now, but seem to think the more extravagance the better, for, instead of the expenditure being $44,000,000, or less, it has been for the year just closed $110,000,000, on a falling revenue, and next year a much larger expenditure is anticipated.

Now, I want to show how some of this money is spent. I have here a summary of what has been paid to the Manitoba 'Free Press,' a newspaper that is well known. And I will give the year and page of the Auditor General's Report so that hon. members may, if they please, satisfy themselves that this is a correct statement :

Payments to 'Manitoba Free Press.'

| Year. | Page, Auditor General's Report | Amount. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1904.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | B—23 | $ 3,140 | |
| 1904.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | B—23 | 753 | |
| 1904.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | L—27 | 4,750 | |
| | | | $ 8,643 |
| 1905.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | B— 7 | 2,475 | |
| 1905.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | B— 7 | 3,906 | |
| 1905.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | L—27 | 17,413 | |
| | | | 23,794 |
| 1906.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | B—16 | 5,442 | |
| 1906.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | B—16 | 21,349 | |
| 1906.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | L—27 | 30,230 | |
| | | | 57,021 |
| | | | $89,458 |

Now, let me give some figures to show the total expenditures of the Immigration Department for printing and advertising :

Cost of immigration printing and advertising.

| | |
|---|---|
| 1904 | $217,896 |
| 1905 | 324,773 |
| 1906 | 235,234 |
| 1907 (9 months) | 114,575 |
| | 892,478 |

For details see Auditor General's Report, L—25 to 27, 1907; L—25, 26 and 27, 1906; L—26, 27 and 28, 1905; and L—26, 27, 28 and 29, 1904.

This shows where some of the money goes. Now, I have some facts here with regard to another matter that has been very badly managed; I refer to the Quebec bridge. This government gave a charter to a company to build that bridge. That company had a capital of only $200,000, of which $62,000 was paid up. I saw it stated in a newspaper that the company had not money enough on hand out of its capital stock to pay for the plans and specifications of the bridge. But our government came to the rescue. They first gave them a bonus of $1,000,000. Of course, they could not get through for that. After they had paid out $374,353, these people came back and the government guaranteed their bonds to the amount of $6,678,200, making the bridge company cost the Dominion of Canada $7,052,553. And where is the bridge now? It is at the bottom of the river. And the loss of the money was not the worst loss that was suffered. There was an appalling and most regrettable loss of life.

I think myself that was the greatest loss, although the other was bad enough to the people of this country. We have the proof of that in the speech given by the Prime Minister when he introduced his Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill, and it is a pretty good speech from his standpoint. It went a good way towards convincing his friends that he was pretty nearly right. When he introduced that Bill he took the precaution not to put any resolution before us, because that would have given the leader of the opposition some chance to get information; he first introduced the Bill and the resolution afterwards. I thought that was very unfair, and the leader of the opposition never got a copy of that Bill until after the Prime Minister had got through speaking upon it. He made a speech in which he said that all this railway would cost the people of Canada was $12,000,000 or $13,000,000, that was every cent. Now he did not say that the road could be built for that, but he said that was all it would cost the people of Canada. I think if you come to consider that they have already paid out $26,000,000 on it, and that we are going to be asked this session for $30,000,000 more, and when you come to consider the interest, interest for the five years that are past, and the interest for another five years as it will probably be five years before this road is done, I think the minister can easily double the cost that he said it would be to this country then. Not only that, but his statement was used in the general election. It was put into the political literature that was circulated throughout Canada, and they said: What a splendid bargain this country is going to get a Pacific railway from ocean to ocean, all on Canadian soil, and it won't cost Canada one cent more than $13,000,000. My goodness, they said what a bargain that is. Well, it would have been a pretty good bargain, but I think that the government was in too big a hurry, they had to go on with the railway long before they were ready, and I think they will find that this railway will cost a great deal more than they or most or other people estimated when the Bill was before the House.

Now there is the question of bounties paid by this government on iron, steel and other articles. I would like to define my position on the bounty question; I have done it before, but I think I cannot do it too often. I am prepared to encourage any industrial development by a moderate amount, until it can be demonstrated that the article can be profitably made or not then I think the government should drop it. Last year I was in favour of trying the experiment of smelting iron ore by electricity. If that can be done successfully, it will be a great thing. But I am not in favour of continuing that year after year, and allowing men to make millions at the expense of the people generally. I have in my hand a copy of a return brought down to the House showing the bounties paid from 1896-7 to January 13, 1908. We have paid in bounty on pig iron during those years, $5,108,223.95. I think most of that money was thrown away so far as any advantage to this country is concerned. I think that as soon as it was demonstrated that pig iron could be profitably made in this country, the bounty should have ceased. The bounty paid on puddled iron bars amounted to $108,061; bounty on steel ingots, $4,459,525; bounty on steel billets, $30,408; bounty on articles manufactured from steel, $1,241,473; bounty on manilla fibre, to make binder twine, I presume, $94,601; bounty on lead, $742,843.63; bounty on silver ore, $30,000; bounty on crude petroleum, $1,204,135. Total bounties paid since hon. gentlemen took office, $13,019,273.29. Now I think it is high time that this part of the business should be stopped.

I intended to say something about immigration, it would not be a speech of mine if it did not contain something on that subject. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said there was no complaint of corruption in regard to the North Atlantic Trading Company. I think there have been very serious complaints of corruption, the charge has been made over and over again. Now when the contract was made with these people on November 28, 1904, they were not incorporated, they were no company at all, nor were they a company until the next June. Then they did not get

incorporated in England, because they would get too much published, and so they went over to the Isle of Guernsey. The members of the company, as we now know, were people in very ordinary circumstances, they only had one share each, though they pretended to have great capital behind them. I want to say something with reference to their refusing to give their names, and the report made to Lord Strathcona, though perhaps that has already been put on the 'Hansard.' Lord Strathcona sent a man by the name of Charles A. Allen to Amsterdam to get these names. He felt that there was great demand in the public mind of Canada to know those names, and so he sent a special messenger over there for the purpose. And this is what he sent back to Lord Strathcona, dated June 5, 1906:

Just received letter from company, as follows: begins, very utmost we are able to do is to allow Mr. Preston to show names to Premier, Hon. Mr. Fielding, and if absolutely necessary also to only one Liberal and only one Conservative member of confidential committee, on condition that they each give a sworn declaration in writing never to mention names either verbally or in any other way and on condition that Premier takes full responsibility that these sworn declarations are kept, as disclosing names would result in some prominent members committing suicide.

We have had another motion recently that is on a par with that. The government do their business in such a way that they are afraid to give names; they try to hide behind the pretension that some great calamity will befall the country. My impression is that when men of honour do business they are not afraid to have everything exposed, they are willing to show their hand, and I think that is the right way. I think that the motions moved here the other night ought to have carried and it is simply a standing disgrace to this country that a condition of this kind should be permitted. Here is a company that got $367,000, and recently a return was brought down showing that they got $7,000 more which makes $374,000 of the public money in about two years; still we do not know who they are and the government is afraid to tell us their names for fear that some of them will commit suicide. It was a most astonishing position which the government took in inserting a clause in this contract that these men were not to violate the laws of any country in which they operated. It is my opinion that we should not protect these men in any way. I have here a clipping from the 'Evening Journal' which shows the kind of immigrants we are getting:

Dr. Clarke, superintendent of the Toronto asylum, says: Of 362 admissions of lunatics last year 136 were foreign-born, the majority recent arrivals. Those that the province will never get rid of amount to about 40. Each patient retained will cost the province $6,000.

Mr. U. WILSON.

That is a lamentable state of things. But, I have a pamphlet here that I want to show to the Prime Minister. Here is a pamphlet written by one Mr. Walker who is the assistant superintendent of immigration in London and which is issued by the Minister of the Interior. What does is show? It shows that we got from the city of London 12,336 immigrants that were sent out here by charitable organizations with the aid of small amounts contributed by the government. Do we want that kind of immigration? I have a statement here from one of the asylums that shows that about 40 per cent of the inmates since opened have been of the immigrating class who might have been detected if a proper examination had been made when they landed in this country. But, how can you expect a proper examination when they are examined in batches of a thousand or when several thousand are imposed up on an inspector in one day. Mr. Walker's statement is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| East End Emigration fund.. .. .. .. | *6,096 |
| Self-help Emigration Society.. .. .. .. | 506 |
| The Salvation Army.. .. .. .. .. .. | 406 |
| The Church Army.. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1,595 |
| The Church Emigration Society.. .. .. | 663 |
| The Central Unemployed Body.. .. .. | 2,842 |

*The above figures include those sent out by the East End Fund for the Central Unemployed Body.

Then we find that:

No pretense is made of assisting the emigration of a man, however competent, however industrious, however ambitious so long as he is in employment.

This man says that they get these people from the most thickly settled part of the city of London and these are the people that are sent out to us.

With regard to the state-aided and rate-aided, these are the products of the distress committees and of the workhouses. The distress committees are bodies in large centres of population, permitted under the terms of the Unemployed Workmen's Act, to levy a small rate as a tax upon the public for the emigration, and for provision by employment, or otherwise, of the unemployed in such communities.

We have had from the Minister of the Interior the statement that there was such a demand for people that the government had taken no pains to try to check emigration, but I think that it is a very great shame, after these things have been called to the attention of the government, both in this House and through the public press, that heretofore they have not taken any pains not only to see that a better class of people came, but to stop the stream before it became a great burden upon the people. We are feeding at the present time thousands of people.

I am satisfied that an extremely large proportion of the non-successes in English emigration is due to the unreasonable proportion of that class of emigration sent to Canada.

That is to say the unreasonably large number of the pauper class.

In my humble judgment the time has now come when the department should devise rigorous and effective measures to, first, discourage and, secondly, to supervise such charitably-aided emigration.

Then he goes on to state that we had over 12,000 from the city of London alone and I think myself that the time has come when the government should decide that no more bonuses shall be given to immigration agents to induce people to come to this country more especially from countries which send us such immigrants as were described by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) yesterday. I think the time has come when we should very closely scrutinize the people who come to our country and that the inspection should be rigorous.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that we were paying on all immigrants who come here from Russia ?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I did not say so. I gave the classes that were paid for—farmers, farm labourers, gardeners, stablemen, navvies, railway men and miners.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that we were paying on all farmers that come from Russia ?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. All who come are paid for.

Mr. SINCLAIR. They are ?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I say that any authorized agent of the Immigration Department who induces a farmer to come to this country is entitled to $5 for his services. If my hon. friend will read the orders in council he will understand them. It was only in January last that the government passed an order in council increasing the bonus on immigrants from Europe from $2.50 to $5 and from $1.25 to $2.50. Anybody can see that if he reads the order in council, it is not a statement I am making, and I hope that the government will in the near future see its way to take action upon this matter and abolish bonuses altogether.

At six o'clock House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, some of the hon. gentlemen to your left who have taken part in this debate, particularly the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), have wandered far afield, have gone back some years in Canadian history and instituted comparisons between this and former administrations. I think that in pursuing this course, these gentlemen acted unwisely, but perhaps, after all, it is natural for gentlemen who have had something to do with former governments and who now find that they have not very much influence in public affairs and whose prospects for the future are not illuminated by many rays of hope to dwell in the past. I believe, however, that young Canadians will prefer to think of and live in the future, with all its great and glorious possibilities and its golden opportunities. But since these gentlemen have harked back to the past and have instituted these comparisons we must of necessity follow them and we do so without any reluctance because we have nothing to fear from comparisons. During a portion of last session and more particularly during this session, the Conservatives in parliament and in their press and in the country have organized and inaugurated a campaign of exaggeration, misrepresentation, villification, insinuation, innuendo, slander and abuse unparalleled in the history of this country, without once having the courage to make a manly, definite charge against any minister of the Crown, or any member of parliament and sending it home as honourable men should do. There is a commandment in the decalogue, which says : Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour. Evidently the Tory party in this country have never heard of that commandment because their whole stock in trade is the bearing of false witness against their neighbours and slander and abuse ; they have no other ressource. How they expect to avoid the consequences of such conduct,—I was almost going to say the eternal consequences of such conduct—I do not know, unless it be in the way that it is stated a notorious character named Tom Pepper avoided such consequences by getting kicked out of Hades because of his monumental mendacity. Old Nic, the Emperor of the place, who was no mean hand at that sort of thing himself, saw that his throne and reputation would be endangered if he allowed Tom to remain in the place, and those gentlemen may hope to escape in the same way. But it is dangerous to rely too much on that, the policy of the place may have changed since Tom was turned out of doors, and if that is so, the Lord help that gentleman who sits in the press gallery and writes those letters that are sent out to the weekly Tory newspapers throughout the country, for instance the Summerside 'Journal' and the Charlottetown 'Herald.'

Since the opening of this session, the Conservatives have asked for documents and returns by the cartloads and complained because they were not brought down as fast as they were demanded,

although they must have known that the available clerks in all the departments, working overtime, working 10 or 12 hours a day were not able to prepare and bring down the returns as fast as they were demanded. They have asked for the production of so many original documents that the ordinary work of some of the departments was seriously interfered with, not that they cared so much to see these documents, but that they hoped and expected and believed that under the circumstances some of the ministers might refuse to bring them down and they would therefore have an opportunity of raising their voices in all sorts of denunciations of the government for trying to burk investigation. In this they were disappointed, because all the documents, original and otherwise, that were asked for were brought down, brought down in such quantities that I am convinced not half of them were read. Since the Christmas holidays the Public Accounts Committee has sat almost daily, on an average four days per week, a thing unprecedented in the parliamentary history of the country. Officials of the departments have been examined, witnesses by the hundred from all over Canada have been examined under oath, cross-examined and re-examined, and the Conservatives have been forced to admit that the rulings of the chairman of the committee, Mr. Clarke, were fair and impartial. And what has been discovered after all this examination and investigation? Some irregularities it is true, some misconduct perhaps, some errors of judgment; but irregularities such as might be found in any large business or shipping house, in a bank, railway corporation, insurance company or Trust company, and when those irregularities were found they seemed generally to be in those departments which had retained the services of the clerks and officials who had been trained under Tory administration. Why, Sir, no better proof can be given of the insincerity of the hon. gentlemen who made such a noise in parliament and in the country and in the press of their desire to see a clean administration and an honest and efficient departmental service than the fact that the present Minister of Marine, who has done certainly more than any other minister in that department since confederation to have honest and competent officials in that department, has in consequence of this effort, met with the opposition of some of the officials of that department and apparently with the undying enmity of the opposition.

But, let us examine the other side of the shield, and here in truth we have an unsavory pot from which I would rather not remove the lid were it not that the circumstances of the present time and the policy of the opposition compel me so to do. When we remember that the Conservative party held power in this country, practically from confederation down to 1896, we will see that they were therefore clearly responsible for any wrong-doing, for an evil, for any misconduct, for any dishonesty that grew up in the departments or in the public life of the country. And as far back as 1873 we find the then Conservative government driven out of power because of their dishonest manipulation of a large public franchise and their attempted debauchery of the electorate of the country. It is true that some five years after, taking advantage of the universal depression that then prevailed and holding out delusive, false, vain expectations and hopes to the people, they obtained power and retained it for 18 years afterwards. But by what means? By the employment of every device that perverted human ingenuity could make use of, till the Conservative party and government fell in 1896 like Milton's angels overwhelmed in utter and irretrievable ruin and confusion. In 1891 Sir John Macdonald dissolved parliament on the specious plea that he wanted to obtain a mandate from the people to enable him to negotiate a reciprocity treaty at Washington as to which he pretended to have an invitation from the then Secretary of State, Mr. Blain, but this turned out to be a pure fabrication. The real reason for the dissolution of parliament at that time was to avoid the horrible disclosures, which, however, was made in the first session of the next parliament, and which the Conservatives in 1891 knew were impending. The trick succeeded, however. The Conservatives were returned to power, but their term in office was not prolonged. Their end was approaching; Nemesis had overtaken them; their cup of iniquity was full to overflowing, and finding their end approaching and finding that they could no longer prey on the country they turned upon and tried to rend one another. Sir Mackenzie Bowell has left us a record of the last sad days of the Conservative administration, of the plots and intrigues and the cabals which make so regrettable a chapter in our national history. I would not refer to this if it were a Liberal who made this statement, but Sir Mackenzie Bowell had been for many years a colleague of these hon. gentlemen, for a time he had been their Prime Minister and leader, and he ought to know the character of the men he was dealing with and describing. And he has left this statement on record with regard to them:

> A disgusted electorate upon the first opportunity thereafter relegated them to a forced retirement from office to the opposition benches where they will remain, if I can interpret public opinion, so long as they are recognized as important factors in the Conservative party.

Well, Sir, the Conservatives were successful in 1891, but that did not save them from the disclosures and from the consequence of their misconduct for so many

years. Early in the session of 1891 the Liberals promulgated their charges and I will tell you how they proceeded. They were not content with insinuations and innuendos. On the 11th of May, 1891, Mr. Tarte, then member for Montmagny, from his place in the House made this formal charge against the then sitting member for Quebec West, the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, and the then Minister of Public Works, Sir Hector Langevin, and this is the opening paragraph of the charge :

That J. Israel Tarte, Esq., a member representing the electoral district of Montmagny in this House having declared from his seat in the House that he is credibly informed and that he believes he is able to establish by satisfactory evidence, that, &c.

And he charged the member for Quebec West and the Minister of Public Works of that date with misappropriation of the public funds to a colossal extent, with the connivance of the officials of the Public Works Department, the chief engineer of that department and he asked for a committee of the House to make an investigation, and the matter was referred to the Privileges and Elections Committee. And what was the result? The Hon. Thomas McGreevy was driven out of parliament; Sir Hector Langevin had to retire from public life, and officials of the department had to be dismissed because every allegation and statement charged by Mr. Tarte was abundantly proven before the committee. Then the Conservative government began to take alarm. They feared that if this was allowed to go on something would happen. I find that charges were made against other members in a similar way. On the 23rd of September, 1891, Mr. Lister rose in his place and made this charge against the then Postmaster General, Mr. Haggart :

In accordance with the notice I gave yesterday I beg to move that James Frederick Lister, Esq., member representing the electoral district of West Lambton in this House, having declared from his seat in this House that he is credibly informed and that he believes he is able to establish by satisfactory evidence, that, &c.

Mr. Lister then refers to a contract with certain gentlemen for certain railway construction and his charge continues :

The said contract and the works in connection therewith were completed by the said contractors, to whom they were a source of great profit.

During the whole period covered by the said contract, the Hon. John G. Haggart, now Postmaster General and a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada, was a member of the House of Commons for the south riding of Lanark, and still is such member.

That the said Hon. John G. Haggart became and was beneficially interested in the profits of said contract which accrued to the share thereof standing in the name of the said Peter McLaren, and has received large sums out of the said profits, and has otherwise derived direct and substantial pecuniary benefits therefrom.

Mr. Lister concluded by asking that the charge be referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections. But was that done? No ; that was refused. Notwithstanding the fact that a member stood up in his place in the House and taking the full responsibility upon his shoulders of such a charge and asking that it be referred to the Privileges and Elections Committee, that motion was refused by the then Conservative government and Conservative majority in this House, and I find amongst the members who voted that there should be no investigation into this charge, the names of the two Conservative members then representing the county I now represent, and I find the names also of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

I wonder if a Conservative member would rise in his place and make such a charge as that on his responsibility as a member of parliament and if the government should refuse to grant him investigation, what the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) would say.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not listening to the hon. gentleman. To what is he referring ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I am referring to the charge of James Frederick Lister, member of parliament, against the then Postmaster General. An investigation was refused by the Conservative government of that day. I was pointing out that should a similar charge be made from the opposite side to-day and this government were to refuse an investigation, the English language would not be strong enough to express the indignation of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Coming to the session of 1892, I find that Mr. Edgar, in his place in parliament, formulated a definite charge against the then Postmaster General, who was, I think, Sir Adolphe Caron. This is how Mr. Edgar proceeded:

On April 6, 1892, James D. Edgar, the member representing the electoral district of the west riding of Ontario, in this House, having stated from his place in this House, that he is credibly informed and believes that he can establish by satisfactory evidence, etc.

Then follows a long list of charges of corrupt association with a railway company in the province of Quebec, from which large sums of money, upwards of $100,000, were obtained for the corruption of the electorate of several districts in that province, and he asked that the charges be referred to the Privileges and Election Committee. Was that motion granted ? No, Sir, it was voted down by the government and their

supporters, and again I find among the Conservative members who voted down that motion the names of the hon. members for Kings, P.E.I. (Macdonald and McLean) the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). All these gentlemen voted down the motion. That was the way they showed their faith in pure administration and full and impartial investigation. But notwithstanding all the opposition made by Conservative members in the Public Accounts Committee to the efforts of the opposition of that day, notwithstanding all the attempts of the Conservative majority to stifle inquiry, so much was exposed that it shocked every civilized country in the world that knew anything about Canadian affairs. So discreditable were the revelations that Canadians residing abroad were ashamed of their country. The publicists of the old country cannot be accused of partisanship or political bias regarding Canadian affairs and they were not sparing in their comments. Let me read a few extracts from the leading British journals to show how public opinion in the old land was excited over the conditions that were shown to exist in this country :

The London 'Times'—Here in the mother country there can be only one feeling, that of deep regret for the wrong done to the fair fame of the eldest of her daughters.

London 'Graphic'—It is no longer possible to doubt that corruption in its worst form is rampant in a large portion of the Canadian civil service.

London 'Telegraph'—Enough, unfortunately, is already known in England to make it clear that only the most resolute and drastic purification can redeem public life in Canada from the taint of corruption, the like of which we have not seen in our own country for hundreds of years.

Birmingham 'Gazette'—Rascals out of office defraud the public in order to bribe rascals in office, and rascals in office prostitute themselves, sacrifice their honour and forsake their trust in order to keep on good terms with the rascals out of office.

London 'Echo'—No country can prosper where public departments are in league with fraudulent contractors, and where ministers are open to offers.

'St. James Gazette'—The existence of an organized system of corruption among public officials in Canada has been conclusively proved, and like everything else on the American continent, the bribery has been colossal.

The 'Graphic Despatch'—Even Tammany Hall smells sweet and clean in comparison with the huge stink-pot of the Conservative government.

Look upon that picture and then upon this. Look upon those days and then upon these.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. To-day the public men of Canada are respected in every country in the world and are commended in the mother land for the work they are doing. To-day Canada has become a Mecca to which the surplus population of Europe are flocking. To-day there is not a Canadian, whether he be Conservative or Liberal, who is not proud of her public record and her public men, if he wishes to declare what he honestly believes. But that was not the case in the days to which I have just referred. These are comparisons that we are not afraid to make, and they are comparisons which some hon. gentlemen opposite very unwisely induce us to make by the course they now pursue. So much for that part of the subject.

Our Conservative friends challenge the policy of this government particularly on two points. They say that our revenue is too large and that our expenditure is extravagant. Let us consider this question a few moments. The revenue of this country is large and it has largely increased since the Liberals obtained power, but the taxation of the country has been reduced since then. The rate of taxation has been reduced by some 14 per cent; and if we consider the fact that the taxation has been increased on spirituous liquors, tobacco and cigars, we will find that the taxation on the necessary and useful things of life has been reduced much more than 14 per cent, more likely 20 per cent. That is a very respectable reduction. I would like to see it greater, but it is very respectable, and it has been followed, as the Liberals in opposition predicted it would, by a great increase in revenue.

It is a strange thing that hon. gentlemen opposite should take exception to the large revenue and to the taxation as it now stands, and yet that during the eleven or twelve years they have been in opposition they have not once moved a resolution in this House that the taxation on any article should be reduced ; on the contrary, they have moved resolutions at various times that the taxation should be increased, and some of them have gone so far as to say that the taxes should be so increased that not a single article that can be made in this country could be imported. I think it was the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who said, in the course of one of his speeches, that the duty ought to be 100 per cent if necessary to exclude imports. Even this year, during the consideration of the French treaty, one of the objections brought by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) against that treaty was that it would reduce the taxation on several articles coming into this country and cause a falling off in the revenue of $400,000. While blaming the government for having so much revenue and so high a rate of taxation, these hon. gentlemen declare that, if they had power, they would increase the taxes. I cannot understand the position these hon. gentlemen take ; that position is

the best possible proof of insincerity and inconsistency, that could be given to the country. They are the descendants of Rehoboam of old. They say : The elder Tories chastised you with whips, but give us power and we will beat you with scorpions. Do they expect that the people of this country will be so foolish as to give them that opportunity ? They must surely give the people credit for having less intelligence than children. I think I can leave the question of taxation and revenue there.

Now, I come to the expenditure. If the expenditure is large, if it has increased under this government, it is because the government has provided liberally for the public service, whereas the public service was starved under the late administration. But let the people bear this well in mind—it is a fact familiar to every member of this House, but not known to all the electors—that not a dollar of that expenditure can be made until it has been voted by a committee of the Whole House at which every member of parliament is or ought to be present ; and every member has the right to object to any item in that appropriation and to move that is shall be struck out if he thinks it should not be there. And, during the twelve years that hon. gentlemen opposite have been in opposition, they have not moved to strike out one item in the appropriation Bill with the exception, that one year I believe they moved to strike out some $60,000. But, on the other hand, these hon. gentlemen have risen in their places time after time and year after year and declared that the appropriations are not large enough. Only a few days ago, when the estimates for the Militia Department were going through the House, member after member on the opposition side rose and said that the appropriations should be larger, that drill sheds and armouries should be built here and there all over the country. But even that is not all : A few days ago when the hon. member for North Toronto was speaking on this subject, he addressed himself to the enormous development in our foreign trade under the present administration. He said that, comparing the records of this year with those of 1896, inasmuch these returns are kept in dollars and cents and not in pounds, bushels, tons and yards, and as there had been a great advance in the prices of all commodities during the last decade, it was not fair to take the returns as made up in dollars and cents and compare them with the returns of 1896 without allowing for the increased value in the products of the country. I thought there was something reasonable in that statement—and I want to give hon. gentlemen opposite credit for every statement they make that is reasonable. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) made calculations to show that there had been an increase in the value of commodities to the extent of 28 per cent. So he deducted 28 per cent from the total returns, and said that the balance was what should be fairly compared with the trade returns for 1896 in order to make the comparison a fair one. Well, there was enough left even then to show an immense increase, a larger increase than at any other period in our national history—there was enough left to satisfy any Liberal. And I notice that some of the hon. gentlemen who sit behind the hon. member for North Toronto took their cue from him and said that our trade was not as large as it appeared to be from the returns. But they did not consider that, if this argument be sound, it completely cuts the ground from under their feet when they charge the present government with extravagance in the expenditure. For, if it is fair to make the deduction on one side, it is equally fair to make the deduction on the other side. Then, let us take the estimated expenditure for this year, the largest in our history. The estimated expenditure on consolidated fund account is $77,500,000. Deduct 28 per cent, and you bring the expenditure down to $55,800,000. Is this the only deduction that should be made in order to make a fair comparison ? No. The present government is called upon to make expenses that the previous government had not to provide for, and, in fairness, these should be deducted. I will not go over all these, I will take only two items. The subsidies to the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and the increase of subsidies to all the provinces means an increase of expenditure of $4,800,000. There is also the expense of keeping up the garrisons at Halifax and Esquimalt—about $2,000,000 more.

An hon. MEMBER. And the Yukon.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Yes, there is the Yukon, which is a new field of expenditure since this government came into power, but I will leave that and many other items aside. The two items I have already given make a total of about $6,800,000. If these be allowed for, the expenditure is brought down to $49,000,000. Is that an extravagant expenditure, considering the growth of the country ? If that is extravagant, then the late government, which expended $37,000,000 or $38,000,000 on consolidated fund account must not only have been guilty of gross extravagance, gross waste, gross prodigality, but even of gross dishonesty, for the public service at that time was starved and the government had to provide for comparatively little.

Why, Sir, it would not be unreasonable to suppose that the present expenditure of the country should be double or treble what it was in 1896. Take my own province for instance, with the conditions of which I am most familiar. We find the present government providing for a public service requir-

ing twice the expenditure of the late government. For instance, we have two ice-breaking steamers now where we had one before; it would be only fair therefore to expect that the expenditure under that head would be twice as great as it was. We have two dredges now where we had one before, dredging our harbours and rivers, a service that was greatly needed, and the new dredge is larger, more powerful and does better work than the old one. It would be only fair therefore to expect that the expenditure under that head should be twice as much as under the late administration. Take aids to navigation; lighthouses, buoys and all that kind of thing have been greatly improved. Take the Post Office Department. New post offices have been opened in many places, there are daily mails where there were tri-weekly or bi-weekly mails before, and there are tri-weekly mails where there were bi-weekly mails before. It would be only fair therefore to expect that the expenditure under that head should be greatly increased. Take the Railway Department. The late government in eighteen years built eleven miles of railway in my province, and they did practically nothing else with regard to railways. The present government have built sixty miles of railway, and have constructed one of the largest railway bridges in the Dominion of Canada, built costly and valuable terminals at Charlottetown and other places; it would be only fair to assume therefore that the expenditure under that head should be twelve, fifteen or perhaps twenty times greater than it was under the previous administration. And so I might go on through all the other services and all the other provinces, and particularly in the west, where conditions demand still greater expenditures perhaps than in the east. Yet we find using the argument of the hon. member for North Toronto, that the increase in the expenditure under the present administration, for the twelve years, has been eleven or twelve million dollars, or about a million dollars a year; and I find in looking over the public accounts that has been just about the increase for each year since confederation. Yet these gentlemen charge extravagance against the present administration, a charge that I think these figures completely refute. I cannot help mentioning a remark of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) who stated that the hon. member for North Toronto had made the campaign speech for the the Conservative party, and had brought forward everything that his fertile imagination and keen analytical mind could find against this government, and though he charged extravagance against them in every possible direction, he could only find in the whole twelve years about a million and a half dollars that he could fairly set down as extravagant or indefensible sums, or about one-twentieth of one per cent of the whole expenditure. The hon. member for South Wellington well said that if there was any government in the world that could produce a better showing than that, if there was any municipality or manager of any corporation who could come before his dirctors and make a better showing than that, he would deserve the thanks of his shareholders and directors.

Now, Sir, I wish to say a few words on another matter that was referred to, and that is the public debt. Here we have a record under the present administration that is unique in the history of this country. The public debt has actually been reduced some seven or eight dollars per head during the last ten or twelve years. The hon. member for North Toronto stated that that was a condition of affairs that should not exist; he stated the government should raise the taxation so high that it would be prohibitive upon certain articles, and thereby obtain a small revenue, and go abroad to borrow the money that would be required for the capital expenditure of the country. Of course he had to approve of that position, because he practised it when he was in power. But I find that the Montreal 'Gazette,' another leading organ supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, absolutely condemns that policy. It says that the revenues of this country should be so large that we would not have to borrow any money at all for any purpose, and that all the capital expenditure should be raised in the country. It is hard indeed to follow the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Every man seems to have a policy of his own. If you have ever been down by the seashore and watched four or five boys out in a boat trying to learn to row, each one dipping in his oar when it suited himself and splashing the water over everybody else, nobody in charge and everybody giving orders, and going astern as fast as ahead, it would fairly illustrate the position of the Conservative party at the present time. Each one has a policy to suit himself. The so-called Halifax platform hinted at public ownership of public utilities, and several other things of that kind. The Montreal 'Gazette' condemns that with bell, book and candle. The Toronto 'World' thinks it does not go quite far enough. The member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), the railway critic of the opposition, never heard of it. The Montreal 'Star,' a moderate supporter of the present administration, declares that it is nonsense. And so on, you can find anything you like in the policy of the Conservative party. Well, the record of this government as concerns the public debt is one that Liberals must certainly be proud of. It is a comparison that we like to make every time that we get a chance, because the previous government in eighteen years ran into debt to the extent of $118,000,000, or at the rate of six and a half millions each years, on which the present government has had to pay interest, and the people of this country will have to pay in-

terest probably for many years to come. That is the reason these loans have to be renewed, and that is the reason why the present minister has got to go to the markets of Europe and borrow money to meet the obligations and pay interest on the debt incurred by the previous administration.

Now I wish to say a word or two with regard to the much talked-of balance of trade question. It is a question that I do not think we can settle very readily; at all events, as hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have discussed it, perhaps I might say a few words about it too. I had the temerity to make a few observations on that question in the early part of the present session, and they have been criticised somewhat. I also put a question to the hon. member for North Toronto relating to that subject, and he said he would answer it later on, but I think he forgot to do so. At all events the hon. member for North Toronto, I must say, has the soundest views upon that question of any member upon that side of the House. Referring to the question of the balance of trade he made this statement:

> We have got to pay our balances; we cannot run credit from year to year on them. Now, they can only be paid either in goods or in gold, and whichever it is it is our export trade which in the final analysis has to pay our bills and we have nothing else to pay them with.

I take that statement as being correct, and I presume that the hon. gentleman will not question it; now it goes to prove that all our imports are paid for, consequently we are not in debt. We have not exported gold to pay for them; we have not drawn upon our reserves to pay for them because we find that our reserves, public and private are increasing very rapidly. We find that the gold reserve of the country is also increasing very rapidly. The gold reserve in the banks and with the government in 1896 was only $18,562,000, while last year it had reached the figures of $67,186,000, or nearly four times as much. Now, Sir, it will take a great deal of figuring by the political economists of Brantford and Wentworth to prove to a merchant who found that he was doing business that he was increasing his stock, that he was increasing the sale of his goods, who had his goods paid for, who found that the balance at his credit in the bank was largely increasing that he was doing business at a loss. The hon. member for Brantford made some very peculiar remarks upon this subject, and I think I will pass them over, because to do the hon. gentleman justice I do not think he understands the question. But the hon. member for Wentworth also had some remarks to make; he dwelt upon this subject at great length and he made a veritable discovery. These gentlemen, when they undertake to speak upon this question, find it very difficult to support their contention with reference to the balance of trade, as they call it, when the imports of all the progressive countries in Europe are much larger than the exports, while in the non-progressive nations the exports are larger than the imports. They find it very difficult to explain that away, particularly in regard to Great Britain. But the hon. member for Wentworth made this discovery: He said that from 1750 down to 1850 the exports of Great Britain were very much larger than the imports and he made the discovery that in 1840 or 1850, or thereabouts, the people of Great Britain had $4,500,000,000 to invest. He said that money invested at four per cent would double itself every twenty years; he went on to make a calculation and he doubled that money to $9,000,000,000; he doubled it again to $18,000,000,000, and I think he would have gone on further had he not run out of figures. But where he found that $4,500,000,000 no man knows. He did not tell us on what authority he made the statement. Any person who would seriously make a statement that the commercial prosperity and financial standing of Great Britain anti-dated the Repeal of the Corn laws or anti-dated the time when the imports of the country greatly exceeded its exports—well, there is no use arguing with him. He should be given in charge of a kindly keeper who would be told to be good to him. Why, Sir, does not every man know that the arguments—the unanswerable, irresistible arguments—of Cobden, Bright and their associates would not have prevailed with the people and the government of Great Britain at the time they did were it not for the universal distress which existed, the financial ruin that was impending and the starving masses of people who cried for bread when bread could not be found for them? The whole commercial and financial prosperity of Great Britain dates from 1850 or thereabouts; everybody who knows anything at all about the history of Great Britain will admit that, and any man who makes a contrary statement does not know or does not care what kind of a statement he makes.

There is, however, one country in the world which affords hon. gentlemen opposite some consolation. For many years the exports of the United States of America have been much larger than the imports and it has been one of the great, progressive nations of the world. But the progress of that country, I hold, is not due to its foreign trade, but due to the enormous internal development, the development of almost illimitable natural resources and the exceedingly large immigration into that country of the best blood of Europe, the young, the strong, the vigorous, the hardy, the energetic and the ambitious from every country in the world. But the hon. member for North Toronto has supplied an argument which will go a long way to show why the exports of

that country are greater than its imports. The people of the United States have become very wealthy in consequence, I believe, of their internal trade and their great internal development. The hon. member for North Toronto referred to that. Wealthy Americans are now residing permanently abroad or travelling in large numbers. The hon. gentleman said that millions upon millions went out of that county every year to support these gentlemen in other countries. All the bills of exchange which are drawn upon London banks generally and which are sent to these gentlemen to support them in the various countries of Europe, or in Canada, or wherever they may reside or travel, have to be met by the exports of the country. That is the argument of the hon. member for North Toronto. It is not original, but it is sound. It would be difficult indeed to tell how many millions this sum amounts to. There is another large item to which the hon. member for North Toronto did not allude. I have reference to the millions of people, young, energetic, vigorous, ambitious, strong, healthy, hardy, coming from every country in the world, but particularly from Europe, who make their homes in the United States of America. They generally succeed there and they generally leave behind them poor, needy, indigent relatives to whom they send monthly, quarterly, or yearly remittances. These remittances may be small in individual cases, but in the aggregate they amount to immense sums. I know some banks in Boston and New York which have not much other business except the selling of these small drafts which are remitted to European countries, and yet these banks do a very large business. How many million dollars go out in that way I do not know, but it must be met by the exports of the country. Whether these two items will be in themselves sufficient to account for the balance of trade, I do not know, but I do know they would be sufficient to account for a very large part of it. So much for the balance of trade. When we find ourselves with our reserves increasing; with the deposits in the savings banks and the chartered banks increasing also, with an increase in the manufactured products of this country and in the manufacturing plants which turn out these products; when we find an increase in farm machinery, an increase in capital of every kind and degree; when we find that going on all over Canada we can very safely assume that we are doing a profitable business.

Now, Sir, a word or two with regard to the Transcontinental Railway. Some of these hon. gentlemen opposite have been so unfair as to try to make it appear that the right hon. the Prime Minister stated that $13,000,000 would build the Transcontinental Railway. Of course they know better. They know that was a misrepresentation of the grossest kind on the part of whoever accused the Prime Minister of making such a statement. Even the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in speaking upon the question and in referring to this very case said that he believed the cost would be nearer $30,000,000 than $13,000,000, and taking it for granted that the hon. member (Mr. Foster) was right let us consider what we will have for this $30,000,000 when we have the Transcontinental Railway. Compare that bargain with the bargain made by the Conservative government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. They gave the Canadian Pacific Railway 25,000,000 acres of land, over $63,000,000 of dollars in cash and completed railway ; they gave the Canadian Pacific Railway an empire in land and the revenues of a kingdom in cash. And besides the Conservative government gave the Canadian Pacific Railway other enormous privileges such as the privilege of exemption from taxation of all the property of the railway for ever in this country; they gave the Canadian Pacific Railway the privilege of exemption from taxation on all their land for 20 years after the patents had been issued ; they gave them the privilege of importing free of duty all the material that entered into the construction of the road. And, Sir, when the railway was completed we did not own a rail or a tie of it, and we denuded ourselves of control over the freight rates until the Canadian Pacific Railway had reached the point when it earned 10 per cent on its capital. On the other hand take the bargain that the Liberal government made with the Grand Trunk Pacific and even supposing the cost of it to be $30,000,000 as stated by the hon. member for North Toronto; still that is less than two years surplus under Liberal rule. And what have we got for that? We have got a railway from ocean to ocean opening up town sites, and bringing into development millions of acres of mineral lands, and timber lands, and rich agricultural lands, and along whose line hundreds of thousands of Canadians will settle and make homes, and become producers and consumers and return to the exchequer of this country many many times over, the cost of that railway. We have not given a grant of one acre of land to the Grand Trunk Pacific outside of what is absolutely necessary for the road beds and terminals, and when that railroad is finished we will own it from Winnipeg to Moncton, and it will be an asset of this country for all future years. Compare that bargain made by this government with the bargain which the Conservatives made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Sir, I do not think there is any one thing which will show the present government to better advantage than will that comparison. I believe that Canadians yet unborn and cities yet unbuilt will do honour to the memory of the man who had the courage, the knowledge, the wisdom, the prescience to conceive and carry through this great scheme; a

scheme that actually gives us another Canada that gives transportation facilities to the great west, that opens up the hinterland of our country, and which will contribute largely to the greatness of the noble country Canada is destined to be.

Mr. A. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) It was not my intention to take part in this debate, for indeed I was of the opinion some days ago that it had already extended beyond the usual term of debates on this very important question. But, when I heard my learned friend from Kings (Mr. J. J. Hughes) make such a halting and rambling speech about some things which he knew very little about and some other things which were not exactly to the point, I thought I would say a few words in reply to him. He commenced by talking about Sir Mackenzie Bowell and his cabinet of some years ago.

An hon. MEMBER. Ancient history.

Mr. A. A. MARTIN. Very ancient history. He gave us some ancient history which was not very true and some modern history which was not history at all. Just think of comparing the cabinet of Sir Mackenzie Bowell with the Liberal cabinet which has existed since 1896. Why, Sir, the men who were in the cabinet of Sir Mackenzie Bowell left a record which stands high in the history of this country and they went out of power without any one ever thinking of making charges against them such as have been made and proven against members of the Liberal cabinet. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. J. Hughes) referred to the balance of trade. Now, I believe it to be true that when a man knows very little about a thing he can talk for a long time about it, and the less he knows about it the longer he will talk. An American statesman was once asked how long he could speak on a certain subject and his reply was: If I know a little about it, I would only speak for fifteen minutes, but if I know nothing about it I could speak for three days. That is the position of my hon. friend (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in regard to the balance of trade. His first statement amounted to this, that the larger the balance of trade against a country the more prosperous that country would become. I suppose, if the hon. gentleman were a member of the government he would have a paragraph in the speech from the Throne, put into the mouth of the Governor General to the effect: We are most pleased to see that the balance of trade against us is largely increasing every year; we are also pleased to see that the imports have largely increased, that the exports have largely decreased and we look to the day when the exports will vanish altogether and the country then will be prosperous indeed. I suppose these are the happy days my hon. friend would be glad to see. I suppose if he ever gets into the cabinet he will have that statement in his speech from the Throne, although I have not yet made up my mind as to whether he is looking for a portfolio or a seat in the Senate, but I think from the prosy speech he has delivered to-day the Senate would be the proper place for him.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the tunnel?

Mr. A. A. MARTIN (Queens). The hon. gentleman did not mention the tunnel. He was strong on the transcontinental railway but he never said a word about his own province. In season and out of season he is here praising this government and I suppose they will have to reward him. If not they ought to. I wish to point out something which is very remarkable in his speech. He said that the revenue and the expenditure of the country had increased nearly three-fold but the taxation had decreased 14 per cent. Can you, Mr. Speaker, can any member of this House, can any sane member or any insane member for that matter, lay down the proposition that the revenue has increased nearly three-fold and the expenditure fully three-fold, and the taxation has decreased 14 per cent. I do not think I need dwell very long on that. The hon. member spoke of the stringency, he steered clear of it, but he would tell us that this country is very prosperous. I beg to give him some recent figures as to the financial condition of this country. I have here the latest returns of business failures in Canada. They show a heavy increase in the number of failures and in the liabilities of the insolvents. I shall read these returns to the House to show just how much the hon. gentleman knows about the financial situation:

Insolvencies in Dominion of Canada during the first quarter of 1908, according to returns of R. G. Dun & Company, were abnormally heavy, exceeding the returns for the corresponding month in every year of the preceding decade, and there was also a new record as to number of failures.

Liabilities heavy.

The 512 defaults for $5,036,993, compared with 320 failures last year, when liabilities were $2,976,695. Manufacturing failures numbered 133, against 89, and liabilities were $2,195,463, against $1,491,296. There were 362 trading failures for $2,732,318, against 229 last year, when the amount involved was $1,255,149.

Other commercial failures numbered 17, against 7, and liabilities of $109,122 made the only favourable comparison with last year's returns, when the amount of defaulted indebtedness was $230,250.

Ontario leads list.

Comparison by provinces shows an increase over last year's figures in every instance as to amount of liabilities, the chief difference occurring in Ontario, Quebec and Alberta.

Failures in Canada.

| Province. | Number. 1908. | Number. 1907. | Liabilities. 1908. | Liabilities. 1907. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ontario.. .. .. | 200 | 129 | $2,040,840 | $1,476,689 |
| Quebec.. .. .. | 216 | 135 | 2,059,746 | 1,190,575 |
| British Columbia.. .. .. .. | 12 | 11 | 101,630 | 81,389 |
| Nova Scotia .. | 14 | 12 | 80,800 | 39,580 |
| Manitoba.. .. .. | 9 | 11 | 209,100 | 57,300 |
| New Brunswick .. .. .. | 10 | 12 | 102,500 | 67,812 |
| Prince Edward Island.. .. .. | 1 | 1 | 25,000 | 2,300 |
| Alberta.. .. .. | 50 | 9 | 417,287 | 61,050 |
| Total.. .. .. | 512 | 320 | $5,036,903 | $2,976,695 |

The hon. gentleman might well attribute this great increase in the number and extent of the failures to the balance of trade against the country not being large enough. I need not dwell on these figures, comment is unnecessary.

The hon. gentleman spoke of what this great government is doing but he carefully refrained from referring to live issues. I would suppose from hearing him speak that he felt it necessary to speak in order to say something in favour of the government, so that the government at the proper time would reward him for the praise he has so lavishly bestowed on them in season and out of season. He did not refer to the Quebec bridge, to the Civil Service Report, to Merwin, to the 'Arctic' or to graft, but he said that the government had decreased the duty on tobacco, cigars and cigarettes. I was not aware that they had reduced the duty on tobacco. I think the Finance Minister this year announced in the House that they had reduced the duty on cigarettes. It may be that by the French treaty they have reduced the duty on French wines.

I expected that a gentleman from my province would, as I have said, have referred to some live questions. There is, for instance, the coasting trade in the maritime provinces, a very live question. Did the hon. gentleman refer to it? He was as silent as an oyster in regard to it. Did he refer to the minute of council passed by the government of Prince Edward Island of which he is an ardent admirer and supporter, taking this government to task for non fulfilment of the terms of confederation in respect to that province? Did he refer to the grievances of Prince Edward Island which are questions of intense interest there? I hold in my hand a letter addressed to me by the legislative council of Prince Edward Island on this subject. These are live questions. My hon. friend has just left his seat; I hope I did not drive him away, I tried to treat him as leniently and kindly as I possibly could under the circumstances and I thought he would stand fire. This letter refers to a matter in reference to which he might have been of some service to his province. This letter reads:

Mr. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.).

Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island,
March 27, 1908.

Alex. Martin, Esq.,
House of Commons.

Dear Sir,—Acting under instructions of the legislative assembly of this province, I beg to inclose a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by this House, and am requested to ask that the matter referred to receive your most earnest and immediate attention.

Yours respectfully,
R. H. MONTGOMERY,
Clerk of the legislative assembly, Prince Edward Island.

I have here the resolution adopted by the legislature of that province. One would suppose from listening to the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. J. J. Hughes) that there is nothing wrong in the province of Prince Edward Island, that all that is wanted is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. J. Hughes) should be properly looked after himself and if he gets all he wants the province may whistle, as far as he is concerned. I intend to rise in my place and advocate the wants and needs of my province, in season or out of season. Here is a copy of the resolution:

Resolution passed unanimously by the legislative assembly of Prince Edward Island, March, 1908.

Resolved, that this legislature, recognizing the difficulties and loss entailed to owners and charterers of sailing vessels, also to the commerce of coal in this province, on account of the preference habitually given to steam tonnage as distinguished from sailing vessels, at the piers of the leading collieries in Nova Scotia, in the matter of loading coal cargoes, respectively request the government of Nova Scotia to exercise such powers as may be within its rights, to secure fair and equitable treatment for the sailing vessels at such piers and if those powers be inadequate to the end proposed, recommend that said government have recourse to the federal authorities, with a view to securing the rights and privileges in question.

Further resolved, that this legislative assembly respectfully request the federal government to pass such legislation, if necessary, as will give to sailing and steam tonnage equal rights in their proper loading turns at the coal ports in Nova Scotia.

Now, this is a live question, but my hon. friend (Mr. J. J. Hughes) left aside all such questions and went into ancient history. There is nothing that he asked for Prince Edward Island. His speech is in effect: The government is doing just lovely. He talks about the Grand Trunk Pacific and the service it is doing. What service is it doing for his own province? Has he been sent up here to advocate the Grand Trunk Pacific at this late day? And has he told us of the increased cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific—that it has increased ten-fold? He talks about having this railway from the west to Moncton. He says, further, that the government are going to provide a new steamer for Prince Edward Island;

and he accounts for the increase in our public expenditure from $40,000,000 to $110,000,000 by the fact that the government are going to build this new steamer for Prince Edward Island. Did you ever hear anything so logical as that, Mr. Speaker? Mind you, this expenditure has not yet been made, and this new vessel not yet provided. And I am not sure that we are any nearer to having the vessel now then we were three years ago when the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) was in office. The whole expenditure, when it is made, will be about $300,000 or $400,000. And such an expenditure which has not yet been made, is used by the hon. gentleman to account for an increase of $60,000,000 or $70,000,000 in our national expenditure.

Nor did the hon. gentleman say anything about the fact that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) was anxious to go to Toronto, which is a good Conservative city, and survey for a tunnel to serve a small island having on it about fourteen voters—at least, that is what I have heard. My hon. friend, apparently, is quite willing that the government should survey for a tunnel between Toronto and this island with fourteen people and do it at once. And why? Because the president of the Reform Association, Mr. Haney, accompanied the deputation here. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. J. Hughes) had not anything to say about survey for a tunnel under the straits of Northumberland which was promised to the province of Prince Edward Island some thirty-five years ago. This is a fair sample of what the hon. gentleman stood up to speak for. It is evidently a speech to get him in good graces of the ministry, so that if there is a vacancy—But I do not know whether they would take him in or not, but there may be a vacancy somewhere else. I had not intended to speak, but I thought that a few words in reply to the hon. gentleman for Kings (Mr. J. J. Hughes) would be in order.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

An hon. MEMBER. Call in the government.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). We had understood that there were several gentlemen yet to speak, and the officials, not anticipating the close of the debate, are not here at the moment. We have sent for them.

Mr. TAYLOR. I had just arranged with the Whip on the other side that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) was to follow the last speaker.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not offering an opinion as to who ought or ought not to speak——

Mr. TAYLOR. And then we had a gentleman ready either to speak or move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FIELDING. We are not objecting. We are quite content.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is the arrangement that was made.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I was not aware of the arrangement. I should have been very happy to proceed on it.

Mr. TAYLOR. We on this side are very much surprised that hon gentlemen opposite did not keep on obstructing by putting up gentlemen to speak for three or four hours each, as has been done for the last few days. We limited our speeches, but apparently hon. gentlemen on the other side wanted to obstruct the business. We are glad that they have come to their senses.

Mr. FIELDING. It is proposed to take up the proposed resolution of Mr. Templeman in relation to the tobacco duties.

On the resolutions:

Resolved, that it is expedient that the Inland Revenue Act be amended as follows:—

1. That section 275 of the said Act be repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

275. The person in whose favour a license for manufacturing tobacco or cigars is granted, shall, upon receiving such license pay to the collector the sum of fifty dollars.

2. That section 279 of the said Act be repealed, and the following substituted therefor:—

279. There shall be imposed, levied and collected on tobacco and cigars manufactured in Canada, the following duties of excise, which shall be paid to the collector as by this Act provided, that is to say:—

(a) on all chewing and smoking tobacco, fine-cut, cavendish, plug or twist, cut or granulated, of every description—on tobacco twisted by hand or reduced into a condition to be consumed or, in any manner other than the ordinary mode of drying and curing, prepared for sale or consumption, even if prepared without the use of any machine or instrument and without being pressed or sweetened—and on all fine-cut shorts and refuse scraps, cuttings and sweepings of tobacco made from raw leaf tobacco or the product in any form, other than in this Act otherwise provided, of raw leaf tobacco five cents per pound actual weight;

(b) on common Canada twist, when made solely from tobacco grown in Canada, and on the farm and premises where grown, by the cultivator duly licensed therefor or in a licensed tobacco manufactory five cents per pound actual weight;

(c) on all snuff made from raw leaf tobacco, or the product in any form of raw leaf tobacco, or any substitute for tobacco, ground, dry, scented or otherwise, of all descriptions, when prepared for use, five cents per pound actual weight;

(d) snuff flour, when sold or removed for use or consumption, shall pay the same duty as snuff, and shall be put up in packages and

stamped in the same manner as herein prescribed for snuff completely manufactured—except that snuff flour not made for use, but which needs to be subject to further processes, by sifting, pickling, scenting or otherwise, before it is in a condition fit for use or consumption, may be sold by one tobacco manufacturer directly to another tobacco manufacturer, and without the payment of the duty, under such regulations as are provided in that behalf by the department;

(e) on cigars of all descriptions, made from raw leaf tobacco, or any substitute therefor, two dollars per thousand;

(f) on all cigars, when put up in packages containing less than ten cigars each, three dollars per thousand;

(g) on cigarettes made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor weighing not more than three pounds per thousand, two dollars and forty cents per thousand;

(h) on cigarettes made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor, weighing more than three pounds per thousand, seven thousand dollars per thousand;

(i) on all foreign raw leaf tobacco, unstemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, twenty-eight cents per pound, computed according to the standard of leaf tobacco as hereinbefore established;

(j) on all foreign raw leaf tobacco, stemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, forty-two cents per pound, computed according to the standard of leaf tobacco as hereinbefore established.

3. In all tobacco manufactories where less than fifty per cent of Canadian raw leaf tobacco is used and where ten per cent or more of other materials is used, such materials shall be subject to a duty of sixteen cents per pound actual weight.

4. All stemmed and unstemmed raw leaf tobacco and all materials and articles the product in whole or in part of raw leaf tobacco which are in process of manufacture in any tobacco or cigar manufactory licensed to use foreign raw leaf tobacco shall, in addition to the duty already paid upon the raw leaf be subject to the difference between the rate so paid and that hereby imposed and all other materials in stock in any factory at the time this Act comes into force shall under the conditions of subsection 2 of this section, be subject to the rate of duty therein mentioned; and the quantity upon which such additional duty shall be paid as well as the quantity upon which the percentage of such other materials shall be based shall be determined in such manner as the department directs.

All manufactured tobacco and cigars in bond at the time of the coming into force of this Act shall be subject to the rates of duty thereon now existing, and such rates of duty shall remain in effect so long as any goods to which they apply remain in the bonded warehouse of the manufacturer or any person.

5. That sections 280 and 281 of the said Act be repealed.

6. That an amendment be made requiring manufacturers of wood alcohol to take out a license and to pay therefor an annual fee of one dollar.

7. That the rates of duty hereby imposed shall come into force and effect upon such day as the Governor General by proclamation directs.

Mr. BERGERON. Was there a deputation here the other day to see the goverument about changes in the excise, and what was the answer of the government?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. A delegation of cigar manufacturers presented their views, more in respect to the effect of the withdrawal of duty on exported cuttings than with regard to any other portion of the resolution. I heard all they had to say; they were very fair in their views, and on the whole I think approved of the resolution as printed. I have already explained to the House that the object of the resolution is to collect the tax on the raw leaf tobacco rather than on the manufactured article. We are to have now one stamp and one license for manufacturers. It was felt that the exchange was in the interest of the tobacco growers of Canada, because the effect of the present regulations was to discourage the growing and consumption of Canadian tobacco by reason of the fact that the use of three labels operated prejudicially against the use of Canadian tobacco. That is the object of the change in the method of collecting the revenue. The change will not impose any new taxation whatever, rather there will be a slight reduction. Calculating the revenue collected under this proposed arrangement and comparing it with the revenue collecetd in 1906, taking the same quantity of manufactured tobacco as was taken in that year, the loss of revenue will be $30,000 or $40,000, divided between cigars and tobacco. The object kept in view in fixing the rates of duty, as given in the resolution, was to collect the same amount of revenue, not to increase it or diminish it in any way. On the whole, I think the duties will be slightly lower than they were before, but not to any appreciable extent.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the revenue be less or more?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Less by $30,000 or $40,000.

Mr. BRISTOL. Has the department any protest from anybody against this change on the ground that the purchaser would not be able to tell whether he was buying a Canadian cigar or an imported cigar?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, not in the way the hon. gentleman puts it. The proposal to abolish the four coloured stamps has been before the country for a long time. At one time, and up to a recent date, the manufacturers of foreign tobacco did certainly object to the proposed change, inasmuch as they thought that the removal of the four stamps, or the use of one stamp instead of four, would militate against their particular product. The manufacturers of foreign tobacco, for instance, have a black

stamp. Up till last year they objected to the use of only one stamp, but this year the leading tobacco manufacturers, or some of them, came to Ottawa and represented that in so far as their opposition to the one stamp was concerned they withdrew it, inasmuch as they recognized the fact that one stamp would inevitably have to be adopted. But so long as the changes in the duties did not increase the amount of taxation they had to pay, they would have no longer an objection to the adoption of one stamp.

Mr. BRISTOL. I have had a strong protest from one or more cigarmaking unions objecting to the change to one stamp.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have been speaking rather of the manufacturers and holders of licenses. It is quite true that from one or two cities, I remember London particularly, we have received some protest against the adoption of the one stamp.

Mr. BERGERON. Any protest from Montreal?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We might have had some, but, as a matter of fact, some of the manufacturers of tobacco in Montreal have been strong advocates of the one stamp, just as the farmers both in Quebec and Ontario have been strong advocates of this proposed change. The change is made in the interest of the growers of Canadian tobacco. The opposition to the one stamp has been practically removed. I presume the union men who make the cigars feared that the manufacturers of Canadian tobacco and cigars would make a cheaper article, and a cheaper article would imply lower wages.

Mr. BERGERON. It will have the effect then of encouraging the cultivation of a better Canadian tobacco in the raw leaf than before? What is the object of the change in the law? Perhaps the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could explain the situation.

Mr. BRODEUR. The object of the change in the law is to give the Canadian growers of tobacco a better advantage. We have had heretofore four stamps affixed upon tobacco. There is a blue stamp affixed upon tobacco imported from foreign countries; then we have a black stamp which is affixed upon foreign tobacco manufactured in this country; then we have the red stamp which is affixed upon tobacco composed of foreign leaf and Canadian leaf; then we have the Canadian leaf upon which we put a green stamp.

Mr. BERGERON. The colour of the stamp would show the purchaser what kind of tobacco it was?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not necessarily, because under the law as it exists to-day, the tobacco manufactured may contain not only foreign leaf, but also Canadian leaf.

Mr. BERGERON. That will be against the law.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it is according to the existing law. Providing the manufacturers pay the duty levied on foreign leaf, they can use Canadian leaf with it. It is to a certain extent a deception on the people. The first question that may be raised in connection with that is this: Is it advisable that the government should put upon a manufactured article a trade mark, or is it advisable that the trade mark should be provided by the manufacturers themselves? To-day, manufactured tobacco bears a stamp which, in some cases, as in the case of the blue stamp, shows that it is a foreign article, but in case of tobacco manufactured in this country the black stamp put upon the tobacco does not necessarily show that it is manufactured entirely of foreign leaf. Is it advisable, I repeat, that the government should maintain, upon tobacco, what I might call a trade mark? This is not a question appertaining to the government; it is a matter which the manufacturers themselves should see to. If they want to advertise or to make a certain manufactured article well known let them adopt a trade mark, and put their product upon the country with that trade mark, but I do not think it is advisable that the government should themselves provide the trade mark for this article. We do not do it in any other case. With respect to woollens or any other manufactured article there is nothing in the law which permits the government of the country to put a trade mark upon these articles. The present arrangement has been to a certain extent detrimental to the Canadian article. Formerly Canadian tobacco was not perhaps as good as it is to-day. It was covered by the green stamp and the idea prevails in many parts of the country that when you see a plug of tobacco or a box of cigars covered by the green stamp it means that it may be interpreted as not being a good article, although I may say in all fairness to the Canadian producer that Canadian tobacco has been greatly improved. This prejudice which existed against Canadian tobacco has been detrimental to it and there is no reason why the government should continue to maintain that prejudice by continuing the use of that stamp.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it on account of the colour of the stamp?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. The green stamp?

Mr. BRODEUR. The green stamp.

Mr. SPROULE. Well then, why not make it orange?

Mr. BRODEUR. Perhaps that is a good suggestion.

Mr. BERGERON. They would not smoke it on St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. BRODEUR. It would be a good mixture. The question has been brought up what kind of a stamp would be used in future. I do not think the department has decided what kind of stamp will be used, but there will be only one stamp for all kinds of tobacco. I think that is an improvement upon the late law and it will prove of great benefit to the Canadian grower.

Mr. MONK. There is no doubt that the substitution of one for the three different stamps that existed before has been sought for a long time in the interest of the growth of Canadian tobacco, and there is no doubt that the invidious distinction between the stamps was detrimental to Canadian tobacco. The removal of the distinction, is, I think, a step in the right direction. I want to ask if the change in the duty itself is intended to secure any advantage for the Canadian grown tobacco or is it just a change without that object in view and how it is proposed to attain the object by that change ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The advantage that it will be to Canadian grown tobacco is that hereafter there will be but one license and all tobacco, Canadian and foreign, can be taken into the same factory and mixed up in any way the manufacturers please. They can either make all Canadian cigars or tobacco or all foreign, or a combination of both, putting any percentage of either of these tobaccos into their manufacture they please.

Mr. BERGERON. The smoker will have to be the judge ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The smoker will have to be the judge, according to the quality of the tobacco, the size and the name of the manufacture. I do not believe that smokers of cigars are very much influenced by the label. To some extent they may be but we all know that blue label cigars are supposed to be the best because they are manufactured in Cuba almost altogether and imported into this country. Notwithstanding the blue label there is an enormous lot of very poor cigars sold under that stamp and we now propose to let the smoker decide from the manufacturer's name, or the brand rather than from the colour of the label. One stamp will apply hereafter. The manufacturers of cigars will sell their goods under the stamp and name of the manufacturer and not by the fact that they have a particular inland revenue label upon them.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you no provision to make them indicate what proportion of Canadian and what proportion of foreign leaf these goods contain ?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. None whatever.

Mr. SPROULE. Can they manufacture Canadian tobacco and sell it under the name of foreign ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Certainly ; they can put any brand they please upon it. It will simply be tobacco. The invidious distinction referred to by my hon. friend lies in the fact that Canadian tobacco cannot be taken to-day into factories licensed to manufacture foreign tobacco because we could not collect our revenue. The reason why three or four different stamps are required is because the rates of duty are different on foreign and Canadian grown tobacco.

Mr. BLAIN. There was a reference made to a reduction of duty on tobacco by an hon. gentleman in the discussion to-day. May I ask the minister if this change will have any effect upon the price to the consumer ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, the rate of taxation is practically the same as it was before.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask also how it will affect the production of cigarettes ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It will bring about the same revenue as we derive from cigarettes under the operation of the existing law.

Mr. BLAIN. We understand then that the changes that the minister is making will in no way affect the price either of cigarettes or tobacco to the Canadian consumer ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I think that is right.

Mr. BRISTOL. Do I understand the minister to say that he has fully considered the protests of the cigar union workers and is of the opinion that this will not affect the wages of the makers of cigars ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, that is my conviction.

Mr. BEATTIE. A number of my constituents are very much interested in the cigar manufacturing business, and I think I am safe in saying that they are opposed strongly to the new regulation which the government proposes to introduce. I may say that London is the second largest cigar manufacturing city in the Dominion and I have here a document signed by the cigar manufacturers of that city and of other cities, protesting against this new policy of the government. It is pointed out that the purchasers of cigars, under this new regulation will not be able to tell, as far as the stamp is concerned, whether they are buying cigars made from Canadian tobacco or cigars made from partly Canadian and partly foreign leaf, or cigars made altogether from imported leaf. In future the

man who buys a cigar will have to depend altogether upon the word of the merchant who sells it, unless indeed it so happens that the purchaser is an expert judge of tobacco. I am not much of a smoker myself, but I know the hon. minister is and probably he might be able to tell of what particular tobacco a cigar is composed, but the ordinary man will have to buy his cigar and light and test it before he is able to tell the quality.

Mr. BRODEUR. In future the cigars will be sold on their own merits.

Mr. BEATTIE. That may be true, but nevertheless the change which is being made is represented as inconvenient and detrimental to the interests of those gentlemen who have forwarded this document to me. I would point out to the minister that Canadian apples, Canadian cheese, and Canadian butter when sent to a foreign market are branded so that the consumers of these articles may be assured that they are of good quality, but in the case of cigars and tobacco you apparently leave the door open to the encouragement of deception. It would appear to be a reasonable proposition to say, that our own people have just as much right to protection with regard to the quality of the articles they buy as have the consumers in foreign countries. This is the petition to which I refer:

The cigar manufacturers, who use foreign leaf exclusively, have learned through the public press that it is the intention of the Dominion Government to consider the advisability of changing the duties at present levied upon raw leaf imported into Canada and the excise duties upon cigars made in Canada; and to consider also the advisability of substituting a uniform stamp for the different stamps now in use. In view of these statements they desire respectfully to lay the following facts and considerations before your Honourable Commission:

1. For many years the government has issued blue stamps for cigars imported into Canada, black stamps for cigars manufactured in Canada, wholly from imported leaf, red stamps for cigars made of a mixture of foreign and domestic leaf, and green stamps for cigars made wholly of Canadian tobacco.

2. Canadian public has become acquainted with the uses to which the various stamps are applied, and know the character of the cigars by the colour of the stamps.

3. In the year ending June 30, 1905, 2,262,400 cigars were manufactured in Canada wholly from Canadian tobacco and 7,221,760 from a mixture of foreign and domestic leaf. Five per cent of the cigars made in Canada were composed wholly or partly of tobacco grown in the country; and the number so composed was less than the number made in the previous year.

4. In 1905 the cigars made in Canada wholly from foreign leaf numbered 176,626,617.

5. The cigars manufactured in Canada from foreign tobacco are made chiefly of Havana fillers, binders purchased in the state of Wisconsin, and wrappers grown in the Island of Sumatra.

6. The substitution of a uniform stamp for the distinguishing stamps now in use would work very serious injury to manufacturers and also to consumers of cigars. The distinctive character of the various classes would not be, as new, apparent to the purchaser, and the imposition would be easy. Unscrupulous dealers could 'and some doubtless would' deceive customers as to the character of the cigars offered them.

7. All manufacturers are earnestly desirous that the growth of tobacco in Canada should be encouraged and the character of the Canadian product improved; but the manufacturers are of the opinion that many years of experiment and encouragement must elapse before satisfactory results can be attained. It is certain that domestic tobacco will be used just as soon as its quality warrants such use; but the fact that domestic leaf is now being used for cigar making in lessening quantities is proof that the article now grown in this country does not commend itself to consumers. It would be a mistake to endeavour by legislation to force upon the public tobacco of a grade they do not desire. The object should be, not to compel the people to use inferior tobacco, but to improve the article until it shall be satisfactory to consumers.

8. The manufacturers are decidely of opinion that the government should conduct experiments in tobacco growing in order to determine the quality of seed best suited to our soil and climate, the nature of the soils and the parts of the country in which the best tobacco can be grown, the fertilizers needed, and the methods of growth and of curing which ought to be followed. The magnitude of the interests involved, and the results likely to follow, would undoubtedly warrant the expenditures necessary for such experiments.

It would appear from this document which is signed by 79 manufacturers, that the cigar manufacturers are strongly of opinion that the policy of the government in this respect is not conducive to the best interests of their trade. I know personally from them that they are very strongly of opinion that this change should not be made. The cigar manufacturers wish to remain in just the position they are at present, and if the government can see their way to allow the present condition to continue I am sure the manufacturers would be very much pleased.

Mr. CLARKE. I regret that I cannot agree in this matter with my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie). I think the very best argument in favour of the change proposed by this resolution is the fact that it is opposed by the manufacturers of foreign leaf.

Mr. BEATTIE. They are not manufacturers of foreign leaf altogether; they are manufacturers of all kinds of leaf.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood that the petitioners were manufacturers of foreign leaf tobacco.

Mr. BEATTIE. I believe they manufacture all kinds of leaf.

Mr. CLARKE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that they manufacture Canadian leaf ?

Mr. BEATTIE. They manufacture the different kinds of leaf, I think.

Mr. CLARKE. Would my hon. friend mind stating which of them manufacture Canadian leaf ?

Mr. BEATTIE. I think Line, McDonald & Company, of London, and John McNee & Sons, of London, do.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood my hon. friend to speak for the manufacturers of foreign leaf. With all deference to my hon. friend I think he will find that Line, McDonald & Company are manufacturers of foreign leaf tobacco.

Mr. BEATTIE. They are, I understood you to ask me if they were manufacturers of foreign leaf.

Mr. CLARKE. I will accept my hon. friend's word if he says they are manufacturers of Canadian leaf, but I will be surprised to find that there is a manufacturer of Canadian tobacco who is opposed to the proposed regulations. I have yet to hear of a single individual who is interested in Canadian tobacco either as a grower or manufacturer who is not most desirous of having the changes proposed in this resolution made.

Mr. BEATTIE. That is exactly what I meant to convey. The representation is made that the manufacturers of Canadian leaf will sell their goods on the market and that you cannot tell the Canadian leaf from the imported leaf cigars. That is what the cigar manufacturers are opposing.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood my hon. friend to say that those who signed the petition which he has read were manufacturers of Canadian tobacco.

Mr. BRODEUR. The heading of the petition says that the petitioners are manufacturers of foreign leaf exclusively.

Mr. CLARKE. I think it will be found that those who are opposed to these regulations are the manufacturers who confine their operations to imported leaf.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what I understood.

Mr. CLARKE. I cannot imagine that those who manufacture Canadian leaf would be opposed to this proposal of the government because they consider that this system of having three separate stamps has been the bane of their operations in Canadian tobacco. Last week the matter was investigated by the Committee on Agriculture, and we had before that committee tobacco growers from Essex, and from Kent, and from the province of Quebec. The growers were unanimously in favour of the regulations now proposed by the government. It was pointed out that in the past the trade had been very much hampered by the fact that the manufacturer had to have three separate buildings, that the holder of a license for Canadian tobacco was not allowed to bring in imported tobacco, that the holder of a license for combination tobacco could not bring in foreign leaf, and that there had to be a separate license for the manufacture of foreign leaf tobacco. It is proposed now to have one uniform license so that the domestic leaf or the imported leaf may be brought into the one factory. I do not know of anything else in the regulation of trade by government, in which the government discriminates against the Canadian grown article except in the tobacco business. Heretofore the policy with regard to tobacco has been in effect a discrimination against Canadian tobacco. It was pointed out in the Agriculture Committee by Mr. Charlin, the tobacco expert, who has given the subject a great deal of care, that in the past there was a good deal of inferior tobacco grown in Canada, but that now a very material improvement has taken place in the quality. Concerning chewing tobacco which is made from the white Burley leaf. Mr. Charlin pointed out that this Canadian tobacco had now attained a very high degree of perfection, and that although the McDonald factory still confines its operations to foreign leaf; yet, the tobacco which is made from white Burley grown in Canada is quite as good in quality as the chewing tobacco made from foreign leaf.

We find that even in ten or twelve years the manufacture of Canadian tobacco has grown from $500,000 to $5,000,000. That I think is good evidence of the fact that a decided improvement is being made in the quality of Canadian tobacco. Experiments have been made in Ontario and Quebec by Mr. Charlin, the expert. Two varieties which are grown in Wisconsin, called Zimmer Spanish and Comstock Spanish, are used for binders by Canadian cigar makers, for instance, by the Tucketts, of Hamilton, the largest manufacturers of cigars in Canada. We import some 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 pounds of that tobacco, and the evidence of the expert is that the tobacco of these varieties grown in Quebec is almost, if not quite as good in quality as that which is being imported from Wisconsin by the Canadian manufacturers in Canada. That grown in Essex and Kent in the past year has not been quite as satisfactory as that grown in Quebec owing to the nature of the season. The expectation is that the quality of Canadian tobacco will mature and be quite equal to the tobacco which is now being imported from the United States for this purpose. The unanimous opinion of those who are interested in the growth of Canadian tobacco is that these regulations are precisely what is required in order to remove the prejudice which has prevailed

in the past against Canadian tobacco and which is to-day without foundation.

Mr. BERGERON. What does my hon. friend think of the loss of revenue?

Mr. CLARKE. I do not understand there will be any loss.

Mr. BERGERON. I understood the minister to say that the loss would be about $30,000 a year.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is a bagatelle.

Mr. BERGERON. I am asking my hon. friend's opinion.

Mr. CLARKE. If there is loss to that extent it is a small matter compared to the benefit which will accrue to the growers in Canada and to the tobacco industry. It has become a very important industry; tobacco is a most profitable crop and the tobacco growers are entitled to encouragement.

There is this to be said in favour of these regulations, that there is a considerable difference in duty on the unstemmed and the stemmed leaf. The duty on the unstemmed leaf is 28 cents and, I think, that on the stemmed leaf is 42 cents. The object and I think the result of that will be to encourage the bringing in of tobacco in the unstemmed condition, which will give employment to cigar men who will do the stemming in this country. The difference in the rate on these two, it seems to me, will force those who import tobacco to import it unstemmed and the result of that will be that the labour of stemming that tobacco will be performed by Canadians and those employed in the Canadian factories, so, to that extent, the labour men employed in foreign leaf factories will derive a decided benefit from these regulations.

One gentleman who was before the Committee on Agriculture the other day, a manufacturer of cigars from foreign leaf tobacco, welcomes these changes. He says that in a foreign leaf factory they are now allowed to put in Canadian tobacco, the only difference being that they would have to pay the increased excise. His difficulty was that if they bring Canadian tobacco into a foreign leaf factory they lose the benefit of the rebate on the cuttings. As I understand the proposed regulations, the rebate will be entirely abolished, so that the foreign leaf factories will be as free as any others. The tobacco will be manufactured, the same stamp will be put on it all, no brand will be placed upon it to the disadvantage of the Canadian tobacco or the Canadian manufacturers, and tobacco will be sold, as every commodity should be, upon its merits. If people want a particular brand, let the manufacturer furnish it. If he has a brand which is well known on the market and is a valuable brand, surely that brand is a sufficient protection to him. It seems to me to be manifestly unjust that the government should undertake to put a brand upon tobacco which will prejudice the growers and prejudice our home product.

Mr. BRISTOL. How long has the present system been in force?

Mr. CLARKE. For a very long time; I do not know when the old regulations were passed. I understand that the present system was not inaugurated in order to protect the smoker, it was for the purpose of raising the revenue. Heretofore there has been a difference in the excise tax; it has been five cents a pound on the home grown leaf and 25 cents a pound on the foreign leaf. Stamps of different colours have been placed on the manufactured tobacco to distinguish the Canadian from the foreign leaf. I do not know the reason for adopting these different stamps, nor can I imagine why parliament should adopt the system of putting on different stamps and so discriminating against the producer and manufacturer of home-grown tobacco. That has been the result of the present system. It seems to me it is high time that state of things should be done away with. The people in my county have petitioned for this change for two or three years and a year ago a large delegation from the counties of Montcalm and Joliette asked for the same change. I doubt very much if among the growers and manufacturers of Canada you will find a single individual who does not heartily welcome and ask for this change.

Mr. BRISTOL. I fancy the fact of the matter is that if the Canadian tobacco was to-day the best tobacco, the Canadian brand on it would not be a detriment to it, but would be very much in its favour; in other words, if it happened to be the best kind, the brand would protect the smoker.

Mr. CLARKE. Will you allow me to say this——

Mr. BRISTOL. I wanted to point out how this works out. We do not have to brand Montreal melons as they are known to be the best in the world, or No. 1 hard wheat.

Mr. CLARKE. The consumer has not yet been educated to a proper appreciation of Canadian tobacco. A great many still believe that the foreign leaf is best. There is a foreign leaf factory in Quebec that is using Canadian tobacco in the manufacture of cigars. Under the law it is permitted to put these on the market as foreign. The black stamp goes on them and they go out to the public as foreign leaf cigars, although a very great proportion of the tobacco in them is Canadian. The people do not know the difference and they pay 10 cents for these cigars, whereas if they knew they were Canadian, they probably would not pay 5 cents. The man who holds the license, in order to get a better price, pays that additional excise of 20 cents a pound, the rate

on foreign leaf, although it is Canadian tobacco.

Mr. BRISTOL. I am glad to know Canadian tobacco is so good.

Mr. CLARKE. I hope you will preach it.

Mr. BRISTOL. I certainly shall. I want to call the attention of the minister to a document which I hold in my hand and which purports to be signed on behalf of the Cigar Makers International Union. It comes to me from Cigar Makers Union No. 27 of Toronto. I do not know if the minister has received a copy of this document or not, but I wish to place it before him. The document reads :

Some reasons why cigarmakers object to a uniform excise stamp on cigars.

Under the present system there are four different coloured stamps issued.

A blue stamp on imported cigars, the black stamp indicates cigars manufactured in this country from foreign leaf, the pink stamp a mixture of foreign and domestic tobacco, and the green stamp indicating all Canadian tobacco.

Under this system the cigar manufacturing industry of this country has grown to its present proportions. Cigars of domestic manufacture from foreign leaf will compare favourably with the best imported article, and in consequence of this trade being built up employment is given to first-class cigarmakers at fair wages in many factories using foreign leaf. One great factor in the upbuilding of this trade in fine cigars, is in the protection afforded the consumer through the different revenue stamps in use; he knows now by the stamp that he is getting a cigar made from foreign leaf or if he prefers the flavour of Canadian tobacco that he is getting what he desires.

Take away the different stamps and substitute one stamp for all and what is likely to happen? The consumer is unable to determine as to the nature of the tobacco used and is at the mercy of unscrupulous manufacturers who will all too readily substitute the inferior Canadian tobacco in whole or in part and advertise the product as made from foreign leaf.

Another result of the change, if carried out, would be to encourage the smoking of the imported article, as the consumer would have no guarantee of getting a clear Havanna cigar of domestic manufacture when he asked for it.

The general result would in our opinion be the degrading of the cigar industry in Canada. The quality of the cigars manufactured would be degraded by the introduction of the inferior Canadian leaf, and as the grades of cigars are cheapened, the tendency will be to lower the prices paid the cigarmaker. Cigars now made from Canadian tobacco are sold as low as $14 per thousand; many of our cigarmakers are paid that much per thousand for making some grades of cigars, and other grades are paid a higher price.

No one who is a smoker of cigars desires to smoke inferior tobacco—we do not object to Canadian tobacco because it is Canadian but because it is at present utterly unsuitable for cigars, the growers have been growing it for quantity not quality; let them reverse this policy and in the near future there will not be needed government action for to force it upon the people, nor will it work any injury to the cigarmakers who work it.

Respectfully,

J. PAMPHILON,

Representing Cigarmakers International Union.

I merely desire to place the matter before the minister because the government must take responsibility for its action in the matter.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We have received petitions from certain union cigar makers and we may have received the one read by my hon. friend. The arguments in it are much the same as those in other papers of the same kind presented to the department. I do not admit for a moment that any of the fears expressed by the members of the union will be realized. I cannot conceive that the effect will be to palm off on to the consumer worse cigars than he now smokes, and I do not think that the rate of wages—because after all that is what the union men fear—will be reduced, because the cigars made from Canadian tobacco will have to be sold at less price than those made from tobacco imported from Cuba or the United States. Under proper conditions of curing the tobacco and handling and packing it, as good tobacco can be grown in Canada as in any portion of the continent outside probably of Cuba. In British Columbia we have a very large area of land upon which tobacco can be grown as good as most of the tobacco imported into Canada. That has been demonstrated already by experts. What our farmers require is to have capitalists take hold of the tobacco after the crop is gathered and cure it and put it on the market in proper condition. By this resolution the quality of Canadian tobacco will be greatly improved, and while some cheap grades of Canadian cigars may be made, a very large percentage of first quality cigars, at 10 cents to 12½ cents, will be put on the market made wholly of Canadian tobacco. Cigars have been made recently from tobacco grown in British Columbia which are equal to some of the very best Cuban tobacco sold in Ottawa today. If my hon. friends had read the evidence given before the Agricultural Committee a few days ago by several experts, men well versed in the growing of tobacco and the making of cigars, he would be impressed with this fact, that the Canadian tobacco has been very materially improved within the last ten years and that Canada to-day can grow as good tobacco as can be had on the continent of America. And with further education along the lines of growing it and packing it and handling cigars made from Canadian grown tobacco, we will have as good product as any that can be obtained

elsewhere. In this view, we will be doing the right thing in removing the discrimination which exists against the products of our own soil.

Mr. MONK. If the present state of the law with regard to labels constitutes, as the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Clarke) has said, a manifest injustice, the government has been very slow in remedying that injustice. Since the twelve years I have had a seat in this House, we have been asking from year to year for the removal of that grievance. More particularly, when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) was Minister of Inland Revenue, great pressure was brought from the province of Quebec to remedy what I think is an injustice. But that pressure was unsuccessful. If we were not very near the general elections probably that injustice would have lasted some time longer. The real reason for this delay is undoubtedly the fact, of which we have had proof this evening, that there is a strong public opinion in favour of the maintenance of those distinctions, but I think the balance of the argument is entirely in favour of taking away that handicap which quite unnecessarily weighs on our home grown tobacco. The same remark applies to the permission which, under these resolutions, will be given for the introduction of the home grown leaf into the ordinary licensed factory. That also has been often petitioned for but up to the present no attention was paid to that request. I cannot however entirely agree with what my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Clarke) says nor with what has just been said by the minister, namely, that these two changes will materially improve the quality of Canadian tobacco. Why will the removal of these two handicaps improve the quality of home grown tobacco? The truth is that at present we produce—at least two years ago we did—quite a sufficient crop to satisfy the demand in Canada. There was a large production of tobacco either last year or the year before sufficient to satisfy the home demand. Our chance of making money is in the export trade. Of that there can be no doubt. We must make our tobacco suit the demand for export. There is the key of the situation, according to those who know something about it. We must learn how to cure tobacco for export to Europe and how to pack it. Then the immense demand that will be created for our home grown tobacco will make it a very paying industry. How are we to do that? Five years ago, in order to satisfy the demands repeatedly made, the government sent a man to England, Belgium and Holland with samples of our tobacco. This man came from the county of Montcalm. He reported that if our tobacco were properly cured and packed and grown under certain indicated conditions, we could not furnish enough of it to satisfy the European demand.

He could not furnish enough of it in Europe for the Belgian market and the Dutch market. And, even going back to Liverpool, he saw representatives of some large factory there, who told him that, under conditions which they indicated, the very tobacco samples of which he then had with him, could be sold in any quantity to-day in England. Therefore, since at this moment, these markets—the Belgian market for instance—are so entirely absorbed by exportations from Wisconsin, Connecticut and other states that have studied the foreign market conditions, it seems to me that what we have to do is to learn how to cure our tobacco for the needs of these immense markets on the other side of the Atlantic. We need to learn also how to pack the tobacco. The packing for the market of any country, in Europe, as everybody knows, is a matter of the utmost importance. We need to learn also some points in regard to the cultivation. The expenditure of a comparatively small amount of money to bring experts from states like Wisconsin and Connecticut, where the tobacco is cured and packed for the foreign market, would enable us to learn how to prepare our tobacco for that market so that we could have an unfailing demand. What would that mean? It would mean the expenditure, probably of $30,000, $40,000 or perhaps $50,000. In the Connecticut region, they spent over $30,000,000 before they brought their tobacco culture to the point of perfection it has reached to-day; and in Wisconsin they spent a large amount before they could prepare the tobacco to be sent under constant demand to European countries. Now, Mr. Charland is an expert, and, since he came to this country, he has examined our tobacco and made experiments in relation to it, which, no doubt, are of very great use. But it seems to me that our efforts ought to tend in that direction. How much are we wasting in the province of Quebec on dredging and public buildings? Why, with a small percentage of what we spend on utterly useless works of the kind I have mentioned in the province of Quebec, we could acquire a valuable science which would make our tobacco product every year sell at a price which would not diminish. For I am told that if the price goes below 9 cents per pound in Quebec, tobacco ceases to be a profitable culture, because it requires so much cultivation and so much care in drying and curing that it cannot be sold at a profit for less than 9 cents per pound. I mention this because it seems to be assumed by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clark) and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) that these changes—of which I approve—are going to produce a revolution in the prosperity of our home-grown tobacco trade. I think this is a step in the right direction. I think it removes a handicap and renders justice to people who have been

claiming it for many years. But if we are to develop our Canadian tobacco industry in the matter it ought to develop, we must go a step further, and I think that step ought to be in the direction I have indicated.

Mr. BRODEUR. As to the last point referred to by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that hon. gentleman is aware, I suppose, of the steps that have been taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to increase the curing and growing of tobacco. While I will not say that very large sums of money have been spent for this purpose, a great deal of work has been done in this direction. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) secured an expert from France, a gentleman who was connected with the French cultivation of tobacco, to come to this country to study the situation and to try, by all means possible, to improve our cultivation of tobacco. This expert has been at work and has been giving lectures in different parts of the country, meeting the farmers and discussing with them the best ways of improving the cultivation of tobacco. I think that since he has been giving these lectures, and publishing them in the newspapers, and especially the papers connected with agriculture, great improvement has been made. If I mistake not, some seeds have been distributed among the farmers in order to improve the quality of their tobacco. Now, this change which has been made is going to simplify immensely the manufacture of tobacco and the administration of the department. Formerly the manufacturer was obliged if he wanted to manufacture Canadian and foreign leaf, to take out what we call a combination license. If he wanted to manufacture Canadian tobacco, he was obliged to get a license for the manufacture of that kind of tobacco, and if he wanted to manufacture foreign leaf, he was obliged to take out a new license. He had to carry out his manufacturing operations under these different licenses in different establishments. He could not use the same machinery for both classes of manufacture, but had to have separate sets of machinery for the manufacture of foreign leaf, Canadian leaf and what we call combination leaf.

Mr. BLAIN. Would that apply to cigars as well?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. And by these laws, the manufacturer was obliged to make expenditures detrimental to his own interest.

Mr. TAYLOR. What machinery is used for the manufacture of cigars?

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course a cigar is made mostly by hand. But there are machines required for certain stages of tobacco manufacture. This is going to disappear and the manufacturer will not be obliged to have three sets of machinery as formerly. I think that, in that respect, the Bill is a step in the right direction. Also, the department will not be obliged to have the same number of employees to supervise these factories, because the tobacco will go into the manufacture, and, if it is foreign leaf, it will be prepaid before it is used in the manufacture. There will be a uniform duty of $2 on the cigars. Formerly, if a man had three factories the department was obliged probably to have three different officers to look after them; while in future all that can be done in one factory. That will bring into use, as I have said, a larger quantity of Canadian tobacco. Now in the petition presented by my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie) it was stated that the black stamp was used only in cases where foreign tobacco is exclusively used. I think that is a mistake. Section 338 of the Inland Revenue Act provides that the licensed manufacturer of foreign leaf tobacco can use Canadian tobacco, provided, however, that he pays a duty of 25 cents a pound upon his Canadian leaf. The section reads as follows:

> When any raw leaf tobacco of Canadian growth has been taken into a licensed warehouse in which there is foreign leaf tobacco, or which is used for storage of foreign leaf tobacco, such Canadian leaf tobacco shall hereafter be deemed to be foreign leaf tobacco and shall be dealt with accordingly.

Under this provision of the law a licensed manufacturer of foreign leaf tobacco could import Canadian tobacco and bring it into his factory, pay a duty of 25 cents a pound, and afterwards he could put a black stamp on the manufactured article and say that it was made with foreign leaf, when in fact he might have used both foreign leaf and Canadian leaf; and under these circumstances he practised deception upon the public.

Mr. BLAIN. Why was that permitted by the department?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was the law, and there was no objection. The law has been in existence for many years because I see this section is reproduced from the revised statutes.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. What would be the penalty if a man did that, selling tobacco as foreign leaf?

Mr. BRODEUR. The penalty is provided in the law. But if it is sold as foreign leaf tobacco and sold on its merits, then I do not think it would fall under the provisions of the Criminal Code.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Supposing there was in a pound of tobacco both foreign and Canadian leaf, what would be the penalty if a man sold it as foreign leaf?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not sure whether that would fall under the disposition of the Criminal Code as constituting a fraud upon

the public. If a man advertise goods as foreign and they are not foreign but native, perhaps he is subject to a penalty under the Criminal Code ; certainly he would be subject to pay damages under the civil law.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood that the regulation went further, and that the black stamp represented cigars made in Canada out of foreign leaf.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not correct. Under this section 328 a man licensed as a foreign manufacturer is supposed to use exclusively foreign leaf tobacco ; but at the same time the law permits him to take some Canadian leaf into his factory, and if he uses the Canadian leaf and mixes it with his foreign leaf and puts a black stamp upon it, then he will have to pay a tax of 25 cents a pound upon that article.

Mr. BLAIN. As I understood it, the former regulation meant that if a manufacturer of cigars in Canada put a black stamp upon them, it meant that the cigars were made out of foreign leaf.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, that meant that he had a foreign license, and that he was obliged to pay 25 cents a pound upon the Canadian tobacco he had used. It was strictly for revenue purposes.

Mr. BLAIN. So far as it was for revenue purposes it was all right ; but the fact remained that the manufacturers in Quebec to which my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Clarke) referred, were manufacturing cigars out of tobacco that was grown in Canada and were putting a black stamp upon then, when that stamp meant that the cigars were manufactured out of foreign leaf.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not necessarily. I think that in those circumstances that was another justification for the government to take the step we are taking. The black stamp simply shows that this tobacco had paid 25 cents excise duty.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Could not section 328 be evaded, and could not any person who had a license for foreign tobacco mix it with Canadian tobacco and put a black stamp upon it and thereby defraud the public ? Any man who had a foreign license could take his Canadian tobacco into the factory which was used for the storage of foreign leaf, he could mix them together and make a compound, and commit a fraud upon the public, and this law would justify him in doing so.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. If the object of the label was to indicate a brand of cigars, my hon. friend would probably be right. But the label is simply to show that the Inland Revenue Department tax has been paid on that box of cigars or tobacco.

Mr. BLAIN. What did the black stamp represent, then ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The black stamp indicates that the manufacturer of foreign leaf has paid a certain duty on the product of his factory.

Mr. BLAIN. That is what it meant, but the effect is that it ws a misrepresentation to the public, for the reason that the black stamp as in the case to which the hon. member for South Essex referred, represented that the cigars were made in Canada of Canadian leaf.

Mr. BRODEUR. When I was in the Department of Inland Revenue several cases were brought to my attention of manufacturers who had what was called a foreign license and were using Canadian leaf. It was not confined to one part of the country but it was found to exist in several parts of the country.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not a fact that the producer of tobacco, say chewing tobacco, is in a worse condition under these regulations than he was before ? I figured it out here that he is about $2 worse off, that he has 33 per cent protection now as against 35 before.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, there is, under this clause, no reduction in duty. If the hon. gentleman will take into consideration the cuttings he will find that the Canadian grower is better off than under the old law. I will give an illustration : Foreign tobacco which was used formerly was paying ten cents per pound duty before it was used in the factory. Then, after it passed through the factory an excise duty of 25 cents per pound was paid. It was sent to the warehouse and the duty was not paid until it reached the consumer. Now, the duty will have to be paid by the manufacturer before using the tobacco and instead of it being 10 cents it will be 28 cents.

Mr. CLEMENTS. He must pay that much duty when it is entered ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, immediately, and the law will therefore work advantageously to the Canadian grower.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I figured it up in this way : At the present rate 100 pounds of foreign leaf tobacco will have to pay a duty of $10. One-third off for stems, leaves 63⅔ pounds and the excise at 25 cents will be $16.66. The liquid balance of 33⅓ pounds at 25 cents will be $8.33 or a total of $35 per 100 pounds. The proposed rate of 28 cents on 100 pounds would be $28. The excise levied on the liquid balance and stems at 5 cents a pound would be $3. It amounts to $33, instead of $35. Of course, I understand it will be an advantge that the manufacturers pay the duty immediately.

Mr. BRODEUR. It will be an advantage to the Canadian grower. It is true that the duty to be paid was 25 cents per pound, but it took so long a time to collect it that the Canadian grower did not have the benefit which this duty might otherwise have afforded him, We must take into consideration also this fact: A pound of tobacco goes into the factory and pays 10 cents and is manufactured. To-day it will have to pay 28 cents before the article is manufactured. Formerly they were not paying 25 cents on the pound of tobacco, which went in but they were paying 25 cents on the part of the tobacco which was used.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. There is an impression that where there are three kinds of tobacco manufactured three factories are necessary. If you want to manufacture Canadian tobacco you must have one factory, if you want to manufacture foreign tobacco you must have another factory and if you want to manufacture a combination of these two kinds of tobacco you must have another factory. Section 328 of the Inland Revenue Act provides that if you take Canadian tobacco into a factory which is used for foreign leaf you must not take such tobacco into that factory without the knowledge of the officers of the department.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The rule then provides that:

All leaf tobacco and other materials are, as soon as received and an account of them taken, to be placed in the warehouse provided for that purpose and secured by Crown lock, the key thereof being in the possession of the officers in charge.

I would like to ask the minister if that rule is carried out and if the officials are there? I fail to see how a man who has a license for the manufacture of foreign tobacco can introduce Canadian leaf into that factory without the knowledge of the officials of the government. Yet, that is being done every day in Canada. It must be done with the knowledge of the officials and I want to tell the minister that this combination is sold with the black stamp on it. It must be with the connivance of the officials of the department. These rules have been made by the hon. gentleman's department and he must himself have a knowledge of this breach of the law.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. What breach of the law?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. If the department have a knowledge of this fraud they should punish the party guilty of it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have no knowledge of what fraud you are referring to.

Mr. CLARKE. It is not a fraud.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. It is a fraud.

Mr. CLEMENTS.

Mr. CLARKE. How is it a fraud if they comply with the law?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. They do not comply with the law.

Mr. CLARKE. The law says that it may be done.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The law says that it cannot be done without the knowledge of the officials.

Mr. CLARKE. Well, the officials know it.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. No, the officials do not know it. I understand that it is being done all over Canada, and it is either done with the connivance of the officials or they have been neglecting their duty.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Where is the fraud upon the revenue?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The Canadian leaf cannot be taken into a foreign leaf factory without the knowledge of the officials of the department and if it is taken there without their knowledge it is a violation of the law. It cannot be done without the knowledge of the official because the Inland Revenue officer has the Crown key. If the tobacco is taken into the foreign leaf factory, manufactured, and a black stamp put upon it, there is a fraud upon the public and there is a fraud which is connived at by the officials of the Inland Revenue department.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. The object of this regulation, as I understand, is not to guarantee to the public that the tobacco they are getting is foreign tobacco or combination tobacco or domestic tobacco. The object of this stamp is to regulate the amount of duty to be paid to the department. The idea that the public have when they see a black stamp is that the article is composed of foreign tobacco, but, that does not show whether it is foreign or any other kind of tobacco. It only shows that the manufacturer has paid 25 cents a pound excise upon it.

Mr. BLAIN. What does the black stamp indicate?

Mr. CLARKE. The black stamp is put on tobacco which is manufactured in the foreign leaf factory. If they use Canadian tobacco with it they must pay excise upon it to the amount of 25 cents a pound, whereas if they were using Canadian tobacco in a domestic or combination tobacco factory they would only have to pay five cents a pound. It must be pretty good tobacco when the manufacturer is willing to pay 25 cents a pound instead of 5 cents and no one can detect it from foreign tobacco. It may be that the public who do not understand the law will be deceived. But ignorance of the law is no excuse; numbers of people are deceived because they do not understand the law. If they would

read it they would know, because the law is perfectly plain. It says that Canadian tobacco may be taken in. The manufacturers know it, but the reason it is not done to any great extent is that they have to pay an extra 20 cents per pound before they can put a black stamp on it.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the hon. gentleman not give an instance of a cigar manufacturing establishment in the province of Quebec which was doing that?

Mr. CLARKE. Quite so, they are doing it all over and the law allows them to do it.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend not regard that as very misleading to the public who are consuming these cigars?

Mr. CLARKE. Not at all. I would say this: It would be misleading if the government undertook to say to the public that they guaranteed the kind of tobacco that stamp was on, but the law does not say anything of that sort. The law says you may use Canadian tobacco in a foreign factory, but if you do use it you must pay an additional 20 cents a pound excise, and all the stamp indicates to the public is that the excise paid on that tobacco is the excise payable in respect to foreign tobacco.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the regulation in clause 6 in regard to wood alcohol?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The purpose is to license the manufacturers of wood alcohol in the future so that we may get them under control and compel them to label wood alcohol as poison under regulations to be provided by the department.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suppose these regulations will come into effect at once?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not think it will take us long to bring them into effect.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I have long advocated in this House the scheme advocated by the government, and although they have taken a long time to wake up to the necessity of this policy I want to give them whatever credit is due them. For the last five years I have been hammering as hard as I could to bring about this legislation with regard to Canadian tobacco, and at last the government have decided to do so. The argument of my hon. friend from Essex in answer to the hon. member from Prince Edward Island is only another proof of what I have always contended, namely, that the Canadian tobacco is as good as any imported tobacco, and as the factories which have been using it have proved the quality is all right.

Mr. CLARKE. It is getting better all the time.

Mr. CLEMENTS. My only regret is that there has not been a duty of 35 cents per pound straight customs duty imposed instead of 28 cents, but half a loaf is better than no bread, and I am satisfied with it as far as it goes.

Resolution reported, read a second time, and agreed to.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 143) to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. Several resolutions and Bills on the Order Paper; the resolution respecting the French steamship line, the Bill respecting immigration, the resolution respecting patent medicines, if time permits, probably the Dry Dock Bill, and then Supply when the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture will probably be taken up.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, April 3, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

### WINDING-UP ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 144) to amend the Winding-up Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The whole purpose of this Bill is to remove all possible misunderstanding with regard to the section of the Winding-up Act which provides that an execution issued against the company in course of winding-up shall not be effective to create any charge upon the property of the company if the winding-up intervenes before the execution has been perfectly carried out. In the framing of the section as it now stands in the Revised Statutes there has been a very slight alteration in the order of the wording and the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal in Manitoba, noticing it, felt that possibly some obscurity was created in the meaning of the section by the arrangement of the wording. In that view it was thought well to remove all possible doubt by re-enacting the section which this Bill proposes to do.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the Prime Minister had an opportunity of reading the letter to which reference was made yesterday ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have received, as I stated yesterday, a letter from Mr. Justice Cassels in which he declared in substance that he would only undertake to assume any duty imposed on him by parliament on conditions, first that there should be no extra consideration beyond the salary of his regular office; and secondly, that the performance of such extra duties should not interfere with his duties as the judge of Court of Exchequer. I shall bring down the correspondence on Monday.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to make a few remarks upon the delay in bringing down the report and to be in order, I shall ask leave to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The matter of urgent public importance which the hon. gentleman desires to discuss is:

The urgent and public importance of having printed copies of the report of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service placed immediately in the hands of members of this House, and the still greater importance of effective action by the government and parliament to redress the defects and abuses disclosed by that report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to detain the House only a very short time. This report was brought down and a motion made for its printing a week ago yesterday, on the 26th day of March. The report has not yet been printed and the delay seems altogether undue. Enterprising newspapers in the country had a very considerable portion of the report printed by the next morning, and for that purpose such portions of the report were sent all over the country by telegraph. The report itself could not possibly be more than about half the length of an ordinary number of 'Hansard,' which is placed on our desks every morning at 11 o'clock. The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) takes the ground that it is not a matter for the government but a matter for the House and for a committee of the House. The best answer to that is that the printing of this document is performed by a government department of which the government have full control and that the committee of the House to which reference has been made, is a committee which is controlled always by the government of the day ; the excuse therefore does not seem to have very much force. I am not pretending to impute any blame to the King's Printer, I have no doubt that he may be doing the best he can ; but I venture to suggest that it is in the power of the government to expedite the printing of this report, and I think it is in the public interest and in the interest of the government itself that the report should be laid upon the table in printed form and made available to the members of this House at the earliest possible moment.

It has rather been assumed by gentlemen speaking from the treasury benches that this report concerns only the officials of the department who happen to be mentioned therein. I do not at all accede to that principle. There seems to be a curious attempt to dissociate the government and even the ministers of the different departments from any responsibility for the conditions disclosed in that report. Let me, in the first place, point out that so far as any particular department is concerned, it is the political head of that department in this House and not the officials of that department with whom this House is concerned. This principle is so well recognized that I wonder it could have escaped the recollection of hon. gentlemen as it seems to have done. Mr. Todd in volume 1 of his well known work on parliamentary government in England, at page 628, uses this language :

As a necessary consequence of the division of the civil service into political and non-political officers, and of the acknowledged supremacy of the members of the administration over all the subordinate employees, it is required by our parliamentary system that every branch of the public service should be represented, either directly or indirectly, in the Houses of parliament. This duty is performed by the political heads, who are themselves solely responsible for every act of administration down to the minutest details of official routine. Having entire control over the public departments, they are bound to assume responsibility for every official Act, and not to permit blame to be imputed to any subordinate for the manner in which the business of the country is transacted, except only in cases of personal misconduct, for which the political chiefs have the remedy in their own hands.

Therefore it is an axiom of responsible government that this responsibility is the responsibility of the minister in the first instance and as I shall show of the whole government eventually for any mal-administration, defects or abuses that may prevail in any department of the government.

But these matters concern not only the political head of any one of the departments involved in the report of this commission, but the government as a whole. The theory of the collective responsibility of the cabinet is so familiar to hon. gentlemen in this House, and Mr. Todd's words with regard thereto are so familiar, that I almost hesitate to quote them again. Just one sentence I may read—quoting from volume II. of Todd, Parliamentary Government in England, page 143 :

It is also distinctly understood that, so long as the different members of a cabinet continue in the ministry, they are jointly and severally responsible for each other's acts, and that any attempt to separate between a particular minister and the rest of his colleagues in such matters would be unconstitutional and unfair.

Then on page 402-3 :

In tracing the origin and development of the rule which requires political unanimity amongst the ministers of the crown, we have seen that it has become an acknowledged principle that, as long as a minister continues to form part of a government, he shares with his colleagues an equal responsibility for everything that is done or agreed upon by them.

Perhaps the theory of cabinet responsibility could not be put better than it has been put by Mr. Morley, in his Life of Walpole. At page 154 of that work, I find the following :

The principal features of our system of cabinet government to-day are four. The first is the doctrine of collective responsibility. Each cabinet minister carries on the work of a particular department, and for that department he is individually answerable.

In addition to this individual responsibility, he shares to a very large extent a collective responsibility with all other members of the government, for anything of high importance that is done in every other branch of the public business besides his own. The question whether the mistakes or misdeeds of one minister involves all the rest, is of course not quite independent of the position of the minister, or of the particular action. The censure and impeachment of Lord Melville, for example, was so purely personal in its bearings that it did not break up the government of Mr. Pitt. But as a general rule every important piece of departmental policy is taken to commit the entire cabinet, and its members stand or fall together. The Chancellor of the Exchequer may be driven from office by a bad despatch from the foreign office, and an excellent Home Secretary may suffer for the blunders of a stupid Minister of War. The cabinet is a unit—a unit as regards the sovereign, and a unit as regards the legislature. Its views are laid before the sovereign and before parliament, as if they were the views of one man. It gives its advice as a single whole, both in the royal closet, and in the hereditary or the representative chamber. If that advice be not taken, provided the matter of it appear to be of proper importance, then the cabinet, before or after an appeal to the electors, dissolves itself and disappears. The first mark of the cabinet, as that institution is now understood, is united and indivisible responsibility.

And Mr. Hearn, in his well known work on constitutional government puts the same idea even more forcibly. I quote from page 218 of the second edition :

It is a further consequence of this corporate character of the cabinet that the responsibility which attaches to the acts of any one member extends to the whole body.

And further on :

But it is not unreasonable that in ordinary matters of policy the conduct of each minister should bind his colleagues. For the ordinary details of the business of each department the other ministers rely upon the discretion of its chief. They have deliberately associated themselves with him; and if they doubted his competence they could have declined his alliance.

And a little further on :

Each minister therefore acts in his own department as the recognized agent of his colleagues in the particular department, subject, however, to inquiry and control by the whole body. But in all cases on which any difficulty is likely to arise, each minister, from motives not merely of prudence but of honour, takes the opinion of the cabinet. When this precaution is taken, the measure becomes of course the common act of the ministry. All its members have either expressly approved of it, or have at least sanctioned it by their acquiescence.

Under these authorities, it is therefore absolutely unquestionable that the abuses disclosed by the report of the Commission on the Civil Service are matters which affect not only the minister of the particular department in which these abuses arose, but the government as a whole. I, for one, therefore do not at all agree with the curious attempt at disassociation which has been put forward by hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches when they refer to these abuses.

Now, let us consider the minute of council and of the proposed action of the government. Let me say, in the first place, that so far as Mr. Justice Cassels is concerned, if you are to go outside the commissioners who have already made investigation, if you are to go to any man upon the judicial bench, I am sure there is no one who would not come to the conclusion that the government had made a very wise selection in choosing Mr. Cassels. That leaves wide open the question whether men occupying judicial positions should be selected to make inquiries of this kind ; and it also leaves wide open the question whether or not there is any reason on account of which this government, after a report has been made to them by men selected by themselves, should appoint another gentleman, however eminent, to investigate, in effect, the commissioners who have just now made that report. Let us look at the order in council which has been brought down by the Prime Minister—and brought down without any previous notice to this House of the intended action of the government.

The minister——

That is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

—observes that some statements are made in that report which affect the honour and in-

tegrity of the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

On page LXI, of the report the following paragraph appears:

There would also seem to be a lack of conscience. In connection with the enormous expenditures which are deemed necessary, the word 'discount' never appears. It is tacitly assumed there is no such thing; but the whole commercial world knows otherwise. If no one gets any benefit from trade with the government, except the trader, then it must be clear that in these great purchases made for the government, without discount, its officers must be assisting the trader to get better prices from the government than he can get anywhere else; for everywhere else he has to give a discount. In other words, some of the government officers are serving two masters and apparently succeeding with both—Scripture notwithstanding.

The minister further observes that it is assumed by that statement that commissions are received improperly, or enhanced prices paid through dishonesty on the part of officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. But, unfortunately, the report does not mention any names which would enable him to take definite action concerning these officials. It is, however, in the interests of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and of the country that immediate steps should be taken in order to determine what officials (if any) deserve condemnation and to give to all an opportunity to meet the charges implied.

Now, I would leave it to the judgment of any hon. member of this House if that portion of the order in council which I have just read would not logically lead up to the conclusion that some further inquiry should be made by the three gentlemen who framed the report. Here are gentlemen who have spent six or seven months in making a certain investigation; they have made a certain report and have presented it to the government. The gentlemen upon the treasury benches understand that that report reflects upon certain officials of that department, although it does not name them. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries declares that it is necesary to ascertain who these officials are, and instead of going back to the commissioners who have made that investigation and know these facts, the gentlemen by whom any further inquiry and investigation should be made, it is proposed to pass these gentlemen over and to appoint another gentleman, a very able gentleman, to make that investigation which should be made by these same commissioners themselves. What is the meaning of it all? What is the reason, if a further inquiry is deemed necessary, that the men who have made a very painstaking and thorough investigation, and who have made a very elaborate report, should not be at least consulted as to these statements in their report before any further investigation is made? Although the logical conclusion of the first part of the order in council is what I have just now stated, the order in council goes on to say:

The minister therefore recommends that he be authorized to appoint the Hon. Walter Cassels a commissioner under part 2, chapter 104, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, to investigate and report upon the foregoing statements contained in said report of the Civil Service Commission reflecting upon the integrity of the officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or of any of them.

There is another remarkable peculiarity about this order in council. If any further investigation of that department is required, why should its scope be restricted to so very narrow limits? The government is simply taking the same course that it took two years ago. Certain statements were made in the House with regard to the expenditure upon the steamship 'Arctic.' The Prime Minister brought down a resolution to this House which was intended in effect to limit the investigation to the question of whether the capacity of that vessel was sufficient to enable all that cargo to be put on board. I then moved as an amendment to the right hon. gentleman's motion a resolution that the scope of that committee should be widened and should be made to include a thorough investigation of this very department of Marine and Fisheries. What was the Prime Minister's answer? That any such suggestion as that was mere froth and wild talk. I do not know whether he regards the report of this commission as froth and wild talk. He did not see fit to broaden the scope of that investigation and every gentleman on the other side of the House who had heard repeated responsible statements made of excessive prices paid to middlemen and others stood up and voted to restrict the scope of that inquiry just as the Prime Minister had suggested, and the scope of the inquiry was restricted accordingly. Now following the course taken on that occasion, the same attempt is made to meet the trend of public opinion throughout this country by selecting one paragraph out of a report of 76 or 77 pages and selecting one department out of several which are involved in the censure of the commission, leaving all other abuses untouched. I do not think the course the government has taken is a wise one, or one which is conducive to the public interest; and for that reason I have taken this opportunity of discussing the subject upon a motion to adjourn the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On a previous occasion when a motion was made by my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) that notice should be given at least two days in advance of all questions which were to be brought to the attention of the House, I understood from my hon. friend that there was no necessity for the rule, and that it was quite sufficient for us to rely upon the

courtesy which is exchanged from one side of the House to the other, to give notice of any question which it was intended on one side or the other to bring forward. I have to observe to my hon. friend that on this occasion he did not live up to the standard of his own rule. I never had the slightest intimation that he intended to bring to the attention of the House the important question which he has brought forward. If I had known that my hon. friend intended to make such a motion, I should have prepared myself by at least looking up authorities to controvert some of the opinions which he had expressed. With regard to the question of printing the report, I do not think, in view of the observations of my hon. friend himself, that there is much to be said; I suppose that he referred to it merely as an introduction to what followed afterwards. The report is in the hands of the printer. I understand, it is a rather voluminous document, not so much the report itself as the appendix which is part of it. This it is which has caused the delay, not very long, of five or six days in presenting the report.

Mr. SPROULE. Ten days.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not my information. I think it was referred to the printer last Thursday night. At all events, in view of the broader question which the hon. gentleman has brought before the House, I think that is of very little consequence. Two questions are now to engage the attention of this House in view of the observations which my hon. friend has just made. First of all, what is the extent of the responsibility of the administration for the condition of things which is said to exist in one of the departments of the administration, according to the report of he Civil Service Commission. Let me say first of all to my hon. friend that there is a wide distinction to be made between the government and the civil service. The civil service is not the government, the government is not the civil service. I am quite prepared to admit, however, that the government is responsible, and ought to be responsibility, for any delinquencies which may occur in the civil service. That is the reason we have appointed the commission, that is the sole reason d'etre of that commission. We wanted to ascertain how far certain rumours which were filling the air were true, and we wanted to know absolutely the conditions which prevailed in certain departments whose officials we should deal with under the responsibility which properly belongs to us. The reason we have appointed this commission is simply to ascertain to the fullest extent the responsibility which weighs upon us, or upon any gentlemen who are advisers of His Excellency, that is to say, we wanted to see that the business of the country was properly carried on. The business of the country must be carried on by means of a civil service, and it follows as a matter of course that the men who are entrusted with the confidence of the people must see to it that the functions of that service are properly discharged. That is why we accept to the fullest the responsibility which rests upon us. But I must go further. I do not think my hon. friend himself will, on reflection, be prepared to admit the consequences of the position which he has taken and the principle he has laid down. If I understood him aright, he lays down the principle that the government as a whole are responsible for anything which takes place in the administration.

I admit that, but to what extent? Does he mean to say that the responsibility is to be placed upon the government whether or not they take any precautions, or any action to correct the abuses which may take place? The limit and the extent of the responsibility which weigh upon the government are to see that the business of the country is properly carried on, to see that every officer does his duty properly, that every minister does his duty also to the country, but, if it so happens unfortunately that an officer fails to do his duty or is delinquent—I will say more—if it happens that a minister is delinquent, if he fails to do his duty, does it follow that the government is to be condemned absolutely and collectively for the mistake or mis-doing of that officer or of that minister? My hon. friend does not pretend any such thing I am sure. He cannot do it. It would not be common sense. The government as a whole would be responsible, if, being informed and apprised of the delinquencies that may have taken place somewhere, or of the wrong-doing which may have been going on somewhere, they failed to take the necessary precautions and measures to correct the abuses which may have crept into the government. I will give to my hon. friend an example that happened—I am sorry to speak of it this way, but what I speak of now is a matter of history. In this House, in the session of 1891, not an officer, not a deputy minister, not a subordinate, but a minister of the Crown, a member of the government, was accused on the floor of this House by an hon. member of certain delinquencies in office. The matter was referred to a committee, investigated and found to be true. To that extent the government were responsible, but that was the limit of their responsibility and they discharged their duty when they saw to it that this minister received—what shall I say?—at all events when he was dealt with and forced out of the government. If, that minister having been found guilty of a grave political offence, had been kept in the government then, certainly, the whole government would have been responsible and they would have been as guilty

as he was himself. But, the duty of the government was discharged the moment they took the means of seeing that this man was no longer allowed to remain in the government. That is the doctrine which was laid down at that time, and it seems to me that the expression of opinion upon the subject to which I will call my hon. friend's attention in a moment, enunciates a principle which need not be supported by authority but which appeals to the common sense and fairness of every man who will reflect upon this subject. In March, 1861, Sir Charles Wood, speaking with reference to a matter of this kind in the English House of Commons, used the following language:

The duty of the House of Commons is to hold those responsible who are the ministers of the Crown. If those ministers find that any of the other officers of the department do not work well under them, then it is their duty to devise some remedy for the inconvenience; but the responsibility should not be divided; it should be imposed only on those who were able to answer for themselves in the House.

That is to say we should not hold the officers responsible to this House. It is the ministers who are to be responsible to the House, but, Sir, the ministers have discharged their duty and met the full responsibility which weighs upon them when they have devised some remedy for the inconvenience. Well, that is what we have done. We have tried to find a remedy for the inconvenience. We have appointed a commission to investigate what may be wrong in the department and to advise us of the abuses which they find so that we may be put in a position to remedy the inconvenience. The commission which we have appointed have fulfilled their duty; they have reported to this House. It was stated to this House, not that in all of the departments, as stated by my hon. friend—I do not admit that statement to be correct—but that in the Department of Marine and Fisheries there were some officers who, they said, had no conscience and who did not discharge their duty properly. They gave no names; they were not in a position to state who were guilty of these delinquencies. How are we to discharge the responsibility which devolves upon us? We have to take action upon this report. What action should be taken except the action which we took which was to decide that we should have a further investigation. My hon. friend cannot controvert the position which I take that this was the proper thing to be done. I have to quote the words of his own colleague, the hon. gentleman who sits next to him, who, when this matter was brought up, spoke as follows:

Now, Sir, that is not that kind of a commission or that the kind of a committee that the people of this country will wish to see or will be satisfied if they do not see. A royal commission or a committee of independent members of this House clothed with authority to go into the whole administration of that department covering the term of the minister preceding the present minister and his own term at least; that is the least that can be done to satisfy the people of this country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

In the report which was made by these three commissioners they complained of two things—the inefficiency of the officials and the dishonesty of the officials. In regard to the inefficiency of the officials I have to take this position that it is the duty of the minister in charge to look after them. It is for him to see that the officers do their duty efficiently and if it is found that they are not doing their duty efficiently then it is for him to take such action, as his responsibility to this House will require him to take. But, when it comes to a matter of dishonesty, when it comes to the fact that the honesty of these officers is put in question, when you find it stated in the report that there has been dishonesty and want of conscience surely another investigation should take place. That is what had to be done and that is what we have done.

Now, my hon. friend takes another exception. He says: If you have an investigation, why do you not entrust the same duty to the commission who were entrusted with that duty before? Why do you not employ the three commissioners whom you employed before? The answer is very obvious. The powers which were conferred upon the commissioners whom we appointed to inquire into these matters were exhausted when they handed in their report. They made their report to us, they stated that there was a lack of conscience in the Department of Marine and Fisheries and that there were some officers in that department who could not be trusted. They gave no names. They might have gone beyond that but they did not do so; they chose to stop where they did stop. They chose not to go beyond and therefore they exhausted their powers. They told us practically that they did not want to investigate the matter further. It is a duty which is not a pleasant one for anybody to undertake. This commission spent several months, from May of last year to April of this year in the discharge of their duties. Perhaps they did not think that they would be called upon to go any further, and since they have discharged their duty, since they have exhausted the authority which we have given them, we think it would not be fair to allow them to assume other duties. If the power of the commissioners had been exhausted by efflux of time, if they had told us that they had gone thus far and that they had no more power to go farther it would have been our duty to have asked them to go on, but when they told us of

their own volition that they did not want to go beyond that, that they desired to limit their inquiry to that point, would it be fair or just or equitable or advisable to ask them to go farther, to say no, we want you to go farther and continue this investigation ? That is the reason we have to give for asking Mr. Justice Cassels to assume these duties since we thought, and I maintain, rightly thought, that we could not ask the other commissioners to go beyond that, they having themselves exhausted their authority. I am proud to say that we have the endorsement of my hon. friend himself for the selection we have made and who agrees with us that we could not have made a wiser selection. We have asked Mr. Justice Cassels to make a through and impartial investigation which will give to the people of this country the true condition of things without fear or favour and which will disclose the whole truth, no matter what the truth may be. It is only in that light that we look upon this matter. We have appointed this commission to discharge this duty because we thought it advisable to do so. We have selected a gentleman to discharge this duty in whom we have the utmost confidence. It does not matter to us who the guilty parties are, if there are guilty parties, it does not matter to us upon whom the blows may fall, if blows are to fall, but in discharging the duty that we owe to the people of this country our only idea is that we shall get the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. It does not matter to us upon whom the blow may fall, if any should fall, we owe it to the people, in the discharge of our duty, that we should have the truth and the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and that is what we want.

Mr. HAGGART. The right hon. gentleman finds fault with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition for lack of courtesy in the way in which he introduced the resolution we are now discussing. Well, Mr. Speaker, the report of the Civil Service Commission has been on the table since the 17th March last. It is open to any member of this House to have that report read at any moment. The government of course have read it, and it is open to any member to bring up a discussion on it, and in doing so he is not guilty of any act of discourtesy. This motion is not one which comes under the category of motions in amendment to Supply, concerning the intent of which the government may have no conception. Here however is a report which has been before the country the last fortnight, and a discussion upon which the government should be prepared for and have not the slightest reason to object to. The right hon. gentleman attempts to defend the order in council which he has brought down, appointing Mr. Justice Cassels, Royal Commissioner, for the purpose of reinforcing the report of this commission. It is a novel feature to have the right hon. gentleman and his supporters so much in love with royal commissions. Any one who has been a member of this House a number of years can remember how these hon. gentlemen, led by Mr. Blake, thundered against the appointment of royal commissions for the purpose of inquiry. But these hon. gentlemen, when they get into power, completely ignore their past professions and fall into the old Tory doctrine of appointing royal commissions for the purpose of defending malfeasance in office. We do not hear them now preach the doctrine of ministerial responsibility. I remember when there was a defalcation in the department, which I was administering at the time, and in which one of the officials combined with a contractor for the purpose of defrauding the people. I suspended every officer who had the least connection with the matter. I ordered the parties implicated to be arrested and brought before the criminal court. But that was not sufficient for hon. gentlemen opposite. They then relied entirely upon the doctrine of ministerial responsibility. That is an entirely different doctrine from what the right hon. gentleman is advocating to-day. To-day he disclaims any ministerial responsibility. He charges the opposition with not taking a particular course. What other course could we take than we have done? Again and again, during the last three or four years, we have charged that in certain departments, presided over by certain ministers, the officers were at least slovenly in the performance of their duties, and we have had that charge confirmed by the report of the Royal Commission. We are told, however, that we did not pursue a manly course. A couple of members—one from Cape Breton and another from Nova Scotia—have got up in this House and said to us : When you have accusations to make against a minister and the officers of any department, why do you not make it in a manly way and risk your seat if you do not prove your case? This is a new doctrine laid down by this couple of gentlemen who seem to have control and dictation, not only in this House, but in the committees of this House. I am not aware that any hon. member risks his seat when he makes an accusation. But what I say is that the minister in charge of the department implicated cannot escape the responsibility for the situation, and neither can the government, because again and again in this House have different members, both on the floor of the House and in the Public Accounts Committee, charged the government with the frauds that have been committed in that department, and on every occasion both in this House and in the committee the government majority have stifled any inquiries. Just look at the position in which the right hon. gentleman stands at present, and in what position does he put a judge of one of our superior courts. He appoints that judge for what purpose? The

Civil Service Commission have reported that frauds have been committed in a particular department. The right hon. gentleman cuts out a small part of that report and refers that to a judge. For what purpose? To find out who the criminals are. Fancy a royal commission being appointed for the purpose of searching and hunting out who the parties are who are stealing in a department. Is that a part of the duty of a royal commission? But they have now the report of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service. Why do they not adopt that report or refuse to adopt it? Why do they take out a small portion of it and refer that to a judge? For what purpose? To find out who the criminals are who are guilty in some transactions in the Marine Department. But were there no reflections on any other department? What about the Militia Department and several others which have been commented on in that report? Are they to escape free? Is there to be nothing done with reference to them? Are we to be told that in their case it is only a petty affair after all? Are we to be told that all, except the particular matters referred to Mr. Justice Cassels, are of no consequence? We have every reason for believing that some of the officers in the Marine and Fisheries Department have been peculating. That has become notorious throughout the country, and the hon. gentlemen who are administering the affairs of this country know it. They know that frauds and everything which debases and corrupts and demoralizes the public service has been carried on under their aegis and protection. Again and again that fact has been brought to their attention and now we find them doing what they denounced in the past. We find them appointing a royal commission for the purpose of covering their own delinquencies. There is to be no free, open inquiry, as their former great tribune, Mr. Blake, would say. Why appoint a royal commission? Is this House not competent to make the inquiry? An inquiry by this House would be open to the public. Every member of parliament could attend and hear every bit of evidence. Every member of parliament can go and hear every bit of evidence that is given there. Let us have no royal commissions. Let us have a free inquiry, and if evidence is stifled there the public will know it. I simply rose for the purpose of drawing attention to the peculiar and anomalous position of hon. gentlemen opposite, who in former years denounced royal commissions as being for the purpose of shielding ministers, and who are now going back on their record in doing what they formerly condemned.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does any other hon. member desire to speak to the motion before the mover exercises his right of reply?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a very few words. I have sometimes observed that when my right hon. friend is in rather a tight place he becomes pathetic and blames this side of the House for alleged discourtesy. If we come to the question of courtesy, perhaps it would have been only fair for the right hon. gentleman to have sent us a copy of the order in council in advance, and to have brought it down under such conditions that there could have been discussion upon it. There are certain privileges granted to the leader of the House by the courtesy of the House. My right hon. friend availed himself of that custom when he brought down this order in council and spoke as no other member of this House could have spoken, by the courtesy of the House, without giving the slightest opportunity for discussion. One would have supposed that when he brought the order in council down he would have understood that it would come under the discussion of the House at a very early day, even if he did not see fit to bring it down under such conditions as would then permit that discussion which ought to take place in such a case. There is a question of discourtesy and there has been no discourtesy. The resolution of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. McLean), to which he has referred, would not have the slightest bearing on this case even if it had passed.

With regard to the responsibility of the government, the right hon. gentleman says that I have taken singular ground. I have taken only such ground as has been laid down by Todd, Hearn and Morley, and have made very little comment of my own. I have read the words of these men, whose words are authoritative in every part of the world where representative institutions prevail, and I have pointed out the collective responsibility of the government for departmental misdeeds. The right hon. gentleman speaks of hardships; he says how hard, how unendurable it would be that a whole government should suffer for the default of one minister. Does not the right hon. gentleman know that if one minister has acted without the consent and concurrence of his colleagues, it becomes his duty to resign from the government and take the whole blame upon himself, and then the rest of the administration do not suffer? That course has been followed over and over again, notably in the case of Lord Russell on his return from Berlin, and in the case of Lord Ellenborough, who disclosed prematurely a confidential despatch to the Governor General of India. In both of these cases the minister involved resigned from the government, and his resignation obviated consequences to the government that would otherwise have ensued. That is the answer to my right hon. friend in that regard.

My right hon. friend refers to the remarks of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) with regard to the Royal Commission. Well, I do not imagine that the hon. member for North Toronto has said his last

word on that subject. The discussion that has taken place up to the present time, including that of to-day is of course only prediminary to that which must come when in course of time, perhaps in the month of November next, the government see fit to lay that Royal Commission in printed form on the table of the House. The discussion will come then. But to suggest, as the right hon. gentleman did, that any language of the hon. member for North Toronto justified for one moment the action of the government is so far beyond my conception of any reasonable meaning which could be drawn from the words of that hon. member, that I really think my right hon. friend must have been joking when he made that suggestion. What did the hon. member for North Toronto suggest? He suggested in the first place that there might be need of a royal commission. Has there been a royal commission? No; there has been a mere departmental commission. The commission to Mr. Courtney and his associates was one issued under the first part of chapter 104—a royal commission in the true sense of the term. The commission issued now is a mere departmental commission, issued under the second part of chapter 104 by the minister himself under the authority of the Governor in Council, but not issued by the Governor in Council. Further than that, did the hon. member for North Toronto suggest that you should take one paragraph of this report and confine any further investigation to that? No; he suggested that, if there were to be any further investigation, it should be even more thorough and sweeping than that which has taken place. There is no doubt that the gentlemen who made this report placed a fairly wide and comprehensive construction upon the terms of the Royal Commission which was issued to them, though I do not for one moment say that they placed upon them too wide and comprehensive a construction. But if there is need of any subsequent investigation, so far as the terms of their report has been made known to the House, it is not necessary to limit the scope of that commission, but to widen and broaden it to the fullest possible extent, so that the whole question of public expenditure, yes, and beyond that, perhaps the question af the alienation of the public domain of this country, shall be inquired into by men who have the courage of their convictions and are not afraid to express what is in their minds when they come to make their report on the evidence before them. The right hon. gentleman has said very little about this commission——

## THE ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the secretary of His Excellency the Governor General the following communication :—

Ottawa, March 17, 1908.

Sir, I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Administrator, will proceed to the Senate Chamber this afternoon at 4 o'clock, for the purpose of assenting to such Bills as have passed the Senate and the House of Commons.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. HANBURY WILLIAMS,
Colonel,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Hon.
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

A message was received from His Excellency the Governor General by the gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows :—

Mr. Speaker,—His Excellency the Administrator desires the immediate attendance of your honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

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

And having returned.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that his honour the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :

An Act to amend the Winding-up Act.
An Act respecting the Erie, London and Tillsonburg Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Interprovincial Railway Bridge Company of New Brunswick.
An Act respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.
An Act respecting a certain patent of Frederick C. Rehm, Elias Frank and Isidor Frank.
An Act respecting the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company.
An Act to amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act.
An Act to amend the Companies Act.
An Act to amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act.
An Act respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.
An Act to amend the Irrigation Act.
An Act respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Bank of Vancouver.
An Act respecting a certain convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.
An Act to amend the Government Railway Act.
An Act to amend the Supreme Court Act.
An Act respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway.
An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial years ending respectively the 31st of March, 1908, and the 31st March, 1909.

## CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was dealing with the question of the scope of this report. I repeat that the order in council brings the proposed investigation down to what is comparatively a very small matter simply the question of discounts which is alluded to in this report, and there is no pretense of a thorough investigation by another commission. If there is to be another investigation it should certainly be very much wider in its scope than is proposed by the government.

The right hon. gentleman rather disputed the statement that other departments of the government besides the Department of Marine and Fisheries are involved. The Department of Militia has been already alluded to. The summary of this report as published in the 'Free Press' on Friday morning, March 27, contains the following passages:

> They condemn the influence of politics in the Customs Department and cite many instances of the power of the political pull. They urge that the department be absolutely divorced from political influences and that all appointments should be made on a basis of merit. The same criticism applies to the Inland Revenue Department. The Railways and Canals Department is passed over with little comment, but that is favourable. The Interior Department is also passed over with the remark that it would have taken months to thoroughly inspect it.

And so on. So it is by no means the case that only the Department of Marine and Fisheries is censured by this report. That report calls for a thorough investigation not only of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but of many other departments of the government, and demands that that investigation should be of the most thorough and searching nature. The very remark of the commission which I have just read, that it would take months to inspect the Department of the Interior is a distinct and positive invitation to this government to have this department investigated fully and fearlessly at the earliest possible moment.

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in effect declared that his best reason—I have no doubt it was his best reason—for passing over the members of the commission whose report has been laid on the table of the House was that the commission was tired and unable to continue its work. If three men, business men of experience and of ability, have become tired in investigating four, five or six departments of the government, what does that indicate as to the condition of these departments? As a matter of fact it is not the commission who are tired but the government, and I very strongly suspect that that is the reason why they have seen fit to pass over these gentlemen and to delegate to another tribunal that which properly should be referred back, if it is referred at all, to the same commissioners. These gentlemen report certain conditions in the Department of Marine and Fisheries to which this order in council relates. Where could the government expect to get the information asked for as easily as through the efforts of the men who have been conducting the investigation of that department? Can there be any question in the minds of any reasonable man as to that? Here are men who for months have been delving into the operations of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and have made a damaging report. That report, in the opinion of the government, calls for further investigation, but the government propose to pass those men over absolutely, and not to utilize their knowledge as to the working of the department and the conduct of its officials; they issue an order in council directing Mr. Justice Cassels of the Exchequer Court to make a departmental investigation. The Prime Minister did not see fit to defend that part of the order in council at length, he passed it over in a very slight way. I think that perhaps in this he was wise. When parliament and the country come to consider this question in the aspects which have been presented this afternoon, they cannot fail to conclude that the government has not acted wisely in the public interest and that the proper course, if any further investigation were demanded would have been to call for an investigation by the men who have already done so well in the public interest during the past few months and whose report we hope to discuss before the session is very much older.

Motion of Mr. R. L. Borden negatived.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I wish to inquire about two returns I asked for on January 29, one with regard to the Hillsborough bridge and the other with regard to Public Works expenditures in Prince Edward Island for a stated period.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Immediately on the latter return being ordered directions were given that the information should be prepared as speedily as possible. It is in course of preparation and I think will be laid on the table very soon.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would also call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that Summerside harbour is now practically free of heavy ice and ask him if he would send the 'Stanley' there to open a harbour so as to open communication between Summerside and Tormentine.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). This is a matter which is left entirely to the discretion of the cap-

tains of the vessels. They decide where the boats shall go. It seems to me that when they leave Georgetown and Pictou their best course would be to go to Charlottetown and Pictou.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understand they are running to Charlottetown and Pictou now.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a matter which is left entirely to the discretion of the captains.

## CANADA-FRANCE STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to enter into a contract for a term not exceeding ten years with any individual or company, for the performance of a steamship service between a port or ports in Canada and a French port or ports, on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council deems expedient, and to grant therefore a subsidy based upon a minimum service of eighteen round voyages a year, and a subsidy therefor not exceeding one hundred thousand dollars, and so in proportion for a more frequent service.—Mr. Brodeur.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The object of this resolution is to improve and extend the steamship service now existing between France and Canada. Some years ago, I think in 1901, the sum of $100,000 was voted and the government were empowered to make a contract for ten years with an annual subsidy of $100,000. The minimum was for eighteen round trips and the subsidy $50,000, with additions for a more frequent service. This amount was not sufficient to induce any person to undertake the contract. It may be of importance to the House to know the history of this subsidy for the establishment of a Canadian French line. In 1889, the sum of $500,000 a year was voted by parliament to establish a service between Canada and England via a French port. As this subsidy was not found large enough, I suppose, to induce any company to take the contract, it was increased to $750,000 in 1894. In 1896 the vote of $750,000 was maintained for a direct service between Canada and England and $50,000 was added providing for a five years contract with a fortnightly service between Canada, France and Belgium. As a matter of fact, this is the first time money was voted for the establishment of a direct line between Canada and France, but this subsidy was not taken up by any company —or it might be more correct to say that some attempts were made but without success. In 1901, this government provided a subsidy of $100,000——

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not the fact that a provisional contract was made by Sir Charles Tupper before he went out of office?

Mr. BRODEUR. For a direct line between Canada and England.

Mr. SPROULE. Did it not include calling at a French port?

Mr. BRODEUR. I thought that the negotiations with the Allan line covered only the service between Canada and England. It is some years since this matter transpired, and my memory of it may not be quite correct. At all events, 1896 was the first year when a sum of money was voted for a direct line between Canada and France. In 1901, this sum was increased to $100,000. No company seemed to be ready to make a contract to carry on the service and earn the subsidy. In 1903, the present government increased the subsidy to $133,333.33. It was provided that $100,000 should be paid for eighteen round trips and proportionately for a more frequent service. On the basis of $100,000 for eighteen round trips, that meant $5,555.55 for each trip. Under this law passed in 1903, nobody undertook to provide a service until 1905, when the Allan line undertook to have vessels running directly between France and Canada. The contractors were the owners of the steamers 'Laurentian,' 'Pomeranian,' 'Sardinian' and 'Buenos Ayrean.' By contract made on February 9, 1905, they undertook to carry on, for three years from the opening of navigation in 1905, a regular direct steamship service between France and Canada. They had, however, the privilege of calling at London. I believe the service they are giving to-day is one by which their vessels call at Le Havre, thence to London, and, returning, call again at Le Havre. This contract has practically expired, because it ceases with the opening of this year's navigation, which is at hand. It is of great importance that we should provide for the maintenance and improvement of this service. My principal reason for thinking this is important is to be found in the new treaty between Canada and France which, I am glad to say, has been to-day assented to by the representative of His Majesty in Canada. By clause 8 of the treaty, it is provided that Canadian goods, in order to be admitted to France under the minimum tariff of that country, must be imported direct from a Canadian port to a French port. These goods, of course, might be exported and transhipped to France and still come under the minimum tariff, but they would be subject also to what is called the surtax d'entrepôt.

Mr. BERGERON. What is that?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the law of France that all goods exported from America—I am not sure about the other continents, but I am sure so far as America is concerned——

Mr. BERGERON. I could understand that in the case of shipment from Canada to any other country but England, for

transhipment to France. But the commercial relations between England and France must be on a better footing than those between Canada and France. The hon. minister has told us the case as he understands it, but what I cannot understand is why there should be surtax d'entrepôt upon our goods going through a country between which and France commerce must be on a better footing than even between Canada and France.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not in a position to give the reasons why the French law is so framed. The French law requires that goods shipped from America to France, if instead of going direct, they pass through England or Belgium or Germany, that is to say, countries enjoying the benefit of the French minimum tariff, then these goods are subject to the surtaxe d'entrepot.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not quite understand how goods passing through England should be on the same footing as goods passing through Germany or Belgium. There are no goods exported from Canada to France that pass through the ports of Germany or Belgium. The only country through which our goods would pass in going to France is England. Now the treaty between England and France is more liberal than a treaty between any of those countries and France, because England is a free trade country, and we all know that she gives greater advantages than any other country.

Mr. BRODEUR. The law with regard to the surtaxe d'entrepot is the same regarding commerce between France and Germany and Belgium, that is to say, that on all goods which are shipped from America to France, or to Germany, Belgium, England or Spain, there is a surtaxe entrepôt when those goods reach France. When I was on the other side I discussed the matter with several French authorities, and I found that the reason why French legislation is so framed is with a view of encouraging shipbuilding in France, as if all the goods going from America were imported directly to France, it would increase French shipping. I understand that is the reason why this surtaxe d'entrepot is imposed.

Mr. SPROULE. A steamer going from Canada to France and calling at a British port before landing in France, but without unloading the goods, would that be regarded as a direct shipment to France ?

Mr. BRODEUR. If goods are exported from Canada, and the ship calls, for example, at Southampton and then goes on to France, without the goods being unloaded at Southampton, that would be considered as a direct shipment, and vice versa. So in virtue of this clause of the treaty which has just been assented to, it is provided that goods, in order to enjoy the benefit of the French minimum tariff, will have to be exported direct from Canada to France, or exported from Canada to a country enjoying the benefit of the French minimum tariff. But in this latter case, when goods are not exported direct, they are subject to the surtaxe d'entrepot, which generally speaking is 3 francs and 50 centimes, equivalent to about 70 cents, for 100 kilos. I may say in this connection that the French tariff is a specific tariff, and the duties are based mostly upon weight or size of the goods. That is the reason why the surtaxe d'entrepot is established. Now if we do not maintain any direct line between Canada and France we will lose the benefit, in many cases, of the French minimum tariff ; at all events, we will be obliged to pay the surtaxe d'entrepot. Then is it not advisable that Canada, as it has been the policy of this government for several years, should pass legislation subsidizing a direct steamship service between Canada and France ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is the minister able to tell us the amount of goods that have been exported to France direct previous to this treaty, and what is the estimated amount that we are likely to export to France?

Mr. BRODEUR. I will come to that question shortly.

Mr. LENNOX. At this point perhaps the minister will explain a provision in this order in council. Will vessel owners be compelled to sail direct from Canada to France and back again, or will they be complying with the subsidy conditions if they first sail to England, then to France, and from France back to England and then to Canada ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have just explained that if goods are exported from Canada to France, and if the vessel stops at Southampton for instance, and the goods are not unloaded there, then they will enjoy the benefit of the French minimum tariff ?

Mr. LENNOX. I mean will a steamship company be tied down to a direct passage from Canada to France and from France to Canada, and will it be prevented from taking any English port ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Provided the goods are not unloaded at the English port, the benefit of the tariff will be absolutely enjoyed by Canadian exporters or importers. Now coming to the question put by my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), when I was in France I discovered a situation which proved to me that we were losing a great deal of the shipping of goods exported from France. I saw by their statistics that the value of the goods exported from France to Canada in the year 1905, that was the last year of which they had complete returns, were valued at about $2,000,000, whereas the value of those same goods, according to our own statistics, was

about $7,000,000. How is it that our statistics were giving $7,000,000 when their own statistics were only giving $2,000,000? I have given the matter some consideration and I have come to the conclusion that most of the goods exported from France to Canada, instead of being exported direct, were exported through the United States. One of the provisions of the new treaty is that goods, in order to get the benefit of the intermediate tariff or of the rates of duty provided in the treaty, will have to be imported direct from France to Canada. There is good reason to believe that this $5,000,000 worth of goods, of which no record is given by France, have probably been exported through Belgium or Germany. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) said a few minutes ago that there were no exports of Canadian goods through Antwerp to the French market. I think he is mistaken, because I have ascertained that the lines that we have subsidized to Antwerp have carried a large quantity of goods for the French market and the same thing applies to the return cargoes. A large quantity of goods exported from France to Canada pass through Belgium. But, for the sake of argument, it does not matter. It is to be expected that, while to-day apparently there are only $2,000,000 worth exported direct from France to Canada, in the future large quantities of goods will be imported direct, probably $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 worth. It therefore becomes imperative for the government to provide for this increased amount of traffic and consequently it is proposed to pay a maximum subsidy of $200,000 instead of $130,000, as at present.

Mr. BERGERON. The resolution provides for a payment of $100,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the resolution goes further and provides for a subsidy not exceeding $100,000 'and so in proportion for a more frequent service.' The resolution is based upon a service of eighteen round trips calling for a subsidy of $5,555.55 for each trip, but this subsidy may be increased and the intention of the government is to increase it to $200,000 if the requirements of the trade demand. We start with the idea that we are going to have eighteen round trips, but the service may be increased to thirty-six round trips which will make the subsidy $200,000.

Mr. BERGERON. You cannot do that.

Mr. BRODEUR. We do not know. To-day, probably nobody would take that subsidy but we are providing for a certain number of years.

Mr. BERGERON. Does my hon. friend think that they can make more than two trips a month?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have just explained the reason why I think there is going to be a much larger traffic. As I have said the statistics issued in France show that there are only $2,000,000 worth of goods exported from France to Canada, when the total exports from France to Canada are really $7,000,000. There are $5,000,000 worth to be provided for which will give an increased traffic, and consequently we must make provision for that increased traffic.

Mr. SPROULE. What accounts for the difference between the trade and navigation returns of France showing the business done between Canada and France and our trade and navigation returns?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think it is because our statistics are kept in a different way from that in which they are kept in France. In France, if goods are exported by way of Antwerp to Canada they will not be entered as being goods exported to Canada but as goods exported to Belgium, while in Canada we exact a sworn declaration for the purpose of showing where these goods are found and we find, by reason of the rigid requirements of our customs officers with respect to information, that the results of this trade are greater insofar as our statistics are concerned than those shown by the French statistics.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman seems to arrive at the conclusion that there are about $5,000,000 worth of goods that this new line would carry that are now carried by boats coming from other countries.

Mr. BRODEUR. From other countries. This is a very important point because if the goods, instead of being exported from France direct to Canada, are exported from Belgium to Canada, they will not enjoy the benefit of the reduced duty.

Mr. BERGERON. That would be a bad thing for the French goods.

Mr. BRODEUR. It would be a bad thing for Canada too because we would have to pay the larger rate of duty.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) some time ago, informed us that the loss of revenue to Canada would be in the neighbourhood of $400,000. We are now making provision for subsidizing transportation between Canada and France which will possibly amount to $200,000. The French government, I understand, contributes nothing towards that subsidy. It seems to me strange, and I rather think the ministers who negotiated this treaty did not secure all that they should have secured from France. Why did they not stipulate that no matter how little went from Canada to France, whether by direct communication, or through England or in some other way, we should be relieved of this surtax d'entrepôt. I think it would have been a fair thing to have asked the French government and, I think we would have been en-

titled to it in consideration of what we are surrendering in revenue and in consideration of the very large sum that we propose to pay to assist transportation between Canada and France. I have wondered that the ministers made no attempt to secure better terms with France, or terms which, I think, we ought to have secured. The minister has told us that the only reason why better conditions were not obtained was that it was contrary to the law of France, but we were making a treaty with France and I think that under the conditions the French republic was fairly entitled to modify its regulations or laws. I do not suppose they are like the laws of the Medes and Persians, that they never can be changed. I think it is something that they should have met the Canadian ministers on and that they should have given us the privilege of entry into France simply under the minimum tariff no matter whether our goods went to France direct, or through England, or whether after breaking bulk in England or in any other country. I have been wondering if the ministers made any attempt to secure those conditions in view of the fact that we are giving so much to France, because the French republic is going to get very much the better of this treaty. True we are to get cheaper silk, but we shall lose the revenue. True we are to get cheaper wine, but I do not know how far that will be an advantage to this country if we have to sacrifice our own industry of wine making. I think that on the whole the French republic have got the best of the treaty and they do not seem to have sacrificed anything. I wonder if the minister asked them to surrender anything. They should have accorded to Canada the right to send its goods to France either directly or via some other country without having to pay any surtax, because that surtax will nullify to a great extent any benefit we are to get from the treaty. Was that matter discussed or was it overlooked ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We obtain absolutely the same advantages as those given other countries. Take the case of the Republic of Argentine, which is doing a big business with France. That country has the benefit of the French minimum tariff on some articles, but the goods have to be exported direct. If they are not, they do not enjoy that benefit. We are absolutely in the same position. What we were negotiating upon mostly was the question of the tariff. This question of surtax d'entrepot is outside the tariff. It is a general law which applies to all countries except European countries. Its object is to encourage the carrying of cargoes by French vessels. The subject was discussed, but they showed us that it was their general law which they have never changed. With regard to the other points, I consider that the advantages we get under the treaty are greater than those we give. It would not be fair to state that we are



going to lose a revenue of $400,000. It would be a fair comparison to take the difference in duty between the French minimum and the French maximum tariff, and my hon. friend will find that the percentage of reduction is very much larger than the percentage of reduction on the French goods between our intermediate tariff and our maximum tariff.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have made no calculation whatever as to what the real difference would be. But I remember my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asking the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), at the time the treaty was brought down, what would be the probable loss of revenue to Canada, and he said about $400,000. We have given up that much revenue, and I doubt whether we are going to be very great gainers considering the fact that we have to contribute a cash subsidy of from $100,000 to $200,000 in order to secure the advantages that we expect to get in the French market. Then we only get those advantages when we conform to a certain restriction. We are not permitted to send our goods to France except in a certain way. We must subsidize a vessel to send them direct. If we send them by a vessel sailing direct to Great Britain, we must make sure that there is a full cargo as it were and that the vessel will sail again from England and France and unload her goods there practically without breaking bulk. In order to secure this entry into France under the minimum tariff, very onerous conditions are imposed. It seems to me that we shall be obliged to pay this surtax in a good many instances. It might be that when we send a full cargo direct to a French port we can escape that.

Mr. BRODEUR. It can go to some English port.

Mr. HENDERSON. But if that vessel should unload those goods in an English port and the goods be then transhipped to France, we shall be subject to the surtax and the benefit that would accrue to us from the treaty would be reduced by the amount of this surtax. The hon. minister said it was about 70 cents for 220 pounds. That is a very considerable tax, and in many things to be relieved from that would be all the advantage we could get. I would not be surprised if that surtax should be nearly all the advantage we would get out of the treaty. I think the hon. ministers who negotiated the treaty failed in their duty when they did not insist that we should have free entry into France on the minimum tariff no matter how our goods go in. We pay enough surely for this. We subsidize vessels to go direct to France; we give up a large revenue and the ministers should have exacted the condition that we would not in any case be subject to that surtax. Of course the treaty is now signed, sealed and

delivered, and whether it be a good treaty or not time alone can tell.

Mr. LOGGIE. When the matter was discussed I understood that if we shipped goods to France via London and transhipped them at London so that they could be identified, they would enter France at the minimum tariff.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is perfectly right. When the goods are shipped from Canada to France, passing through London, and being there transhipped from one vessel to another, they enjoy the benefit of the French minimum tariff; but in that case they are liable to the surtaxe d'entrepôt. But, as I have already explained the surtaxe d'entrepôt is a small tax. Our goods, on entering France, enjoy the benefit of a reduction of about 35 per cent. That is one of the reasons why we should encourage the establishment of a direct line, in order to avoid the surtaxe d'entrepôt. I may say, however, that this question of the surtaxe d'entrepôt is reciprocal. We have the right under the treaty to establish a similar tax if we so desire.

Mr. MONK. There is no doubt that by the terms of the treaty we have reserved the right to establish a surtaxe d'entrepôt; but that system of taxation does not exist in this country, and will not be resorted to. As to the French surtaxe d'entrepôt, it is much larger than my hon. friend thinks. It is 60 cents per kilo on certain unenumerated articles; but that is the very lowest rate. It is absolutely prohibitive on a great many other goods which we would be likely to export to France.

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. MONK. Certainly. It goes up to over 100f. per kilo in certain cases.

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. MONK. Yes; my hon. friend will find that in the blue-book which he has brought down. What I want to ask is, why did not these plenipotentiaries ask for the right to enjoy in full the minimum tariff of France on goods shipped through England? The record of what they asked is in the blue-book which has been brought down, and they did not even ask for that. They did not ask that we should have the right to avail ourselves of the use of British shipping, the largest shipping in the world —we who are a dependency of Great Britain, and incorporated in that country in a certain sense. Why did they not take the trouble to ask the French Republic that in the case of shipments through England we should not be subjected to the surtaxe d'entrepôt? They asked that shipments should be direct. This condition of the treaty was not exacted by France; it was asked by my hon. friend at a time when he knew that we must necessarily establish and subsidize a direct line to France. If this condition had not been inserted in the treaty by the request of our own representatives we would have had the benefit of all shipments through England. I am not against our establishing a direct line to France; I am in favour of it, I think it is a good thing, and I am sure the House is in favour of it, if it is really going to produce valuable results. Our representatives might at least have asked for exemption from the surtaxe d'entrepôt for goods shipped through three British ports, which would have given us the advantage of competing rates; but we have no evidence whatever of any such demand having been made. So that at present, under the condition that shipments must be direct to obtain the benefit of the minimum tariff, we are in this position, that we have to establish a direct line to France at a cost of $200,000. Will the hon. minister explain to the committee why he did not ask the French Republic to share in that expense? We all know that France is the richest country in the world, and that the French government have made heavy sacrifices in the way of subsidies to encourage their own shipping. Why were they not asked to contribute, if not one-half, if we are so rich that we can be lavish, at least one-third or one-fourth of the subsidy which we have now to pay alone? It was not asked. I feel convinced for my part, from the language used by Mr. Pichon in the French Chamber, that such a proposal would have been listened to by France; but it was not even made. Now, under the terms of this resolution we are asked to vote this subsidy, and we are asked to vote it unconditionally. Therefore for rates of freight we shall be practically entirely dependent upon the subsidized line. If there are articles on which we can expect to enjoy the benefit of the minimum tariff, they are very few in number; but trade must be encouraged. If there are articles which we can expect to export to France, the rates of freight on them will be fixed absolutely by this company, a monopolistic company. Therefore I submit that we should insert in this resolution a clause having this purport, that the freight rates on all goods shipped from Canada to France or from France to Canada direct should be subject to the approval and control of the Governor General in Council. Since we are narrowed down under the terms of the treaty to this direct line, it seems to me that we should have the same control over its freight rates that we have always had in the case of railways, if we are to derive any benefit from the treaty; because we must see the possibility of this line, having a very limited direct trade between Canada and France, raising its freight rates beyond a point that is just and reasonable. It is a matter of regret that we did not press for the inclusion in the favours of the treaty of two or three important ports

with which we are continually trading. There is no doubt that the French Republic would have assented to that extension. France does far too large a trade with England and is on far too friendly terms with England to permit us to suppose that it would have refused that slight extension, which would have enabled us to ship through those English ports. The condition might have been abandoned that the transhipment would have to take place in the port or on the docks of the port without penetration into the interior of the country. Under those circumstances we would have had an immense advantage in regard to our freights to France. These plenipotentiaries seemed to have proceeded in this way. We must make the shipments direct in order that we may be in a position to subsidize a line of steamers. That was not the position to take up, it was a trade treaty and it should have had as its object the doing of everything possible to facilitate and extend trade.

Mr. SPROULE. The proposal appears to me to be very defective at least in some respects. First I think that the term of ten years is unusual and is too long.

Mr. BRODEUR. The statute provided for ten years although the contract was for only three years.

Mr. SPROULE. With the possibility of renewal, but, if my memory serves me, the contract was only for three years.

Then there is no provision as to the rate of speed, they might take the 'Arctic,' which would require thirty-five days to go across, so that this service may be of little use as a passenger service. Then there is no control over freight rates, we practically give them a monopoly of this freight trade and we may be sure that they will charge what will give them a good profit. So far as I know there is no provision either for cold storage or for the proper carrying of perishable goods to France.

This means to the Consolidated revenue of Canada a charge practically of $600,000 a year. We are first told that we will lose $400,000 of revenue on account of this treaty and then we pay out of the same fund $200,000 a year to subsidize this line, so the consolidated fund will lose to the extent of $600,000 a year. This amount would pay all the extra duty on goods passing between France and Canada and pay a liberal tax during the whole time. The question, of course, is whether we can cultivate a trade that will offset this in some other way, but it appears to me we are paying too much for the benefit we will derive. Of what benefit is it to us and to France that there should be such a treaty like this? Whatever benefit we derive owing to the reduced cost to the consumer of goods coming from France will be enjoyed in equal degree by the people of France, through the operation of this treaty. But while France derives an equal benefit she does not join with us in paying the cost of this new transportation line, so that Canada pays both considerations, the benefit enjoyed by Canada and that enjoyed by France.

I think, in view of the considerations which I have advanced, we are paying a high figure for the benefit we are likely to derive from this service and this treaty.

Mr. BRODEUR. As to the length of time provided in the statute this is in exactly the same terms as the previous statutes; it was always provided that we could enter into a contract for ten years. I do not know whether we will have to make a contract for that period of time because it is not always easy to get a company to institute a service. As I have explained, we had great difficulty in finding a company to establish a service because it was not a paying proposition.

Mr. SPROULE. If the reduction of duties will increase the trade tenfold, then it ought to be a paying proposition and this should be a strong inducement.

Mr. BRODEUR. We do not know yet. I am speaking in the light of the facts we had before us and our previous experience. Provision for a subsidy has been made since 1889, but it was only in 1905, sixteen years after, that a company was bold enough to undertake the establishment of that service. It was tried repeatedly. The Ligne Bussière tried it and lost money and I think Mr. Clergue also tried to establish a direct line but had to abandon it because it did not pay. It was only in 1905 that the Allan line, with characteristic energy took up the service and entered into a contract with us. They would not contract for a long time. The statute provided for ten years, but they made it three years because they were not sure whether or not there was anything in it. I am not sure whether they have made money with the direct service.

Mr. BERGERON. How many trips did they make and are they subsidized by the trip or by the year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are subsidized by the trip.

Mr. BRODEUR. In 1905, they made 17 trips ; in 1906, 22 trips ; in 1907, 20 trips.

Mr. BERGERON. Not by direct route, but touching at a port in England ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They start from Montreal and go to Le Havre, thence to London, thence back to Le Havre and so to Montreal. My hon. friend objects that no conditions are attached as to cold storage, &c. It is the intention of the government to provide for these matters, but the resolution is so framed as to leave these conditions to be negotiated by the government. It is provid-

ed under the present contract that there shall be cold storage facilities, and these cold storage facilities have been furnished. I know that it is the intention of the government also to provide that the freight rates between Canada and France shall be no higher than the freight rates between New York, Boston and similar American ports and France. But we cannot state all these conditions here, because of the enormous difficulty there has been in finding a line that will undertake to make a contract with the government. It will be a question of negotiations.

Mr. SPROULE. Why must they be left out here if they are to be provided later? Is the minister going to deceive the company, by leaving these matters unmentioned and putting them in the regulations afterwards?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will see that, under the resolution, a contract is to be made on conditions to be determined by the Governor in Council. There must be negotiations between the government and the company that is bold enough to undertake this work. It may be that we shall not experience this year the same difficulties as in former years. But it is not a very paying proposition, as the quotations I have given show.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the contract with the Allans expired?

Mr. BRODEUR. Practically so—it expires with the opening of navigation this year.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it expected that the Allan line will continue the contract under the new terms?

Mr. BRODEUR. We expect they will be able to continue the work. It will be a matter of negotiation.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the minister know the form of the contract he intends to ask the contractor to sign?

Mr. BRODEUR. It will be about the same as the present contract, except that the government will try to have a clause providing that the freight rates shall be no higher than those between American Atlantic ports and France.

Mr. DANIEL. That will be the only important addition?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the matter of choice of ports be left as in the old contract to the line accepting service?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no decision as to that; it would be a matter of negotiation. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) stated that the surtaxe d'entrepot would affect most of our goods going to France. And, by the way, I may state that I was mistaken when I gave the minimum as 3 francs 50 centimes—it is 3 francs 60 centimes. But the hon. gentleman will see that most of the goods mentioned are goods we do not export. For instance, sugar—we do not export much of that to France. Coffee, cocoa—we do not export much.

Mr. MONK. Not a very large quantity.

Mr. BRODEUR. Cloves, cinnamon—I do not think we export much of that. Pepper, vanilla, tea, tobacco, balsams, roots, herbs, leaves, flowers and barks for medicinal purposes other than cinchona bark, medicinal fruits, sponges, tortoise shell, mother of pearl, guano, mineral oils, borax, cochineal, lac in dye or in trochisci, indigo, isinglass, and so on through a considerable list. But here is one which does enter under this maximum rate of 100 francs. It is tissues of silk.

Mr. MONK. But the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) knows that the French surtaxe d'entrepôt is practically prohibitive.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have quoted to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) the articles which are subject to a less rate of surtax than 100 francs.

Mr. MONK. It is $7 a ton at the lowest.

Mr. BRODEUR. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) indicated that the surtaxe d'entrepôt was an enormous one and would affect all the articles we exported. But I have quoted to him a list of articles which are not subject to the maximum surtax. So, evidently, the hon. gentleman is in error. He had not the document before him, and so I cannot blame him if his statement is not correct.

Mr. CLEMENTS. In answer to the hon. member for Northumberland, N.B. (Mr. Loggie) the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) stated, with regard to shipments to France by way of London, that the surtaxe d'entrepôt was a trifling tax. But, as I figure it, it will be 20 cents a bushel on wheat and 30 cents a hundred on pork.

Mr. MONK. It is a prohibitive tax.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is another argument in favour of the direct service——

Mr. HENDERSON. But if the minister had insisted, when making the treaty, that there should be no surtaxe d'entrepôt, the difficulty would not exist. We surely gave the French republic enough to secure entry under the minimum tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. The surtaxe d'entrepôt is a matter to which the French government attach great importance, and if you say you will not make a treaty with the French government unless they will abolish that tax, you will probably make no treaty. The idea that this government can insist upon

what it wants, as my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) suggests, is a mistake. This is a very important feature of the commercial policy of France, and I know from repeated discussions with gentlemen of that country that they attach great importance to it and would not be willing to waive it.

Mr. MONK. We have on record, whatever may be the disposition of the French government, that this matter is not enumerated among the things asked from the French government.

Mr. FIELDING. Because the matter had been so often discussed that there was not the shadow of a chance to secure it.

Mr. MONK. We have the record to show that it was not asked. I have some knowledge of what the disposition of the French government in these matters is, and I repeat that we have no means of knowing that they would not have excepted from the surtax such ports as London, Bristol, Liverpool and perhaps one or two other English ports from which it would have been possible for us to ship.

Now, my hon. friend makes light of the surtaxe d'entrepôt. That means practically $7 a ton. But anybody who knows anything of French commerce knows that in addition even to the minimum tariff, the surtaxe d'entrepôt amounts to a prohibition, if it did not amount to a prohibition French legislation would not be in that sense. Their policy, by their surtaxe d'entrepôt, is to prevent the shipment of goods from any other countries of the world to France through European ports. They want to encourage their shipping, and they have so framed their laws that they have effectively stopped it. You cannot possibly meet that charge of $7 a ton and other charges connected with the surtaxe d'entrepôt and you cannot ship through a European country—the Americans have tried it—to French ports. I am prepared to admit that if this line is confided to the Allans, who have undoubtedly made sacrifices and have done a great deal to favour trade with France, the probability is that we will be fairly treated with respect to the matter of rates. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that they intend to stipulate in the contract that the same rates shall prevail as they have between American ports and France. I think that is a very unwise stipulation, because how do we know that those rates are fair? How do we know that we could not allow our shipping men to retain a profit and ship at lower rates? I prefer to incorporate in this resolution the conditions I mentioned, and I beg to move to add to the resolution:

Provided that the freight rates on all goods shipped to and from France shall be subject to the approval and control of the Governor General in Council.

I think that is only fair. If the line happens to fall into the hands of men whom we do not know, we will be in a position at any rate to control the rates and to keep them within the bounds of fairness.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It seems to me that the same improvident bargain was made in this case that the government makes almost every time it undertakes to deal with any foreign country. I find in this commercial relations pamphlet presented by the government, a clause bearing upon this matter which evidently makes it part of the French treaty. Clause 8 reads as follows:

To enjoy the benefits of the aforementioned tariff advantages, Canadian products shall be conveyed without transhipment from a Canadian port or from a port of a country enjoying the French minimum tariff to a port in France, Algeria, the French colonies and possessions and the territories of the Protectorate of Indo-China.

Now that was evidently put in there for a purpose, and the purpose was that we were going to be called upon to pay this large subsidy which the resolution calls for. I agree with my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that the French government should have been asked to bear at least one-half the expense of this subsidy. The arrangement is supposed to be one for mutual advantage so the hon. gentleman told us; it is presumed that the treaty was negotiated for mutual advantage, that is equal to France and equal to Canada. If that is the case, why should we be called upon to subsidize a line of steamers in order to get the advantage of the treaty, the whole subsidy being paid by this country and not one dollar being paid by France? So far as we can see, the plenipotentiaries who went over there made no request to the French government to participate in the expense; if they did, they have not yet told us so. That would have been a very reasonable thing to do. No request was made, therefore the French government are not in this at all. We are asked in this resolution for an immediate sum of $100,000, with the probability that in the near future it will reach to $200,000. It is $100,000 for eighteen round trips, or in round figures, about $6,000 per trip. It is not to be expected that the goods these ships carry will yield such immense profit that we can afford to pay out of the coffers of this country $6,000 for every shipload that goes from here to France, and every shipload that comes in from France to Canada. The subsidy will amount to $3,000 perhaps each way; therefore, even if this trade turns out to be all that the hon. gentlemen expect, does it not appear that to pay $3,000 for every shipload going each way will be a very large handicap, or at least will greatly reduce the profit upon those goods? It means that the people who are shipping those goods will receive that much less for them. Certainly I think this is a matter that should have attracted more attention when the French treaty was going through the House. I en-

deavoured to point out at the time that this was one of the features of the treaty that ought to be considered really a part of the treaty, because we cannot enter into the advantage of that treaty without paying out this immense subsidy. The subsidy is going to increase, eighteen trips is the minimum with the possibility of the number being double and that will make thirty-six trips a year, or three trips per month. That is not a very large number of trips. Perhaps it will be more. It seems to me that our representatives should have made an earnest effort, if they were looking after the interest of this country, to get the French government to participate with us, and they should have been asked to pay at least one-half the subsidy. If the advantage is mutual the expense should be mutual, and this country being ever so prosperous, the government should have made an effort at least to get one-half that subsidy out of the French government. I think this is a very improvident resolution. It is really an adjunct of the French treaty, and ought to be considered as such.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) omitted an important point. This provision regarding direct shipment which he treats as something new, something designed for the special purpose of meeting a demand for a subsidy, that precise condition is in the old treaty, was in force for many years, and the hon. gentleman never yet saw anything wrong with it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have never been called upon to discuss it.

Mr. FIELDING. Then the hon. gentleman should not have treated it as something entirely new. This provision is substantially the same as in the old treaty.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I understand the provision is not new. But this is a new treaty, or at least these gentlemen say it is, and what I am pointing out is that they are derelict in their duty in that they did not raise the question with the French government of bearing part of the subsidy. The old treaty is now abrogated and we have a new treaty. If the other items of the old treaty have been taken up and discussed seriatim, why should not this item also have been taken up? Why did not the minister ask the French government who are receiving half the advantage, according to his own statement, to pay half the expense of carrying out this treaty, of which the resolutions form part? That evidently was not done. I believe that the French government being a reasonable government, and seeing that the advantages were mutual, would have consented that the burden of the treaty should be mutual.

Mr. LALOR. I hope the Minister of Finance will be equally prompt in calling his own friends to time when they speak upon this old treaty, as he has my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) spoke about the immense increases that would likely come on account of this treaty in the exports of apples, both green and dried, and he said that the trade would now double and quadruple in this particular line, but when we come to inquire we find that these articles are the same under this treaty as under the old one. I hope that when his friends make mistakes of this kind the hon. Minister of Finance will call their attention to them. The subsidy that the government are asking for is going to put a tax upon the country far in excess of the benefits to be derived from this treaty. We are told that this subsidy will be $200,000 for ten years; that is, $2,000,000. We also lose in revenue $400,000, which makes in ten years $4,000,000; so that the country will have to pay in ten years $6,000,000 for this treaty that we are now negotiating with France. Probably I can speak more feelingly in connection with this treaty than some others, because I am interested in a business which is detrimentally affected by the treaty and which business is also engaged in by the farming community. I went into a store down town yesterday and I found upon the shelves of that store cans of French peas which were selling 2 for 25 cents, or about as cheap as the Canadian product can be sold for. The young man in charge of the store told me that they expected to be able to import them at a lower rate and that their business in these goods would increase. These peas are not as good as the Canadian peas, but they are more sightly; they are highly coloured and on each tin there is written in plain letters that they are coloured with copperas. I do not understand why the hon. Minister of Finance and his associates should allow the duty to be reduced on an article that is not only consumed by the people of Canada and which is detrimental to their health, but the importation of which in large quantities is going to affect a great industry in this country. In Ontario there is hardly a town from Windsor to the Bay of Quinté that has not two or three canning factories, each doing a large business, employing a great many people, canning the fruits and vegetables grown by the farmers of these districts and paying out to these farmers a large amount of money. This treaty directly affects this business. My hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) and myself went into a wholesale house the other day in Ottawa and we were shown strawberries, raspberries and fruit pulps of different kinds that were imported cheaper than we can buy them from the farmers of this country and put them up. In order to encourage the importation of that class of goods directly in competition with the farmers, the treaty has placed those goods under a lower tariff. As this treaty injuriously affects the interests of a great many farmers in this country, grape producers, wine pro-

ducers, fruit producers generally and those engaged in the canning business it would be very much better if it had never been brought into effect. I believe the treaty is detrimental to the country and I am opposed to subsidizing a line of vessels even if that line is to run direct to France for the purpose of bringing goods to this country to the detriment of our own people.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I take an entirely different view from that of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lalor). I have every reason to believe that this treaty is going to be of great benefit to the manufacturing industries of this country. When this treaty was first introduced one of the largest manufacturers in Canada came to Ottawa to inquire minutely into the whole situation. One of the important matters was the question of freight rates from Hamilton to France. We interviewed Mr. Allan, president of the Allan Steamship Company, and he guaranteed this manufacturer as good rates by the ports of Montreal in summer and St. John in winter as we could get via New York or any American port. The manufacturer was perfectly satisfied on that line I trust that the government will make arrangements with the steamship compny by which Montreal will be the port in summer and St. John in winter. I would be very sorry if they made Halifax the port in winter. It is too far away from the manufacturing centres of Ontario. The hon. gentleman said that the subsidizing of this line would cost an additional $100,000, but at the present time we get eighteen round trips for $133,000. If we are to-day getting $2,000,000 worth of goods and if this extra $100,000 will bring the other $5,000,000 worth which we import through other ports directly to this country from France via our own ports it will be a very small appropriation indeed.

Mr. BERGERON. But will it do that?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There is no doubt that with the French treaty in operation these goods will have to come through Canadian ports. I want to ask the minister what port in France the boat will stop at?

Mr. HENDERSON. It may be taken as a good old protectionist argument which the hon. gentleman is repeating that if you increase the industries of the country you are going to benefit the farmers because the more mouths you get to feed the better will be the market that you are going to have. To that extent I think the hon. gentleman is right provided we do not pay too much for it. There is an important proviso. If we export agricultural implements to France the farmers of this country have to put their hands in their pockets and contribute to make up the rebate of duty that is allowed on these agricultural implements that are exported to France. We give back 99 per cent of the duty that is collected from the manufacturers in Hamilton on the material which enters into the implements that are exported to some other country. And the government of Canada is so generous that it gives back 99 per cent of that duty. Who pays it? The farmers of this country. It is just a question which way the balance will be, whether the farmer will get the benefit or perhaps pay more than it comes to.

Mr. BRODEUR. How does the farmer pay that?

Mr. HENDERSON. Because he pays his share of the tax.

Mr. FIELDING. If the manufacturer pays it and then gets it back, how does the farmer pay it?

Mr. HENDERSON. It is paid out of the consolidated revenue of the country and the Minister of Finance knows that he gets a considerable portion of that revenue from the farmers. When the hon. member for Hamilton says the farmer is to be benefited so much by the export of agricultural implements, I ask him to consider whether the farmer is not going to pay most of the duty.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. These goods are largely the articles that farmers use, and our manufacturers will be able to make them so much cheaper that the farmers will pay less for them than they do to-day.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

## After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

### PRIVATE BILLS.

### FORT WILLIAM TERMINALS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 101), respecting the Fort William Terminal Railway and Bridge Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Mr. HENDERSON. Where is the promoter of this Bill? Nobody seems to be in charge of it. You had better follow the rule, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Bill has been reported from the Railway Committee, and if my hon. friend from Halton has no special reason why the Bill should not proceed——

Mr. LENNOX. I think there is a very good reason. As introduced, it had only one section, but it now appears to have three or four, and it is necessary to consider them. The Bill has been reprinted, but has not been distributed so far as I know.

Mr. HENDERSON. As the promoter does not seem to think it worth while to attend to this Bill, I do not see why we should.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Does the hon. member move to report progress ?

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Railways can do that.

Mr. GRAHAM. So far as I am concerned, I do not wish to urge proceeding with the Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. In looking over the Bill as reprinted, I have very great doubt whether we can put it through at all or not. There has been such a decided alteration in it that I doubt very much whether the advertisement would cover it. By the third clause there is a change of location and by the fourth clause there is a change as to the manner of expenditure. So that this Bill will have to stand for the present at all events.

Mr. GRAHAM. The real history of the Bill is this. It was introduced originally in a form to which the municipality of Fort William objected. The promoters of the Bill and the representatives of the town of Fort William came together, and agreed on the redrafting of the Bill in a form to meet the wishes of the municipality of Fort William. One of the objections was that the location of the line was near the water-front, and I think a change has been made to place the location under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners. Another change is in regard to the charging of tolls on the bridge. I am not pressing the Bill ; it can stand until the promoter comes; but that accounts for the changes.

Mr. LENNOX. I think it would be very desirable, when Bills are reprinted, to have the attention of the House called to the fact by a copy of the Bill being put in the box of each member. As it is, our attention is not called to it until it comes before us at eight o'clock, when every member is hurried. Promoters of Bills should be here to explain them, and they should see that members have notice of important alterations. I have not a copy of this Bill as reprinted, and have only seen it now for the first time. It is a new Bill practically.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Does any one move to report progress ?

Mr. LENNOX. I move to report progress.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

## QUEBEC AND NEW BRUNSWICK RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 128), respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—Mr. Michaud.

Mr. MICHAUD. I move that the Bill stand till Monday.

Progress reported.

## PACIFIC COAST FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 40), respecting the Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Mr. LENNOX. This is a very extensive Bill, and the promoter is not here, and there is no person representing the Justice Department of the government here. When Bills of a very technical character like this one are going through, I submit that it is absolutely necessary, if we cannot have the Minister of Justice, to have at least the Solicitor General present. Members of the opposition are here to watch as well as they can, but they are not specially learned in matters of this kind. In adition to moving that we report progress on this Bill, I wish as one individual member to give that intimation.

Mr. HENDERSON. I note that both the Chairman of the Banking and Commerce Committee who could give us information and the promoter of the Bill are absent. We are expected to put this Bill through in the dark. I do not approve of that kind of legislation.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not agree with my hon. friend as to the special duties of the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General in this matter. However, his point that the promoter of the Bill is not here, I have no reason to object to. I do not wish to press the Bill against the wish of anybody.

Mr. LENNOX. I have the greatest respect for the opinion of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, but, speaking for myself, I wish to say as distinctly as I can, and I will take occasion from time to time to repeat it in the hope of getting in time the attention of the country to the matter, that I believe it is the duty of the government to have some one who is learned in the law to watch these technical Bills as they go through. For my part I shall take occasion frequently to call the attention of the House to the fact that we are from time to time putting through a class of very dangerous technical legislation without having the benefit of the advice and the responsibility of the Law Department of the government, which we should have in the interest of the country.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid I do not appreciate as much as I should the necessity of the legal profession everywhere, but I have no objection to this Bill standing. Every insurance company's Bill passes under the review of the Superintendent of Insurance who happens to be a lawyer. However, I have no desire to press the Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. I am only speaking generally.

Progress reported.

STANDARD PLATE GLASS INSURANCE INSURANCE.

Hous in committee on Bill (No. 41) to incorporate the Standard Plate Glass Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Mr. FIELDING. Of course the Minister of Justice is not here for this Bill either.

Mr. LENNOX. I think the same remarks apply.

Mr. HENDERSON. This I think is a very exceptional case. We have the promoter here, he is a good lawyer and will be able to explain everything without the assistance of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not objecting.

Mr. HENDERSON. My object in raising that objection is to insist that members who have charge of legislation should be in their places.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not object to that.

Mr. HENDERSON. If we put through legislation without their presence it only educates them to the propriety of going home and trusting to others to put their legislation through.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

DOMINION GUARANTEE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 127) respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.—Mr. Pringle.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Chairman, I drew your attention to the fact that the promoter of this Bill is not present.

Mr. LENNOX. Let it stand.

Progress reported.

WESTERN ALBERTA RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 125) respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

On section 1—extension of time.

Mr. HERRON. I opposed the passage of this Bill in the Railway Committee the other day, and I still oppose this extension of time and the reviving of this charter. I do so in behalf of the people who are most directly interested in the building of a railway in that part of the country. The charter of this company was granted in 1898, and there has never been any work done on the railway or any attempt towards construction. This is a section in which a railway is badly needed. I may say that there is also a subsidy in connection with this railway. The road is to run from the international boundary to a point on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway near the town in which I live, a distance of about 50 miles, passing at or near the town of Cardston which is one of the most important towns in that part of the country to the south of the Crows Nest Pass Railway. I have had several protests from the people all along the line who asked me to oppose this extension of time. I wish to read a resolution from the Board of Trade of Cardston on this subject:

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Cardston Board of Trade held February 12, 1908:

Whereas, the Western Alberta Railway Company in the year 1898 obtained a charter for the building of a railway through this section of southern Alberta, and

Whereas, a subsidy was granted in the year 1899 to assist in the building of fifty miles of the said proposed railway, and

Whereas, both charter and subsidy have been extended from time to time, and

Whereas, as yet no construction work on the said proposed railway has been commenced, and

Whereas, at the last renewal of the subsidy (chapter 43, statutes of Canada, 1906) this board of trade was led to believe that construction work would be commenced without delay, and

Whereas, we now observe the said railway company is again seeking extension of time for the commencement and completion of the proposed railway, and

Whereas, other proposed railways holding charters over much the same territory might be induced to proceed without unnecessary delay under the same privileges as now enjoyed by the said Western Alberta Railway Company;

Therefore be it resolved, that in the opinion of the Cardston Board of Trade, no further extensions should be granted the Western Alberta Railway Company, either in the matter of extension of charter, or a renewal of subsidy, with reference to that portion of the proposed railway, running from the international boundary to a point on the Crows Nest Pass Railway.

That is only from the town of Cardston, but the people all along this line of railway hold the same opinion regarding the extension of time of this charter. The situation of this proposed railway is rather a peculiar one. It runs parallel to the foot of the Rocky mountains, and where they propose to intersect the Crows Nest Pass Railway is in a farming district just outside the mountains. It runs parallel to the mountains through a good locality thickly settled with farmers the whole way through, probably as good a section of farming country as can be found in the whole province of Alberta. The distance from thet town of Cardston to the point where they propose to join the Crows Nest Pass Railway is forty-five or fifty miles. The only railway they have from the boundary line in that section of country starts from Cardston, running east instead of running west; it practically starts toward northetast and runs away to Lethbridge, a distance of sixty-six miles, then from Lethbridge back to Crows Nest Pass to Pin-

cher Creek, a distance of about seventy miles; so it runs nearly 140 miles in this roundabout way. Now practically all the produce raised in that country from Cardston to the boundary line and from Cardston to Pincher Creek finds its market in British Columbia, therefore the Crows Nest Pass towards British Columbia is their natural outlet. If the farmers had this railway they could take their freight from Cardston to the junction on the Crows Nest Pass Railway a distance of fifty miles, whereas in going by the roundabout way the distance is about 140 miles, and I must say is a very expensive route over which to transport freight. Freight has to pass over two railways, that is the Coal and Navigation Company's Railway, sixty-six miles, and this Crows Nest Pass Railway. Now there are three or four charters covering almost this same ground and I believe that if this subsidy was granted to some of the other railways, we would have a railway such as we desire. I believe we would have a railway over that ground were it not for the fact that the gentlemen holding this charter have also a subsidy with the charter. When I say that we would get a railway I believe I am quite correct, we would get a railway perhaps this year over that very country. The people of that country, I might almost say, are starving for the want of a railway. The farmers produce excellent crops but they have no way of getting them to market. I think it is too bad that people in a good section of country like that, a thickly settled section, should be debarred from a market simply because certain gentlemen who hold a railway charter come here every two or three years, as they have since 1898, and ask for a renewal. I see the Minister of Railways in his place, and I would like to ask him to state positively whether the renewal of this charter would carry the renewal of the subsidy that goes with the charter. If it did not, of course it would not make so much difference. But the railway is so badly needed in that country that I would recommend the minister and the government to grant a subsidy to the first company that is prepared to build over that section.

Mr. GRAHAM. In reply to the hon. gentleman's question I may say that the renewal of the charter in no way renews the subsidy.

Mr. HENDERSON. What does the minister say about keeping the subsidy alive if these people do go on and build the road?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no subsidy now, the subsidy has lapsed.

Mr. HERRON. The charter is not dead yet, I understand the time does not expire until June of this year, so the subsidy still holds good.

Mr. FIELDING. This Act has no relation whatever to the subsidy. The Subsidy Act stands on its own merits. If the time for the subsidy has not expired, it remains. But the passing of this Act in no way affects the subsidy. Whether the subsidy is voted to this particular company or to the line of railway——

Mr. HERRON. To the company.

Mr. MACPHERSON. To the line of railway.

Mr. FIELDING. If it is voted to the company by name it can only be granted to that company, and the effect would be that this company would be put in a position to make a contract. The government of course would still be free to exercise their discretion as to whether they would approve such a contract, if none has already been made.

Mr. HERRON. I feel that a railroad is needed very badly in that country, and I hope the government will see their way either to grant a subsidy or to give some other assistance to some new company which is prepared to build a railway in that part of the country. I think it is unfortunate that people holding that charter come here from time to time and ask for renewals and never make an attempt to build the railway. If this charter was not renewed would the bonus lapse?

Mr. FIELDING. If it were not renewed there would be no company.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I understood the Minister of Finance to say that this would not affect the subsidy. Now it certainly does affect the subsidy inasmuch as if the charter were not renewed there would be no subsidy coming to them. If they show no disposition to go on with the work there is no reason why the charter should be renewed. If they come here every few years for a renewal it is to prevent some other persons from taking hold of it and building the road, and would do it if they were granted the aid these people have been promised.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the matter now is pretty plain. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron), to my mind, has made out a very excellent case calling for government intervention. It appears that the subsidy may not be granted to this company. Perhaps it is granted for the construction of a railway along this route. I understand the hon. Minister of Finance to say that the subsidy may be given to any company that has a charter for a railway along this route. It would be important that we should find this out. If such is the case, if this charter is renewed and this company make no progress whatever it seems to me that it is a matter of government policy as to whether it will allow the subsidy to stand and allow this company to claim it when they are taking no action. If they can hand over that subsidy to another company then I think it would be a matter of wisdom to do it on account of

the special demand there is for railway communication through that country.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I think that the hon. member for Alberta has given us a good reason for granting a charter to this company. They need the railway. This company are in the position of some other companies that have been before the Railway Committee for a renewal of their charters. They have not succeeded in getting all the money necessary for the construction of the road. The road is necessary, so necessary that the government recognized the fact by granting a subsidy for a line through this territory. This company received a charter in 1898, but I am informed that they are now prepared to go ahead with the construction of this line. The custom of the Railway Committee has been to give companies a renewal of their charters. Any other company can start in and build this railway. It is the company that first files its plans. The hon. member for Alberta desires to see the road built. These people tell me that they are anxious to go ahead. I do not think that the hon. gentleman could do better than allow this Bill to pass.

Mr. HERRON. I dare say that the hon. member for Vancouver gives the guarantee in good faith that these gentlemen are prepared to go on and build this road.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I am not guaranteeing anything. That is what they told me.

Mr. HERRON. Well, I want to say to my hon. friend that I had that same guarantee two years ago from the gentleman in charge of this Bill. A solicitor from Toronto came here on behalf of the promoters and stated positively that they were in a position to go on and build this road. They got a renewal of their charter and there has not been the slightest effort made to begin its construction since that time.

Mr. LENNOX. This Bill differs in two respects from a good many others that come before us. We have been renewing charters without much objection probably on account of the alleged stringency in the times. In those cases the railway companies were depending on their own resources entirely, there being no subsidy. But here is a subsidy awaiting this company as soon as they commence to build the road. In this case there is an objection set forth in a very strong petition from the parties in the neighbourhood who are interested which was read by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) and which should be taken into the serious consideration of this House. I am inclined to think, that, having reference to the circumstance that the government have offered a subsidy for the construction of this road, the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) could very well devise a method of securing action by this company. If this matter were held in suspense for a short time and the Minister of Finance gave this railway company to understand that upon their activity would depend the question of whether they should get the subsidy or not I think that we would probably see some distinct undertaking that the promoter of the Bill is not prepared to give, that this railway would go on right away. I understood the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) to say that if this company did not build some other company could build, that this charter did not block the way. I presume there is no other railway company that has a charter, is there?

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) says that there are two other companies.

Mr. HERRON. There are other charters covering the same ground.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Finance suggested that very likely this subsidy would not go to this railway company by name, but that it was a subsidy voted for the construction of a railway along that route, and if so it seems to me that this is an occasion on which the government could very well help the people of that locality by stepping in and ascertaining when this road would be built, or rather giving an intimation to this company that if they want a renewal of the charter they must undertake to do something for these people who are so badly in need of a railway.

Mr. FIELDING. I find that the provision of the statute of two years ago grants the subsidies to this company by name. It grants a subsidy to the Western Alberta company for a line from a point on the United States boundary for 50 miles of railway.

Mr. LENNOX. How long is that good for?

Mr. FIELDING. The general provision of the Act is that they shall commence within two years and finish in four. The effect of the amendment would be to put the company in a position to make a contract with the government, if the government see fit to make one and then, of course, the government ought to be satisfied that the company seeking a contract are in a position to do the work. I do not know whether they have a contract outstanding or not.

Mr. LENNOX. Do they need a contract?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, the subsidy acts are simply what our legal friends call enabling Acts authorizing the government to enter into a contract when they are reasonably satisfied that a company means to carry on the work. If this company have a contract already, then, under this subsidy Act, it will stand for some little time, but if they have no contract the effect of the amendment will be to put them in a posi-

tion to come to the government and seek a contract. Then it will be for the government to satisfy themselves that the company are in a position to do the work.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

OTTAWA, BROCKVILLE AND ST. LAWRENCE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. GRANT moved second reading of amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 74) respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). The amendment made by the Senate consists in striking out an amendment made by the Railway Committee of this House. The Railway Committee inserted an additional section in the Bill providing that the company shall not dispose of or distribute power or electrical energy in any municipality owning and operating a power plant without the consent by by-law of the council of such municipality. In the various Bills we have been dealing with in the Railway Committee, we have inserted an amendment such as this for the protection of the municipalities which own and operate their own light and power plants. This clause was put in this Bill because there is on the route of the proposed line the town of Brockville which owns and operates its own public utility, and for the protection of that and other municipalities, we placed the same clause in this Bill that we did in others of a like nature. I beg to move therefore :

That the amendment of the Senate be disagreed to for the reason that clause 4 which the Senate have stricken out is considered a safeguard to municipalities which own and operate their own light and power plants, and that the municipal autonomy in that regard should be respected.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask the Minister of Railways if this is the same amendment that was put in the Hamilton Radial Railway Bill in regard to St. Thomas ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Senate did not interfere with that, did they ? They must have two policies on railway legislation—one for the Minister of Railways and another for the Hamilton people. I think when they allowed the other to go through, they should allow this to go through.

Motion agreed to.

VANCOUVER ISLAND AND EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. SLOAN moved that amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company, be read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. LENNOX. What are they ?

Mr. SLOAN. The one is to increase the borrowing power from $30,000 to $50,000 a mile for the mountain section of the road. Another is to give the company power to borrow money on bonds on the ferry which they propose to establish.

Mr. LENNOX. How is it that the Senate has increased the borrowing power ? Did not the application ask for enough in the first instance ?

Mr. SLOAN. No, it was no considered sufficient.

Mr. LENNOX. Was that asked in the Railway Committee ?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Was it refused by the Railway Committee ?

Mr. SLOAN. No.

Mr. LENNOX. If it was asked for and not granted, it was practically refused.

Mr. SLOAN. It was not asked for, but was considered at the time the Bill went through that the borrowing power was not sufficient, and when the Bill went before the Senate it was decided to increase it, only in the mountain section.

Motion agreed to.

RELIEF OF EDITH MAUD ROSARIO GAMMELL.

Mr. SLOAN—for Mr. Galliher—moved second reading of Bill (No. 139) for the relief of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell.

Mr. LENNOX. I might call the attention of the committee that is going to deal with this Bill to the fact that although the evidence is pretty satisfactory on most points, there does not seem to be any clear evidence of identification of the husband. A gentleman came from England, but there has been no attempt to identify him as the party referred to by the applicant for divorce.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Did not the woman swear that she had seen him ?

Mr. LENNOX. The wife swore that she had seen her husband in Saskatoon in the company of a lady whom she did not know. There were others who swore to the facts would establish sufficient ground for dissolution of marriage.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I would have more doubt about that evidence than as to the identity.

Mr. LENNOX. There was no cross-examination to test that evidence, and there was no attempt to show that the person spoken of is the husband of the applicant for divorce. It may be supplemented. The

circumstantial evidence is very strong, I admit.

Motion agreed to, on division, and Bill read the second time.

## CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Eastern Trust Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 132) to incorporate the Standard Accident and Guarantee Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 134) respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Marcil.

## SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 137) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 138) respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 141) to incorporate the Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank.—Mr. Guthrie.

## CANADA-FRANCE STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

House again in committee on the proposed resolution of Mr. Brodeur and the amendment thereto proposed by Mr. Monk.

Mr. TALBOT. I am somewhat surprised at the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. He seems to take very strong exception to this treaty between France and Canada and the conditions attached thereto.

Mr. MONK. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I did not take any exception to the treaty at all.

Mr. TALBOT. To the conditions, I say. My hon. friend should be aware of the fact that we have a statute of Canada, 52 Victoria, the second section of which reads as follows :—

The Governor in Council may grant to any individual or company, to whom there is granted by the government of the United Kingdom the aid hereinafter mentioned, a subsidy not exceeding the sum of fifteen thousand pounds sterling per annum, for a monthly steamship service, or a subsidy not exceeding the sum of twenty-five thousand pounds sterling per annum, for a fortnightly steamship service, between British Columbia and China and Japan, such subsidy to be granted for such term of years and on such conditions as the Governor in Council considers expedient; provided always, that during such term the government of the United Kingdom grants to such individual or company a subsidy of not less than forty-five thousand pounds sterling per annum for the monthly service, or of not less than seventy-five thousand pounds sterling per annum for the fortnightly service above mentioned.

Mr. LENNOX.

This statute has been in existence since 1889, and I do not know that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier ever took exception to it. If we read the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce with reference to the trade between Canada and China, what do we find ? We find that the total trade between Canada and China is $804,257. If we go further, and refer to the total trade between Canada and Japan, we find that it is $2,197,343 ; that is, the total trade between Canada and these two countries amounts to about $3,000,000. In the same report we find that the trade between France and Canada is over $8,000,000. Yet our friends take very strong exception to the payment of a subsidy to a line of steamers between France and Canada to carry direct trade between the two countries. We do not admit the citizens of Japan and China to Canada, we will have nothing to do with them, and we have heard eulogies from hon. members on both sides of the House in regard to immigration from France. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier says that the government is not to be commended but is rather to be blamed for giving a subsidy to any line of steamers that will facilitate this trade of over $8,000,000 between the two countries, yet neither he nor any other hon. member opposed the steamship subventions to the two countries whose citizens we will not admit to this country. It would be worth his while to explain his position on these two points.

Mr. MONK. I do not know where my hon. friend was when I spoke before six o'clock, whether he was in China or Japan I do not know, but I did not take that exception at all. I mentioned that I thought that under any circumstances it would be a wise policy to subsidize a line to France. Did my hon. friend hear me when I said that ? I said it loud enough to be heard. What I said was that if we established a direct line with France, as we must do in order to benefit by the treaty, that would be the only line plying between the two countries, and this line would consequently have a monopoly of the shipping to France, and that if we gave $200,000 a year to that line we should be able to control its rates of freight. Does my hon. friend object to that and does he think that if we give this $200,000 a year and if, as my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) says, we are losing $400,000 a year of revenue, so that we are actually the poorer by $600,000 a year, it is exorbitant to demand in our contract with that company a proviso that their rates of freight should be approved and controlled by the government ? Is there anything unreasonable in that ?

Mr. TALBOT. The unreasonableness of the hon. gentleman's position lies in the fact that it is Canadian and British bottoms that are going to get the benefit of this subsidy ; not a cent of it is to go to any French ships, either in subsidy or in transportation.

Mr. MONK. I do not know what my hon. friend means, but I know what he is driving at. It is the same old thing, to go down to the province of Quebec and say that Mr. Monk, with Dr. Sproule and Col. Hughes, opposed the French treaty, did his best to prevent our having a direct line of communication with France and that consequently, while the Liberal party were benefiting the province of Quebec, the Conservative party deserves condemnation. That is my hon. friend's object.

Mr. TALBOT. Is my hon. friend sure of that ?

Mr. MONK. I have a very, very strong suspicion. I would not like to impugn the motives of my hon. friend, but I am like the old fox, I have so often been treated to this in the province of Quebec——

Mr. TALBOT. So often been caught.

Mr. MONK. As to this law passed a long time ago the hon. gentleman is again pursuing the same policy. What was enacted years ago and before I came to this parliament does not concern us. We are met with the same kind of argument from gentlemen on the other side with regard to immigration. Immigration conditions which existed 20 years ago, according to these hon. gentlemen must exist to-day ; it does not matter if the circumstances are changed, if the current of immigration is different, if there are reasons for changing our policy. At any rate anything that was done before 1896 has been condemned by my hon. friends.

Mr. TALBOT. This statute is in existence to-day.

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend will move to amend that law, which I never heard of until this evening, so as to give control over freight rates to any government that pays 16,000 or 20,000 or 25,000 pounds sterling a year to any line of steamers, I promise him my cordial support.

I wish to correct a statement I made before recess. I said that the French surtax of 3 francs 50 centines per kilo represented $7 a ton. In that I made a mistake, it would amount to between $3.50 and $3.75 a ton. But of this I am perfectly certain ; the object of the French surtax is to prevent indirect shipping from any port of the world through European ports to France. That is the reason of that French legislation which is peculiar to that country and which has been enacted in order to encourage direct shipping to French ports. I repeat that if our plenipotentiaries who were so lauded and praised on their return and for whom we incurred so much expense, had placed before the French plenipotentiaries a demand that the surtax should not be imposed on shipments from Canada even with transhipment through certain British ports that demand would have been immediately acceded to. I repeat that it was our plenipotentiaries who demanded direct shipment and the object of that demand was to ensure the subsidizing of a line. I do not think that was wise, I do not think it was statesmanlike. I think we should not have insisted on direct shipment.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sorry my hon. friend has repeated that statement. As far as I have any means of learning the facts, it is entirely inaccurate. I do not know what possible ground the hon. gentleman can have for stating that the French government would have been willing to wave the surtax if we had asked them to do so, or what ground he has to say they were not asked, still less what ground he has to say what was the motive in the minds of the ministers in dealing with the matter. All I can say is that this surtaxe d'entrepôt is deemed by the French a very important part of their fiscal policy. It has been repeatedly discussed between the French government and ministers from Canada and we have never had the slightest intimation that they were willing to give up the surtax. When the hon. gentleman implies that all we had to do was to ask the waiving of the surtax in order to receive it, I can assure him there is absolutely no warrant whatever for any such statement.

Mr. MONK. My ground for saying we did not ask for it is, if we are to believe the documents placed before us at the time we considered the treaty, that our demands as stated by our plenipotentiaries in the blue-book, did not contain that request. Moreover, when I stated here this afternoon that we never asked from the French plenipotentiaries the extension of that favour, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) did not contradict that statement but seemed to accede to it. That is the ground I have for stating that if we had made that demand it would have been granted. I believe so, it is my impression that we did not ask it. Had we asked it, it seems to me, in view of statements made by M. Pichon in the French Chamber, that rather than abandon the important privileges obtained by the French Republic by this special list in the treaty, they would have waived the surtax for three or four British ports, and therefore we would have had competition in freight rates which would be an immense advantage. I am told that we could ship indirectly through the port of Liverpool or London to France cheaper than it will ever be possible for us to ship directly by the subsidized line.

That is the information I have. And, under these circumstances, since we have not asked for it and have not it in the treaty, I think it is fair, in spite of what my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) has said, that we should insert a clause in our

contract with the steamship company, keeping control of freight rates. I am against monopoly in this as in everything else.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member (Mr. Monk) speaks from impression, but I speak from knowledge gained from frequent discussion of the subject, not only recently, but years ago, with representatives of the French government, and they were absolutely satisfied that the French government would not waive the surtax and therefore there was no use in discussing it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I made reference to this matter this afternoon. I knew nothing at that time of the position taken by the French government. But it did seem to me very reasonable that our plenipotentiaries should have asked the privilege of having Canadian goods enter without the surtax. I do not see any harm in asking it and expressing an opinion in favour of it. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has told us that opinion in France was opposed to anything of that kind. Still I think we had a good case. We were surrendering a very large amount of revenue and proposing to subsidize a line of steamers, while France was contributing nothing towards this subsidy. I think our ministers had a splendid case to go to France with. They could say: We are doing all this, and are not asking you to contribute anything to cheapen the transportation between Canada and France, and we think it only reasonable that you should give us better terms than you may have given to some other countries. I have but a limited knowledge of the question, but I think that would have been a reasonable proposition. Of course, I accept the minister's statement that it could not be done. The reflection I made was that I thought the ministers might have asked for it. Possibly they had good reasons for not asking for it. The Minister of Finance tells us that he was aware years ago that France would not concede it. But, although he had that knowledge, I think he might have asked for it. Were I trying to make a bargain of that kind, I would advance every argument I could think of that would work in my favour, whether I believed it would result in my getting what I wanted or not. I would at least put my best foot forward. I would endeavour to impress the other party with the soundness of my case. If my requests were refused—well, I would have done my best at any rate. I think the two ministers would stand now in a better light before the country if they had done this.

Mr. LOGGIE. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) objects to the resolution largely because there will be a monopoly. I would remind the House that during the last season we have had two lines of steamers running directly from Canada to France. We have now the Furness line running out of St. John, subsidized to London, but calling at Havre. So there will be at any rate two lines. And, so far as I am concerned, I shall be quite satisfied if we have a guarantee that the ocean rates shall not exceed the ocean rate from the French port to New York. As a matter of fact, rates from France to New York in the past have been somewhat less than from Montreal to Havre, or from St. John to Havre.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Loggie) to say that these boats were running directly to France at regular intervals and not subsidized by the Canadian government?

Mr. LOGGIE. I did not say that the Furness line was running directly to France and not subsidized by the Canadian government. What I said was that they were subsidized as a London line from the maritime provinces, and that, on the way to London, they called at Havre, thus avoiding the surtax d'entrepot which is to be in existence under this treaty as it has been in the past. I have known cases where the steamship company made an error and sent goods by London boat, and when the goods were transhipped from London to Havre the surtax had to be paid. For this reason the Furness line for a number of years have run a direct boat, calling at Havre to discharge cargo before going on to London. So I do not think we need be much afraid of monopoly, provided that there is a guarantee that our ocean rate does not exceed the ocean rate between New York and French ports. While I am on my feet, I have a grievance in this regard that I would like to bring before the minister. When he is arranging the subsidies for the London boat from maritime ports, I think he ought to have in the contract a clause to the effect that the rates between St. John and Havre and St. John and London should not exceed the rates between New York and Havre, New York and London. I find that, as a matter of fact, maritime province ports and maritime province towns are not fairly dealt with in this regard. Through freight that comes via St. John and is to go through to Brockville, Toronto, Hamilton and other places is carried at a much less rate than to places within a hundred miles of St. John. I know that the steamship line claim that they have a right to give the long haul a lower rate in proportion because it competes with the New York route. But, in future, we cannot have our French goods come via New York without paying more duty. It seems to me that it would be fair to look out for maritime province towns that are exporting their goods that they do not have to pay an excessive rate—but lower rates than in the past. For example, the ocean rates from St. John to Havre have been considerably more than from Montreal to Havre. If the guarantee provided for regarding this steamship line is provided for in the case of the Furness line as well, it will meet the difficulty. It would be only

fair to the maritime province ports to have this done. As I understand from the minister, this line of steamers will run from Montreal via the straits of Belle Isle in summer. In that case, we in the maritime provinces will have no opportunity to ship by that line unless we railroad the goods up to Montreal, making the total freight rate from the maritime provinces much higher than from Montreal.

I think it would be only fair to the maritime provinces, under the circumstances, to see that the ocean rates from their ports are as low as they are from Montreal. That seems to me a reasonable proposition, and when the contract is renewed with the Furness line I would suggest to the minister to take that matter into consideration. Now regarding the point mentioned by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) as to our losing $400,000, and refunding to the manufacturers the duty paid on the materials going into the articles manufactured. It seems to me that argument does not apply here, because it is expected that there will be an increased manufacture of these articles, and consequently an increased duty paid, and if only the duty is returned that is paid in, it seems to me there can be no loss in that respect. Regarding the surtax, as I understand the matter, the French government were not willing to enter into this treaty unless that clause was inserted. If that be the case it seems to me it is only fair trade that the same provision should apply to goods coming into Canada. As for goods going from Canada to France, that has been the law for many years. I think there is one change now, that is to say that we cannot ship now via New York and escape the surtax. Am I right in that? Suppose we ship a carload of lobsters to Havre via New York, do we escape the surtax? At the present time we do, there has been no surtax during the past year on shipments via New York. I do not understand why it it so, but as a matter of fact there has been for a number of years no surtax on shipments via New York, but there has been via London. But recently nearly all our shipments have been going by the Furness line and the Allan line.

Mr. LALOR. We have heard discussed the question of the surtax that is imposed on German goods coming into Canada, and our goods going into Germany meet with a surtax. The hon. gentleman says that a shipment of lobsters via New York may escape the surtax. I am largely interested in evaporated apples and the products of evaporated apples, and I know that for years, in exporting these goods via New York to Germany, I have, like my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) escaped the surtax. That is because they go to New York, and apparently are shipped as American goods. But the French do not seem to understand that they come from Canada.

Mr. MONK. The reason why the surtax is not charged via New York by the French authorities is that it only applies to goods shipped from any part of the world and going into France through some European country. If you ship via New York there is no surtax. But the Minister of Finance has denied that we get the benefit of the treaty if we ship via New York. I think my hon. friend from Northumberland is inclined to agree with me that we ought to control the rates, but he seems to want to limit it to lobsters.

Mr. LOGGIE. No, my hon. friend wants to leave it for the Governor in Council. I say put it in the agreement and make it the same as the New York rate.

Mr. MONK. Is my hon. friend satisfied with the New York rate as it is now?

Mr. LOGGIE. Yes.

Mr. MONK. But who will say that it won't be changed, and won't become unreasonably high? If we are paying $200,000 in a subsidy, why should we oblige that company to conform to a foreign rate over which we have no control and lose control ourselves? Does my hon. friend from Northumberland know when the contract with the Furness line terminates?

Mr. LOGGIE. I think it is a yearly contract.

Mr. MONK. Then we are exposed to a monopoly.

Mr. BRODEUR. In answer to the point raised by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Loggie), the surtaxe d'entrepôt only applies to goods that are shipped to France through a European country. With regard to the question raised by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), the condition he wants to put into the statute has not been embodied in any previous statute. In the statute passed in 1896 where for the first time, a direct subsidy has been provided for, it is stated that the Governor in Council is empowered to make a contract upon conditions which may seem expedient. That statute was passed by the late government, and why was that provision made? Because conditions vary, and it is not easy to find companies who would undertake to carry out a contract carrying a subsidy if we impose too onerous conditions. Take the case we have now under consideration. From 1889 the Canadian government has had a law on the statute-book granting a subsidy for a French service. In spite of the offer which has been made since then, nobody has come forward to make a contract and take the subsidy. Why? Because it is not a paying proposition. I have quoted two cases where I know that companies which have tried to establish that service have been obliged to discontinue it. So we cannot easily find people who are ready to embark in that service. It is a subject of negotia-

tion between the government and the companies. Now what would be the result if my hon. friend put into the statute the condition which he suggests? The result might be that no company would undertake the contract.

I may go farther; a company stated to me that they would be willing to establish a service, but that they would not be willing to take the subsidy because they were bound by the subsidy in such a way that it might turn out a losing proposition. The adoption of the resolution of my hon. friend would mean that a company which might otherwise be prepared to establish that line would not be subjected to that condition. If we did not find a company willing to undertake that service the benefits of the French treaty would be lost. We would not be able to have the benefit of the reduction of duty on goods which is provided for by this treaty. It would be a most serious thing. The contract is going to expire in a few days. In a few days there will be no more obligation on the part of the Allan line to continue the service between France and Canada. It is of the greatest importance that this service should be continued, but if we put in a condition like the one my hon. friend is proposing we may kill the project. I am sure that is not what my hon. friend has in view. Why should we put a condition in the statutes to-day that has not been put in before? Let my hon. friend read the statutes of 1889 and 1896 which were passed by the previous government. These statutes give to the Governor in Council power to negotiate upon the basis of a subsidy of so much, the conditions being left entirely subject to negotiation between the company and the government. I appeal to my hon. friend. I know that he does not desire to kill the project. I know he is anxious that this direct service should be continued and I am sure that he would not like to put in a condition which would prevent this contract from being carried out. It is the intention of the government to press upon the companies which may be willing to negotiate with us the condition that the rates should be the same. If we can find a company that would be willing to accept the condition which my hon. friend puts in his resolution I would be very glad but I am almost sure that we would not be able to find a company which would accept such a condition. If my hon. friend is willing that we should make this contract and maintain this service he will not insist upon the proposition which he has made being part of the contract. The statute of 1903 provides that:

The Governor in Council may enter into a contract for a term not exceeding ten years with an individual or company for the performance of a steamship service between a port or ports in Canada and a French port or ports on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council deems expedient, and may grant therefor a subsidy not exceeding one million three hundred and thirty-three thousand three hundred and thirty-three dollars.

Provision is made in the statute by which a contract for two years may be made. It was to our advantage then to induce some company to accept that contract at that time, but nobody would accept it. They did not know whether it would be a success or not. We were very glad that the Allan line were willing to make a contract for three years. They would not accept a ten-year contract because they were afraid of serious loss which might be incurred in establishing that service. My hon. friend wants to impose a condition which I am sorry I cannot accept. However, I will assure my hon. friend and the House that the intention of the government is to try, in the negotiations, to get an assurance that the rates will be fair, and if any company is willing to accept the condition which my hon. friend is now proposing I will be very glad, but I fear there will not be many people who will be willing to accept that condition. I regret, therefore, that I cannot accept this amendment.

Mr. MONK. I do not know under what circumstances this House adopted legislation in the eighties. I do not know what were the conditions which prevailed at that time. Our hon. friends on the other side are always citing to us as models the perfected things that were done long before the parliament of 1896 existed, but it is difficult to know what the circumstances were at that time. But, this much strikes me as rather significant. My hon. friend declared this afternoon that he intended placing in the contract that the company should conform to the rates of freight obtaining between New York and La Havre. Does he find this condition more acceptable by a company than the one I have suggested? For my part I would look with a great deal of suspicion upon a company which, receiving $200,000 subsidy from the government, would not be prepared to submit their freight rates for the approval of the government. It seeems to me a very fair proposition and the condition seems a more acceptable one than the one mentioned by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It seems to me that ship owners would bind themselves to something much more indefinite and rigorous under the terms of a contract to conform to the rates of freight which may exist at any time between New York and Havre than if they accepted the condition to submit their rates to the approval of the government which subsidized them to the extent of $200,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would be very happy to see this condition put in but I would be rather inclined to think that we could not get anybody to tender upon it.

Mr. MONK. What is the difference between a condition that says to a steamship company: You must be willing to conform exactly to the freight rates between New York and France, and saying to the company: We reserve the right of approval of rates?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no objection. It will be a matter for my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I will be glad to report the discussion which we are now having to my colleague and I am sure he will give it his most serious consideration, but I am afraid that if we put in such a condition we cannot find anybody who will make a contract. I might perhaps succeed in having this clause inserted, but if we make it a condition immediately, I am afraid we would not get any company which would accept it. The only promise I can make is that the matter will be the subject of negotiations with any company which we can find disposed to enter into a contract with the government. This assurance ought to be acceptable to my hon. friend because I am sure he would not like to defeat the line that exists now between France and Canada.

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend gives the assurance that he will see that the rates of freight will be protected in some way or other, I am very glad to take note of his declaration. We are very anxious to see this line established. I am sorry my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) is not here to take a note also of this declaration of the hon. minister. For my part, I would be prepared to withdraw this resolution although it seems to me a reasonable one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) or the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) or whoever it may be that undertakes the preparation or supervision of this contract should pay a good deal of attention to the stipulations of the contract. I remember a debate in parliament some three or four years ago in which it was clearly demonstrated that steamers subsidized by the Canadian exchequer were carrying goods from Chicago and other points of shipment in the United States at a lower rate than they were carrying goods from Canada across the Atlantic. The contract was so unfortunately framed that there seemed to be absolutely no remedy, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who was then a member of this House, was obliged to admit that such a condition of affairs did exist because indisputable evidence was brought of the fact. I would like also to know from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what is the proposal of the government regarding a system of cold storage. It is anticipated that certain Canadian products, which require specially a system of that kind, will be exported to France in largely increased quantities under the French treaty. If the treaty and this subsidized line are supposed to work together, surely the minister must see how extremely important it is that cold storage accommodation should be provided on board these steamers; and while the stipulations and terms and conditions cannot be set out in a resolution or a statute, we ought to understand what the policy of the government is in that regard before we pass this resolution.

Mr. BRODEUR. In the existing contract there is a clause which provides for cold storage facilities, and of course it is the policy of the government to provide the same facilities in any future contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I hope the facilities will be more efficient than some I have heard described in this House, especially by my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith). My hon. friend pointed out in a very forcible and convincing speech this session that the conditions contained in the contract with the government have not been very useful. There has been absolutely no control by the government over the temperature; and consequently, owing to these defects in the contract made by the government with certain steamship companies, the cold storage accommodation has been almost altogether useless in some cases at least. Would it not be possible to remedy that? I have not heard any answer to the indictment of my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith), at least none that would satisfy me. If his charges were well founded, surely the government should endeavour to so frame the new contract that these conditions may not continue.

Mr. FISHER. All the contracts for steamship subsidies, for a number of years back, contain the condition that the steamer shall supply adequate cold storage facilities. Those facilities have been such as to meet the requirements of the trade. It may be that occasionally the temperature was a little higher or a little lower, but the general conditions of the cold storage chambers in all subsidized steamers going out from Canada have been such as to meet the requirements of the trade. There are, of course, a number of vessels going out from Canada which are not subsidized and over which the government have no control, but in the subsidized steamers the cold storage facilities have been sufficient. When the trade has made any complaint of any kind, the Department of Trade and Commerce has immediately drawn the attention of the steamship owners to the complaints and has had them cleared up, and in all such cases the Department of Trade and Commerce refers to the Department of Agriculture for advice. I happen to know of one of the complaints made not very long ago regarding one of our lines of steamers, and there was some little discussion going on in the De-

partment of Trade and Commerce with that line in which the owners of the steamers submitted evidence as to what actually occurred and claimed that they had fulfilled the necessary conditions. I cannot offhand give the details.

Mr. BERGERON. Who would be the judge?

Mr. FISHER. The Department of Trade and Commerce. If the conditions were not fulfilled, that department has the power to withhold the subsidy.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. In what way has the department control? There is no agreement in the contract with these steamers that they must carry goods at any stated temperature or at any temperature subject to the approval of the government.

Mr. FISHER. There is no temperature stated in the contract, it is true, but the conditions are in general terms. They are obliged to provide adequate facilities for cold storage and the Department of Trade and Commerce is the judge, and that department is generally advised by mine.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. It is very easy to provide facilities but it is quite another thing to provide that they be properly carried out. I see nothing in the contract which gives the government any control or enables them to compel the companies to operate these cold storage plants at any given temperature or in any manner the government may dictate.

Mr. FISHER. There is no doubt that there is no definite condition, but the parties with whom the contract is made have to carry on their service to the satisfaction of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He is the judge and he can at any time hold back part of their subsidy or fine them for not having provided facilities adequate for the purpose. To go into details in a contract and state just what temperature would be required in every chamber would be practically impossible. The matter has to be dealt with in general terms, and the department must judge whether the service supplied is adequate for the necessities or the trade.

Mr. BERGERON. Are these cold storage facilities costly?

Mr. FISHER. The insulation of the chambers and the installation of the machinery to keep them cool are quite costly.

Mr. BERGERON. The government do not contribute to this.

Mr. FISHER. Not for many years, but we require all our subsidized steamers to be provided with cold storage facilities. I may say that the Department of Trade and Commerce, when any question arises, refers to the officers of my department, who are more familiar with cold storage matters. That is why I happen to know something about the cases that have arisen.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. That only applies to steamers at present receiving subsidies, which are only a limited number, are they not?

Mr. FISHER. We are speaking of the line of subsidized steamers sailing to Japan Steamers receiving subsidies must provide cold storage facilities.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. My criticism has always been in regard to those steamers that received subsidies for providing a cold storage plant. These have expired.

Mr. FISHER. That is another matter. Any steamer that receives a subsidy from the government of Canada is now and has been for a good many years required to provide such cold storage facilities as are necessary for the trade.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. From what port of Canada do these steamers proceed ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are no places fixed as ports of call, either in Canada or on the other side. That will be the subject of negotiation.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that the steamer 'Parisian' of the Allan line was engaged in the service between Canada and France. Does my hon. friend know whether she has cold storage facilities according to the regulations?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR. In the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce it is stated that each vessel shall be fitted with such amount of cold storage accommodation and under such regulations as the minister may require, and to be at all times subject to the approval of the minister. It is the intention of the government to provide for the same thing in the contract to be made under this resolution.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there any inspector in the Department of Trade and Commerce to see that these vessels are built as they should be, or does the department only act after receiving a complaint?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the department has some means by which it can ascertain whether or not the obligations of the contract in that respect are being fulfilled. I do not know how it is done, but I am very sure it is done.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. Minister of Agriculture said that when the department heard of a complaint they would see that it was attended to.

Mr. FISHER. I am not in a position to state exactly what arrangements the Department of Trade and Commerce has for the inspection of the vessels. I take it, however,

that when a contractor offers a vessel to the department for the carrying out of the contract, he has to describe the vessel and show that it has cold storage accommodation. I may say that the cold storage plant is not always in operation, but only when there are any cold storage products offered for freight. If it is not then operated the department would see to it and would no doubt immediately call the contractor to account.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It seems to me that in regard to cold storage the Minister of Agriculture is simply placing himself in the same old position that he has occupied for several years. Several years ago he spent hundreds of thousands of dollars getting vessels equipped with cold storage plants, but took no control over the temperature in those boats, and, judging from his remarks, he is in the same position now. He is prepared to grant to this company a subsidy for merely installing a cold storage system in their boats by which they can take care of their food or other materials, but they will not look after the perishable products which are being shipped to France. These vessels carry only a very small portion of the perishable products of Canada to the markets of Europe in cold storage chambers, and we may expect the same thing to occur under the contract which we are now providing for, unless the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will in some way compel the contractor to come under government regulations in regard to the temperature that should be maintained in those chambers while the vessels are crossing the Atlantic. There is no reason why we should pay out money for the equipment of steamers with cold storage accommodation which is so small that it will only take care of the food of the passengers. I cannot impress too strongly on the minister the fact that though he has been spending hundreds and thousands of dollars in helping to install cold storage equipments in vessels crossing the Atlantic, they have not been giving the satisfaction to the shippers of perishable products. A very small portion of the perishable products are carried in these cold storage chambers, and the minister knows it. If he refers to the splendid system of cold storage in the boats coming from the Argentine Republic, Australia and New Zealand, and compare it with the system we have, he will find that we are in a most humiliating position in that regard. I wish I could impress upon him the importance, when entering into this contract, of providing that the government shall have control over the temperature in these chambers and also over the rates. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) gives us to understand that there is to-day direct communication between Canadian ports and France and that the service is reasonably satisfactory to our people, except that the rates may be excessive. If the present service is fairly satisfactory, now that the Minister of Marine is going to double the subsidy it is only reasonable and fair that we should ask that some consideration should be given to the shippers of Canada, not only as to cold storage, but as to reduction of rates.

Mr. LOGGIE. The present service from the maritime provinces is only a monthly service and certainly Canada is entitled to a better service to France. I wish to say a word in defence of the steamship lines having cold storage. Both the Allans and the Canadian Pacific Railway have first class cold storage accommodation. I know as a matter of fact that on several trips they have taken over as much as forty or fifty tons of frozen salmon during August and September and it has arrived in first-class condition. I can speak with some assurance and I say that the cold storage plant on these two lines is satisfactory.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. On that one product.

Mr. LOGGIE. If they can carry that they can carry anything because it requires such a low temperature.

Mr. MARSHALL. During a previous discussion I stated that French peas were artificially coloured. I have here a tin of French peas bearing on the label a statement that they are coloured with copperas. There is no mistake about that. I would like to know what the Minister of Agriculture is going to do. You allow these goods to come in coloured but you will not allow Canadian packers to colour their goods.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the Act which applies to Canadian goods applies to all canned goods exposed for sale in Canada, these imported goods will be subject to exactly the same restrictions as Canadian goods.

Mr. BRODEUR. I made a statement the other day that possibly may not have been quite clear. I said that the Adulteration Act applied not only to Canadian goods but also to imported goods, I think the law reads that all goods offered for sale are liable to be inspected and to be analysed, and if they are found to be adulterated the person offering them for sale is liable to a penalty under the Adulteration Act.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would this be effective against the French treaty ?

Mr. FISHER. No, but it would be against the man who attempted to sell adulterated goods in this country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The question is when you find them what will you do with them.

Mr. FISHER. We will apply the Canadian law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not seem to be applied very hard.

Mr. FISHER. It can be at any time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The question is whether the policy of the government is that it can or will be. The pure food law is supposed to be for the public benefit. If it amounts to anything it should be enforced by the government.

Mr. FISHER. Let me take issue at once. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that there are regular inspectors of the Inland Revenue Department to enforce the Adulteration Act, but as far as the Canned Goods Act passed last year is concerned, it is not contemplated that the government shall set to work and prosecute everybody all over the country. The Act is to a large extent like the Fruit Marks Act, it defines what may or may not be sold, and there are certain government inspectors to, if I may use the term, frighten the dealers in these goods, and who can be called on to inspect goods in any case, but there is no expectation or intention that every package of goods in the country shall be inspected or marked or tagged and it is the same with the Adulteration Act. If adulterated goods are sold my hon. friend or any one else can take action against the person offering them for sale, but the inspectors cannot possibly inspect all the goods in the country and mark them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not suggesting that every one throughout the country should be prosecuted but only those who expose for sale an article that I understand is injurious to health. The allegation has been made in this House without contradiction that articles of food which are coloured with this very ingredient, sulphate of copper are injurious to human health.

Mr. FISHER. I should think so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not dealing with the specific terms of any Act, but with the policy, and I say that such a case comes exactly within the terms of the pure food law. If you undertake to enforce the pure food law, you should punish those violating the Act.

Mr. FISHER. Should we not prosecute the buyer?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not unless he bought to sell again.

Mr. FIELDING. Should we not prosecute the hon. gentleman who has produced this tin of peas ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend has brought this tin of peas here in order to instruct a somewhat ignorant government in their duty.

Mr. FISHER. There are a number of articles that are said to be adulterated or coloured by injurious matters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I speak of things injurious to human health.

Mr. FISHER. I understand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know the statement referred to, but I believe it is that certain peas are coloured with copperas.

Mr. FISHER. Does the can indicate that the peas are coloured with copperas?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to have the opinion of a medical expert as to whether it is injurious to health, as I think it is, and I would say that any goods marked 'coloured with copperas' ought to be prohibited.

Mr. BARR. I do not think it requires even a medical man to know that sulphate of copper is a most injurious poison, and it is impossible to colour goods as these goods are coloured without using a quantity of copperas which would be injurious to health. I think the officers of the law are not doing their duty when the sale of these goods is permitted. There is no question that they are injurious and that the large numbers of persons using them are running the risk of injury. Now it is very much to the detriment of the Canadian canners that they should be compelled to compete with these goods. They are not permitted to put out goods coloured in that way. But there is no doubt that goods coloured in that way are much more attractive than the ordinary canned peas. We know that the dealers endeavour to explain it away, saying that the quantity of colouring matter used is so small as not to be injurious, and thus many are induced to purchase. But I believe it is the duty of the officers of the law to see to it that these articles are not sold to the public. If there is sufficient of this colouring matter used to colour the peas, it is injurious to the consumer.

Mr. FIELDING. Since the announcement is stamped on the can that the peas are coloured with sulphate of copper, would it not be a fair presumption that only such a quantity is used as is held not to be unwholesome? We can understand the use of dangerous colouring matter when the fact of its use is concealed, but, when the fact is stamped on the can, the ordinary observer would imagine that the colouring is not held to be unwholesome. I merely throw out that suggestion.

Mr. BARR. I know that the ordinary observer may come to that conclusion. But that just shows the wisdom of those who

sell the goods—by putting it on the can they make the public believe that the colouring is not injurious, though, in fact, it may be known to be injurious by those who put up these goods.

Mr. MARSHALL. I think that the reason the statement concerning colouring the peas is stamped on the cans is to be found in the pure food law of the United States. There used to be quite a lot of French peas shipped to the United States, but, under the pure food law, this trade could not be continued unless the label showed what the goods were coloured with.

Mr. FIELDING. Are these goods French or Italian?

Mr. MARSHALL. French, I believe.

Mr. FISHER. The name is an Italian name.

Mr. MARSHALL. I notice that there is an import into Canada of $65,000 worth of canned goods from France in the year. I have never yet seen a can of French corn or of French tomatoes in this market. Therefore, I think practically all these imports must be of peas.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman speaks of these as coming from France, but the label is in English and the name seems to be an Italian name.

Mr. MARSHALL. I think they are from France. I think it would have been only fair for the ministers to consult the canners before they arranged for a reduction of this duty. Large sums have been spent by the Canadian canners to put their business in shape to put up peas and corn, and, as a matter of fact, the canners of this country can pack double the peas that they can find sale for. Our market is confined to this country. We can undertake to ship goods to the United States, but we are met with a duty of 48 cents per dozen, to say nothing of the fact that in the United States also they pack more than they can find sale for. The ministers have reduced the duty by 16 per cent. But we are glad, very often, to sell goods at a profit of 5 per cent.

Mr. ELSON. I desire to say a word on this resolution and also on the French treaty. These are so closely connected that one is little use without the other, and it seems to me that the resolution should have been discussed about the same time as the treaty. I speak from the standpoint of the farmer, and shall not touch any other line. I cannot agree with the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Schell) and the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) concerning this French treaty, that a large trade will be likely to be worked up between Canada and France as a result of the treaty. I had thought there would be an effort on the part of the plenipotentiaries to make a treaty that would be beneficial to both countries. But it seems to me that our plenipotentiaries did not give due consideration to the interests of our farmers. See how the French government protect the agricultural interest of their country. Note how careful Germany is to protect her farmers and the products of the soil. Consider the United States, close beside us, how particularly careful that government is to protect its farming class. But, apparently, our plenipotentiaries overlooked the farmers of this country. They seem to have regarded our farmers as hewers of wood and drawers of water in years past, and, as the farmers did not complain, these gentlemen seem to have thought that the condition might safely be continued. But I believe the farmers are awakening to their own interest, and that they will expect the government, whatever side of politics it may represent, to give them fair play and justice. Speaking from the standpoint of the farmer, I wish to allude to some articles covered by this first schedule 'a.' The first article is horses. I believe that Canada is a splendid country for raising first class horses. We have men who understand thoroughly the business of horse breeding, and we have the pasture fields and the feed to raise horses to maturity. I think I may be pardoned if I am somewhat elated upon this subject. For some horses raised in the riding which I have the honour to represent in this House were shipped over to England last year to the great exhibition there, and I am glad to say that these Canadian horses from the constituency I have the honour to represent swept the first prize in competition with the world.

Canada is an excellent country for raising horses, and France is a great importer of horses. She imported in 1905 $2,397,000 worth of horses, but not one of them came from Canada. Although this treaty has reduced the duty on horses, it is still prohibitory, $30 on a horse is a prohibitory duty; so I feel that this treaty is no good to the Canadian horse raiser. Then look at cattle. Is not Canada a magnificent country for raising cattle ? Does she not raise vast numbers of sheep and steers which bring great sums of money into our country ? But what chance have we of dealing with France ? Take oxen, for instance, the first item mentioned in the schedule, and what is the duty upon them ? An ox, I suppose, would be a steer six or seven years old that has got his growth, in good condition, and would weigh probably 1,700 or 1,800 pounds at least. The duty upon an ox is 20 francs per hundred kilogrammes. We will reckon the franc at 20 cents, which is a little above the mark ; that would be $4 upon every hundred kilogrammes. Now, an ox weighing 700 kilogrammes would meet a duty of

$28 going into France. There is no chance of selling them there. Then take cows. France is a great importer of cows, she paid nearly $2,000,000 for cows in 1905, but not a dollar came to Canada. We did not send a single cow to France. There is no chance of doing it even now, because a cow is supposed to weigh 1,200 or 1,300 pounds, that would mean about 600 kilogrammes, or $24 duty on a cow. No possible chance of sending in cows. Then take steers which we take so much pride in. They would weigh probably 1,500 pounds or 700 kilogrammes, and the duty would be $28. So there is little chance of finding a market in France under the French treaty for our cattle. I must say there was a small number of young cattle went into France, to the value of $113,000. But that is a very small item in the vast sum of nearly $2,000,000 which France paid for young cattle.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is another thing I would call attention to. I notice that sheep are not mentioned at all in this French treaty. Let me say again that I feel a little dignified, because the constituency I have the honour to represent has turned out some magnificent sheep. Large numbers of them were taken over to Chicago and exhibited there in the past two or three years, in competition with the whole world, and again Canadian sheep swept all the prizes. Yet sheep are not mentioned at all in this French treaty. What is the reason of that ? I will tell you why. I remember a speech that was made here last year by an hon. gentleman who had been up to the experimental farm and had seen the sheep there. I remember hearing him say from his place in this House : I have seen scabby sheep, but of all the scabby sheep I have ever seen those at the experimental farm were the scabbiest. Now, what does the Minister of Agriculture think of that? I think probably that was the reason why our plenipotentiaries did not mention sheep in this French treaty. Now, there is poultry. Canada is a fine country for raising poultry, and I am pleased to say that about 15 years ago, in the time of Sir Charles Tupper, poultry was on the minimum tariff ; yet no poultry has been sent from Canada to France, although France buys a large quantity. Then again there is fresh meat, none of that goes into France, mutton being 3 cents a pound, pork and beef about the same. Salted pork and beef, France only took $10 worth. There doesn't seem to be a possibility of getting a trade there. Bacon and ham, nearly 3 cents a pound ; France buys about a million and a half dollars worth of that. Pork, $10 per hundred kilogrammes. France buys $700,000 worth of that, but we get none of it. Dead poultry, that is also under the old treaty. France buys a great deal of that, but we get none of it. Canned meat was also under the old treaty, and we only exported to France about $5 worth ; no chance of working up a trade there. Then in the matter of eggs, France is a great importer. In 1905 she bought no less than $7,300,000 worth of eggs, yet Canada gets none of that. Cheese—now there is something of great importance to the farmers of this country. Since the wheat fields of the west have been doing so well they have crowded out the farmers of the older provinces, shifted them to one side as it were in the matter of raising grain, and our eastern farmers have gone into dairying. Yet we find that nothing at all has been done in this French treaty to admit cheese into France. It is the same as under the old treaty of 14 years ago. Now, France bought in 1905 $9,720,000 worth of cheese, yet none of it comes to us. Butter about the same way. Then wheat, Mr. Chairman, is not our country noted for its excellent wheat fields ? Look at the Northwest we are so proud of, and its wheat fields of which we boast, hoping and expecting that they will become the granary of the world in the course of time. But, Sir, where is the chance of sending much wheat to France under this treaty ? No chance worth speaking of considering that France is purchasing $37,000,000 worth of wheat annually while she only takes from Canada $45,000 worth. What is the duty upon wheat? It is under the old treaty; this present treaty does not touch it at all and yet, if you figure it out you will find that the duty upon wheat is 36 cents per bushel. We cannot expect to work up much trade under conditions of that kind. It is the same with oats. France is a great importer of oats, she purchased no less than $10,000,000 worth in 1905, and yet she takes none from us. The present duty does not make any change whatever but leaves the duty, under the old general tariff, the same as it was fifteen years ago. Oatmeal, rye and barley are much the same. Then, there are canned tomatoes and corn. My hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) alluded to peas. Tomatoes in cans imported from France in 1905 amounted to $55,000 in value. The old duty was 1½ cents and it is now reduced to 1¼ cents. What chance will our farmers and vegetable growers have to raise tomatoes and corn? Surely we ought to raise all the vegetables we require for the supply of our own markets. On account of cheap labour in France they can send these goods in cheaper than our growers can raise them and our canners can put them up. This is an injustice to the farmers and vegetable growers of Canada. I do not see very much benefit in the French treaty as far as the farmer is concerned. It is true that we may be able to get our wines and champagnes a little cheaper but our farmers do not indulge to any great extent in luxuries of that kind, and it is well that they do not. The treaty in this respect works an injustice to the grape growers of our own coun-

try. Now as Canada will lose about $400,000 revenue in addition to the subsidy granted, and as France buys from Canada only $1,400,000 in goods and Canada buys from France $6,500,000 per year, it seems to me that France should pay at least half the subsidy instead of nothing, as now proposed. A few days ago the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) in his speech said that in his part of the country the farmer was looked upon as the man who worked the farm and the agriculturist was the man who worked the farmer. When that statement was made there was a tremendous pounding of desks on the other side of the House; it seems to me almost like a roar of musketry. I felt at the moment as if it were rather a reflection upon the farmers of the country, but when I recall the fact that it was the first of April I looked upon it as a little bit of a joke. The hon. member who made that remark knows perfectly well, so does every hon. member of this House and so do the farmers whom he represents, that the agriculturist and the farmer are one and the same man. There was one exception made yesterday to which I shall not allude. But as a general thing the farmer and the agriculturist are one and the same man and instead of the agriculturist working the farmer it seems to me that it is this extravagant Liberal government that is working the agriculturist or the farmer for all he is worth. I sincerely hope that the government of the day will see to it that the agricultural interest of the country shall be fostered and that everything will be done by the government that they can do to encourage young men to stay upon the land and thereby to increase the wealth of the country.

In regard to the proposed motion before the committee, I would like to see it amended just by the insertion of a small syllable, or, falling that, of one word. For instance, it reads 'that it is expedient.' I would propose that before the word 'expedient' there should be inserted 'in' so that it would read that it is expedient'; or, if that be not suitable, that the word 'not' should be inserted before the word 'expedient.' That is about the way I look at the proposed resolution. However, if the government decide to pass the resolution I would certainly feel like voting for the amendment of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, because it will improve the resolution. But, at the same time I would like to see it dropped altogether.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. With the permission of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) I will order that an examination be made of this can of peas. I, of course, do not know whether sulphate of copper is deleterious or not, but I will submit it to the analyst of the department who has charge of the adulteration of foods branch.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. That is not sulphate of copper; it is sulphate of iron.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The can is marked 'sulphate of copper.'

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. Some hon. gentleman spoke about copperas. Copperas is not sulphate of copper.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. As my hon. friend the Minister of Finance said the appearance of the words 'coloured by sulphate of copper' upon the can would indicate that its use was believed to be harmless, but I will have it investigated, and if it is a contravention of the Adulteration of Foods Act, as was suggested by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) we may have some prosecutions.

Mr. HENDERSON. It would scarcely be fair to have this sent to the analyst in the name of my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) because he is not the man who sold these goods. In case that my hon. friend may be reported all over the country as dealing in a class of goods that are poisonous I think it would be well that the minister should get the name of the person from whom my hon. friend from East Elgin purchased these goods. He could go down to Sparks street and find the name at once.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. One of the greatest difficulties that we find in enforcing the Adulteration of Foods Act is to get evidence against the parties selling. The evidence we produce in court is that of the inspector of the Inland Revenue Department who purchases from the dealer the articles supposed to be adulterated. That inspector has to go into court and testify that he bought a particular article from a particular individual. I do not for a moment suppose that we will use the hon. member for East Elgin for that purpose. We could get some of our officials to procure further samples.

Mr. A. M. McLEAN. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) stated that the ocean freight rate from St. John was greater than the ocean freight rate from Montreal. I am informed by shippers in the maritime provinces that they can ship lobsters from points on the north side of the St. Lawrence to Montreal and get a cheaper rate from Montreal to Havre than they can from St. John. It should be provided in any contract that the rate from St. John shall be the ruling rate, if the company will not take the New York rate. I do not think that shippers from the maritime provinces should pay a higher rate than do shippers from Montreal. I know of my own personal knowledge that men who ship lobsters to France can get cheaper rates by way of

Montreal than by way of St. John. There should be a uniform rate from the maritime provinces and all other points in Canada.

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall make inquiries of the Trade and Commerce Department, and if we can get the right to control the freight rates, that will be a matter to be dealt with by that department.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the minister announced the assent of His Excellency to this resolution.

Mr. BRODEUR. The announcement was made when the resolution was introduced.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. BRODEUR moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 145) to amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## PROPRIETARY AND PATENT MEDICINES.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to bring in a measure providing for the inspection and the regulation of the sale of proprietary and patent medicines.—Mr. Templeman.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). I think it is generally conceded that there is some need for legislation on this matter. The various provinces have attempted to legislate on it on numerous occasions during the past four or five years, but in almost every instance that legislation was withdrawn because it was felt that any Act of this kind should be of a Dominion character. Two sessions ago a committee of this House took evidence and reported that legislation should be enacted to regulate to some extent the sale of patent medicines. Last session a Bill was prepared and I think distributed, but it was not passed owing to the fact that we wanted to bring the session to a close. The Bill of last session was of a rather drastic character, and after numerous interviews with representatives of the wholesale and retail trade and of the manufacturers of proprietary medicines, it was found very difficult to frame legislation which would safeguard the public interests without at the same time committing injustice to the business interests. The Bill I am about to introduce is a new one. It does not altogether follow the line of the Bill of last session. It proposes to define what constitutes a proprietary medicine and will exempt from its operation all patent or proprietary medicines which bear a label giving the formula of the remedy, thereby giving publicity to its various ingredients.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the hon. gentleman say that a retail merchant can put up a cough mixture for sale provided he places on the bottle a label giving the ingredients ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Any one can put up any medicine for sale provided he publishes the formula on the bottle. The Bill provides also that the use of cocaine shall be absolutely prohibited. The use of an unusual quantity of alcohol is also prohibited. Another clause provides for naming on the label any deleterious drug which the medicine may contain, and a list of drugs considered deleterious is given in the schedule. These are the main features of the Bill. It does not go as far as some gentlemen may want, but I thought it better to go slow and enact some law and have it in operation a year or two in order to ascertain how it works, and then later amendments may be made.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM. Will the formula be given in Latin or English ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I certainly think it ought to be in English.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the hon. minister considered the advisability of inserting a clause forbidding the importaton or sale of absinthe ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would it not be wise to have an amendment of the kind ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We are prepared to accept amendments that will improve the Bill.

Mr. BERGERON. The suggestion of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Chisholm) that, if a formula is to be published on the bottle, it should be in a language the people understood, is certainly one that ought to be adopted.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I understood by the Bill of last year that a fee was attached to each patent medicine, and a retail merchant, on paying that fee, might put up a special medicine himself. Is that eliminated ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is practically no fee. There is a registration fee of $1 for one firm or individual, and on paying that $1 they may put up as many medicines as they please.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would emphasize the necessity of some clause being put in

the Bill which will prohibit the use of absinthe in this country altogether.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is not a proprietary or patent medicine.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 146) respecting proprietary and patent medicines.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.07 p.m.

# INDEX

## FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT, 1907-1908.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Conside ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques- Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

---


ADAMSON, Mr. A. J., *Humboldt.*

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, 1732 (i); in Com., 4996 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10511 (iv).

Northern Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 7) 1°*, 231 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8583 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, of, &c., Com. of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2276 (ii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4401 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552 (v).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5955; Section of House of Commons Act (read) 5955 (iii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1843 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 80) 1° m., 1671 (i); 2° m., 5228 (iii).

——— B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7890 (iv), 11753 (vi); in Com., 11812, 11840, (amt.) 11846, 11927 (vi); in Com., 12939 (vii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13254 (vii).

Immigration Agent A. G. McDonald, Payments *re* Placing of Immigrants (M. for cor.*) 4773 (iii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12402 (vii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants, &c. (Ques.) 8617 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7231; on M. for 3°, 7222 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9498 (v).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11998 (vi).

Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9969; (relief to settlers) 9985 (v).

Indians, Ont and Que. (land sales) 12735 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (patrol boats) 4750 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (obstructions) 3213; (tidal services) 3215; (wrecks) 3202 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5528 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10865 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10899 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8530 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax, customs) 7163; (Halifax, military) 7144; (Shelburne) 7177 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 7680; (Kincardine) 7699; (Kingston gun shed) 7701; (London military) 7708; (North Bay) 7713 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Museum) 1498 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8594 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte) 12092 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713; (Stanley island pier) 5722 (iii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I.C.R. (St. Cyrille diversion) 12757 (vii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10544 (vi).

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).

Albert Development Co., Control of Coal Lands (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

All-Red Line, Mr. White's Duties in England (Ques.) 694 (i).

Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Boyle Concession, Memorials from Dawson Legislature (Ques.) 509, 562, 681 (i).

Census Map, Publishing of (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re* (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).

Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 8380 (v).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 5469 (iii).

—— Agency of M. McKenzie and J. H. Moss, Applications, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

—— Held by F. E. Keniston, Cor., Papers, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

—— Name and Address of Agents *re* Applications, &c. (Ques.) 5789 (iii).

Coal Lands, Applicants, Names, Price, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3434 (ii).

Coal Lands in Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c. (Ques.) 9278 (v.)

—— Royalty Fees, &c., Sale or Lease of (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt., Original Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 3232, 3480 (ii).

—— Purchase Price, &c., on Section 16, 20 and 21, &c. (Ques.) 10512 (vi).

—— sold, or assigned, &c., since March, 1907 (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

—— Sale of through J. W. Bettes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6242 (iv).

—— sold by P. E. Lessard (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

—— Sale by McGivern & Hayden (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

—— in Sections 2, 4, 9, 15, 17 and 28, First Applicants, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

—— in Section 13, First Applicants, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii).

AMES, Mr. H. B. —*Con.*

Coal Mining Privileges in Sections 11, Applications, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 3850 (ii).

Coal Mining in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt., &c. (Ques.) 10257 (v).

Customs Frauds, in Montreal, Complaints *re* Compromises (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9558 (v).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers (M. for ret.) 1132; (reply) 1196; Amt. neg. (Y. 51; N. 86) 1201 (i).

Documents, Original, Examination of by Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 3853 (ii).

—— Production to Members, on M. for Sup., 1775, 1806 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11817; (amt.) 11821 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11137; in Com., 11189, 11423 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4678 (iii); in Com., 10761 (vi).

Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c. (Ques.) 846 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1408 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products enjoying benefit of Minimum Tariff, &c. (M. for ret.) 851 (i).

—— Correction of Question *re* Sir Charles Tupper's Expenses, 1424 (i).

—— Favoured Nation Clause; and Foreign Powers, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

—— German Surtax, Effect, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

—— Imports from U.S., Exclusion of, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

—— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

Fishing Privileges granted in Clearwater, &c., Lakes, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

—— on Lesser Slave Lake, Date of Lease, Protest, &c. (Ques.) 6398 (iv).

Gaetz Brothers, Payments to (Ques.) 10514 (vi).

G. T. P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

G. T. P. Prohibition Zone, Reduction of, &c. (Ques.) 516 (i).

Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Woods, Fleck and Finnie (Ques.) 238 (i).

Homestead Application of Mr. John C. Haddock, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11197 (vi).

Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage (Ques.) 6920 (iv).

Homesteading in Section 18, Extension *re* Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 8381 (v).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Hough, Campbell and Ferguson, Sales of Lands to, &c. (Ques.) 364, 568 (i).
Immigrant Bonuses, Increase to Agents, &c. (Ques.) 3429 (ii).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4673 (iii).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to date, &c. (Ques.) 11299 (vi).
Land Grants to Rys., Selection, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 4766 (iii).
*See* 'Rys.', &c.
Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantee, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
Land Patents, Section 8, Twp. 53, &c., Occupation of Present Owner, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).
McGuire, ex-chief Justice, Superannuation of, &c. (Ques.) 10514 (vi).
Mining, Surface or Timber Rights, on Section 8, Applications, &c. (M. for copies*) 3850 (ii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse, Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).
Patent and Proprietary Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10553 (vi).
Peace River Colonization and Land Development Co., Surveys, Reps., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 3481 (ii).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals of (Ques.) 9271 (v).
—— Amounts and Names of Cos. (Ques.) 9271 (v).
Railway Land Grants in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, &c. (Ques.) 6920 (iv).
*See* 'Lands.'
Ry. Subsidies in Land, Areas for 1892-6 (Ques.) 8613 (v).
Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4662 (iii).
*See* 'Documents.'
Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended to Date (Ques.) 4763 (iii).
—— (M.) for Papers, 5210 (iii).
St. Andrews Rapids Improvements, Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co. (Ques.) 238 (i).
Sessional Paper No. 167b, brought down April 26 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).
Sessional Paper No. 207 *re* Fishing Leases (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9538 (v).
Dom. Lands (surveys) 9996 (v).
Marine (ice breakers) 1895 (i).



AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dominion arsenal) 7434; (Montreal, barracks) 7408; (Montreal examining warehouse) 7424; (Montreal, post office) 7410; (Montreal, station B) 7419; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Nicolet) 7428; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11693 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11686; (Madawaska) 11696 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. Lake Ainslie) 11228; (McPherson's Cove) 11229; (Margaree) 11229; (Middle River) 11229; (New Glasgow) 11257; (Oyster Pond) 11258; (Parker's Cove) 11258; (Parrsborough) 11259; (Porter's lake) 11260; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268; (Pugwash) 11280; (Round Hill) 11281; (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).
Taché, J. C., Emplmt. in Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 8180 (iv).
Timber Berths, Leasing, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2269 (ii).
Timber Berths, 1046, &c., Original Applications (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
—— No. 1100, Area, &c. (Ques.) 364 (i).
—— No. 1168, Area, &c. (Ques.) 363 (i).
—— No. 1279, Applications, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).
Timber Lands, Sale or Lease subsequent to Ret. of April, 1907 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 3580 (ii).
Timber Leases, *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8711 (v).
Timber Licenses in Man. and N. W. Ters., Renewals, &c., Total Areas, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).
Timber Licenses issued in Man. and N. W. T. during 1896-7 (Ques.) 2396 (ii).
Timber Limits, Disposal of Ques. of Priv., *re* Mr. Turriff's Charges, 2309 (ii).
Timber Permits to Settlers *re* cutting, in Twp. 39, Range 11 (Ques.) 11495 (vi).
Water-power Privileges in Alberta, &c., Sale or Leases (Ques.) 8378 (v).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10535 (vi).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *Lambton, East.*
Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 689 (i).
Address, The, 335, 366; (amt.) 380; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 103) 505 (i).
Advertisement for Tenders, for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4735 (iii).
Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

'Arctic' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4030 (ii).

Atlantic Steamers Mail Service, Cost per Annum (Ques.) 5656 (iii).

Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5205 (iii).

——— Payments *re* Temagami District, 5787 (iii).

——— Survey *re* Temagami District (Ques.) 5473 (iii).

Bayfield, &c., Ret., Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).
*See* 'Docks,' &c.

Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 6404 (iv).

Brock, Mr., Emplymt. *re* Geological Survey (Ques.) 5204 (iii).

Budget, The, 6046; (M.) to adjn. deb., 6054; rsmd., 6062 (iii).

Campaign Literature, sent by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6164, 6196 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Action of Govt., Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2795 (ii).

——— Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896 (Ques.) 2167 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6223 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).

——— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette,' 13081 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5124 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11371 (vi).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9168 (v).

Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March 1, 1908 (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Customs Officers at Niagara, Fort Erie, &c., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 6980 (iv).

Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5204, 5473 (iii).

Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

Docks, Piers, &c., constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).
*See* 'Bayfield,' 'Grand Bend.'

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, 1878 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8645 (v); in Com., 12971 (vii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5023 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Dowling, Mr. D. B., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5206 (iii).

——— Emplymt. by German Development Co. (Ques.) 5564 (iii).
*See* 'German.

Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4585 (iii).

Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails, &c. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3605, 3637 (ii).

Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c., (Ques.) 2166 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10554 (vi).

German Development Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10580 (vi).
*See* 'Dowling.'

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 689 (i).

Geological Survey Department, Total Expenditure from 1896-1908 (Ques.) 6402 (iv).

Geological Survey Yacht, Use of (Ques.) 11231 (vi).

Grain Inspection in 1906, Total Expenditure, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur (Ques.) 8892 (v).

Grand Bend Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 5085 (iii).

——— Ret., Delays, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

G. T. R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12062 (vii).

G. T. P., Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

——— Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes (remarks) 9025 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10375 (vi).

'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c. (Ques.) 5081 (iii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6651 (iv).

Hay and Straw Embargo by G. B., &c. (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Immigrant Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. for Sup., 11022 (vi).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13127 (vii).

Indian Lands and Islands owned by Indians, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

——— Number of Acres sold since 1896, Total Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
I. C. R., Concrete Pipe, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 6640 (iv).
——— on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4428 (iii).
Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re* (Ques.) 5079 (iii).
'Lady Evelyn' Str., Date and Place of Wintering, &c. (Ques.) 7936 (iv).
*See* 'Rimouski.'
Literature, &c., distributed through Mails (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).
Mail Matters, Fradulent Weighing, Inspection of (Ques.) 4827 (iii).
Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 2214 (ii).
Mail Service in B. C., Improvements *re* (remarks) 3754 (ii).
Mail Steamer, Purchase of (Ques.) 4827 (iii).
*See* 'Lady Evelyn.'
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 689 (i).
Meat Inspection Act and Packing Houses, Cor., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c. (Ques.) 9274 (v).
Montreal Post Office, Extra Clerks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9113 (v).
Newspapers, Postal Arrangements, &c.(Ques.) 6460 (iv).
North East Harobur Wharf, Total Length (Ques.) 11019 (vi).
Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10850 (vi).
Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).
Postal Arrangements between U.S. and Canada, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 3885 (ii).
——— on Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3040 (ii).
Postal Note Business, Commission, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 9279 (v).
Postal Rates on N. S. Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re* (Ques.) 3484 (ii).
Postal Regulations *re* Weekly Newspapers, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5201 (iii).
Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy (Ques.) 352 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 7257 (iv).
——— Improvements in, &c. (Ques.) 8891 (v).
——— Irregularities in Western Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).
*See* 'Rimouski.'
Postal Service Printing, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5472 (iii).
Postal Service Return, Inquiry for, 4832 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10705 (vi).
Post Office Returns, Number, &c. (Ques.) 6405 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Change of Plans *re* Height of Span (Ques.) 5202 (iii).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4969 (iii).
——— (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10640 (vi).
Red Head Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure (Ques.) 11019 (vi).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2024 (ii).
——— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4664 (iii).
*See* 'Documents.'
Rimouski, Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of Str. 'Lady Evelyn,' &c. (Ques.) 7727 (iv).
*See* 'Lady Evelyn.'
Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda' (Ques.) 8176 (iv).
Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office (Ques.) 11297 (vi).
Royal Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c. (Ques.) 8612 (v).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 4580 (iii).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction (Ques.) 8890 (v).
*See* 'Bayfield,' &c.
Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tender *re* (Ques.) 8891 (v).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3786 (ii); in Com., 12622 (vii).
South Huron, By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c. (Ques.) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).
Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 2391 (ii).
Steamship Subsidies and Subventions, Total Amount paid for five years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 671 (i); (dairying, &c.) 10399 (vi); (census, &c.) 674 (i); (exhibitions) 10577 (vi); (fumigating stations) 12879; (Meat and Canned Foods Act) 12894 (vii); (seed branch) 5560 (iii); (Year Book) 678 (i).
Canals (Port Colborne) 10312 (vi).
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623; Mines (salaries) 646 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8873 (v); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 651 (i).
Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227 (v).
Geological Survey (oil borings) 13163 (vii).
House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).
Indians—Generally (destitute, &c.) 5762 (iii); Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12748

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 5039; (aids to navigation) 5040, 5774; (Thunder Bay Ice-breaker) 5041 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson bay patrol) 4030, 4133 (ii).

Marine, &c.—Public Works (ship channel) 5035 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5749 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2942; (wrecks) 3149, 3209 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 9094; (stamps, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10872; (Victoria immigration) 10875 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886, 10887 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10966 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7135 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Markham) 7711; (North Bay) 7712, 7812; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Sarnia) 7829 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11009; (lighting) 11011 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7282; (Knowlton) 7290; (Lévis) 7295 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8586; (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John) 12020 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii).

Railways (extra clerks) 10343 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5552 (iii), (supplies) 10193 (v).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10375 (vi).

AVERY, Mr. M., *Frontenac.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5123 (iii).

Hawkeye, Mr., Emplymnt. as Returning Officer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7251 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5529 (iii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2489, 2662 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B. (Minister of Justice) *North York, Ont.*

Accountants, Emplymt. and Payment by Dept. of Justice (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

Admiralty Jurisdiction Act Amt. (B. 122) prop. Res., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4835; 1°* of Bill, 4867 (iii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Anti-Cigarette Bill: *See 'Tobacco.'*

B. C., Appeal Court (B. 165) prop. Res. 8185 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8465; 1° m., 8466 (v); 2°*, in Com., 10863 (vi).

——— M. to withdraw Res., 7992 (iv).

Badgley Island, Trespass of T. H. Jackman, Claims *re* (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

Belgian Syndicate, Commission *re* Investigation (Ans.) 842 (i).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. (B. 142) 1° m., 6054 (iii); in Com., 6520 (iv).

Binder Twine, Purchasers' Names and P.O. Addresses (Ans) 9715 (v).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3467 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 12909 (vii).

Brantford Stove Works Strike, Interpretation of Criminal Code (remarks) 9027 (v).

——— Cor. with Justice Dept. (Ans.) 10016

C. P. R. Taxation Cases, on Inquiry for Ret., 5049 (iii).

Cigarette and Tobacco Restraint Bill: *See 'Tobacco.'*

Cimon, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence (Ans.) 2545 (ii).

——— Payments to *re* Travelling Expenses &c. (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Residence *re* District (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

Civil Service Commission, Instructions to Judge Cassels, on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7505 (iv).

*See 'Marine.'*

Criminal Code (Ry. mortgage) Amt. (B. 212) 1° m., 12919; on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

*See 'Ry. Act.'*

Dominion Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) 1° m., 4566 (iii); 2° m., 7835 (iv), 11755; in Com., 11796, 11827 (vi), 12919; 3° m., 13229; on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13238; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 13255; on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

——— (B. 115) Adjnd. debate, 11707 (vi).

Doukhobors, Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept. (Ans.) 6983 (iv).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) 7624 (iv).

Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Accepting Appmt. (Ans.) 4768, 5084 (iii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5486 (iii).

Essex County Junior Judgeship, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 116) 1° m., 4576 (iii); in Com., 8401 (v).

Forbes, Mr. Justice, Personal Status, Apptmt., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., &c., 899 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Forbes, Mr. Justice, Professional Status, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).

——— Qualifications *re* Apptmt. (Ans) 2390 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 1861 (i).

Fraser, A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel for Purchase of Sussex St. Property (Ans.) 3478 (ii).

——— Payments *re* Legal Services, &c., (Ans.) 2979 (ii).

Gillis, Release from Penitentiary, (Ans.) 510 (i).

Govt. Officials as Political Partisans at Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).

*See* 'St. Vincent de Paul.'

G. T. P., Commissions issued to Inspectors (remarks) 9716 (v).

——— Liquor, Prohibition of Sale, on Inquiry for Ret., 2024 (ii).

——— Madawaska Right of Way (remarks) 12661 (vii).

——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

Japanese Immigration Acts, Disallowance of (Ans.) 6642 (iv).

Judges Salaries in Man. and Ont. (B. 206) prop. Res., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12551; 1° m., 12554; in Com., 13048 (vii).

Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar (Ans.) 842 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents (B. 190) 1°*, 10915 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12399 (vii).

Kun, Agnes B., Release of (remarks) 9580 (v).

——— Letter laid on Table, 9710 (v).

Lacoste, Sir Alexander, Amount of Pension, &c. (Ans.) 1935 (i).

Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4768 (iii).

——— for Govt. in P.E.I., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4764 (iii).

Lord's Day Act Violations at Ottawa, *re* Horse Racing on Sunday (remarks) 3753 (ii).

MacIlreith, Mr. R. T., Payments to for Legal Services (Ans.) 696 (i).

McGuire, ex-Chief Justice, Superannuation of (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Delay in giving Judgments (Ans.) 2594 (ii).

Man. Appeal Act: *See* 'Winding-up Act.'

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt of Counsel, for Commission, on M. (Mr Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7360 (iv).

——— Counsel Fees (Ans.) 8838 (v).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Letter of Instruction to Mr. Watson laid on Table, 7621 (iv).

*See* 'Civil Service.'

Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Opinions of Dept. of Justice, on M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).

Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Increase in Salary (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 12553 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11990 (vi).

Northwest Territories Act Amt. (B. 210) 1° m., 12650; 2° m., in Com., 13051 (vii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of (Ans.) 516 (i).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals released since 1896, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2825 (ii).

——— Ret. (remarks) 9579 (v), 13081 (vii).

*See* 'Blunden.'

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. (B. 166) 1°*, 8604 (v); 2° m., 10690; in Com., 10691 (vi).

Prisoners released, &c.: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'

Queebc Superior Court, Apptmt. of additional Judge (Ans.) 1288 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 28) M. to wthdrw., 3579 (ii).

Railway Act (Commission, Ass't Chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4966 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10637; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 11590; Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) moved in Com., 11632 (vi).

Ry. Act (mortgages) Amt. (B. 204) 1° m., 12549; 2°*, in Com., 13046 (vii).

*See* 'Criminal Code.'

Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition, &c. (Ans.) 6983 (iv).

St. Louis, Mr. H., Emplymt. in Justice Dept. (Ans.) 1347 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Officers and Municipal Elections (Ans.) 2791 (ii).

——— Holidays for Officials (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Saskatchewan Legislature Acts, Reports *re* (Ans.) 6401 (iv).

——— Disallowance of (Ans.) 6644 (iv).

School Statutes, *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6858 (iv).

Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to (remarks) 1112 (i).

Sudbury Court Judges, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 12413 (vii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Supreme Court Act Amt. (B. 121) 1° m., 4826; 2°*, in Com., 5497 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Justice (Dominion Police) 5509; (Exchequer Court) 5505; (printing, &c.) 5508 (iii); Supreme Court (contingencies) 12917 (vii); (registrar's uniform) 5507 (iii).

Penitentiaries—B.C. (land purchase) 12918 (vii); Generally (maintenance) 5515 (iii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 12918 (vii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint (B. 173) 1° m., 9021 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 10693; 3°*, 11235 (vi); on Sen. Amts., 13044 (vii).

Winding-up Act (Man. Appeals) Amt. (B. 102) 1° m., 3477; 2°* in Com., and 3°*, 3933 (ii).

——— (B. 144) 1° m., 6142 (iii); 2°* in Com., 6523 (iv).

Yukon Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court (Ans.) 10301 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law and Instructions to N.W.M.P. (Ans.) 565 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 841 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S. *East Hamilton.*

Address, The, 519, (amt.) 530, Neg. (Y. 50; N. 96) 552 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4712 (iii).

Atlantic Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Bank of Hamilton incorp. (B. 56) 1°*, 1207 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4387 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671 (iv).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6521 (iv).

British Columbia Bank incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Sloan) on M. for 2°, 1470 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5888 (iii).

Civil Service Employees, 1905-6-7, Dates of Apptmts., &c. (M. for ret.*) 558 (i).

Coal Lands, O.C., Regulations, &c., *re* Disposal (M. for copies*) 4246 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1162 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1793 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com.., 11837, 11851; (amt.) 11865 (vi).

Dom. Elections, Forms, Writs, Instructions, &c., issued in 1907 (M. for copies*) 555 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Fire Extinguishers File, Cor. quoted by Min., Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7775 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8133 (iv).

G. T. P., Eastern Limit Mountain Section, Establishment of (Ques.) 9265 (v).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12361 (vii).

——— and National Trans. Ry., Disputed Questions (Ques.) 6235 (iv).

——— Protests *re* Land Acquisitions (Ques.) 6640 (iv).

——— Ry. Sections B and F, Contracts, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5211 (iii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3706, 3743 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Contract, Claims of M. J. Haney, O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3042, 3690 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Moncton Car Shops, Lease, &c., O.C., &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11995 (vi).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 5056 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Burning of Papers, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4072 (ii).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Incomplete Return (remarks) 5726 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3138 (ii).

——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1441 (i).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c., Extravagant Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7148 (iv).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, ref. to in debate on Address, 519 (i).

——— Commission's Report (remarks) 3901 (ii).

Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13293 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3780 (ii).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5833 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5682 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4072 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7716 (iv); Ottawa (Mint) 1477; (Museum) 1492 (i); Harbours and Rivers —N.B. (St. John) 12019 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. (amt.) 921 (i).

BARR, Mr. J. *Dufferin.*

Address, The, 276 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4525 (iii).

*See* 'National.'

Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10350 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6208 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5100 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11361 (vi).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13539 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11831 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute, Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5012 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co's. B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13209 (vii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3611, 3647 (ii).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) in Com., 13508 (vii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6272 (iv).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10501 (vi).

Inland Revenue Seizures, 1906-7 in Cornwall, Toronto, Ottawa, &c. (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii), 4247 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7236 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9491 (v).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Office Specialty Co., Fittings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4696 (iii); in Com., 10858 (vi).

BARR, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Patent and Proprietary Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10553 (vi); in Com., 12624 (vii).

Posters, Prohibition of Indecent Bills, Enforcement of Tariff Regulations (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4978 (iii); in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii).

——— (wires, &c.) Amt. (B. 43) 1° m., 840 (i); 2° m., 5212 (iii).

Ry. Tracks, Crossing by Water Mains, Application to Board (Ques.) 1109 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1294 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3768 (ii); in Com., 12608 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 12893 (vii); (seed branch) 5504 (iii); (Year Book) 677 (i).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 978 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8876 (v).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227, 9450 (v).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).

Immigration (agents) 9869 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4082, 4151 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 10297 (v).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5511 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Vernon) 10872; (Victoria immigration) 10881 (vi); Man. (Dauphin) 8520; (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10958 (vi); Ont. (Dom. renewals) 7483; (Glencoe) 7488; (Guelph armoury) 7682 (iv); Ottawa (Mint) 1452, 1481 (i); Sask. (Battleford) 8577 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 12097 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11988 (vi).

Telephone Wires, Applications to cross Ry. Tracks (Ques.) 690 (i).

*See* 'Railways,' &c.

Wheat Transportation from N. W., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2193 (ii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6489 (iv).

Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks (remarks) 7322 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12600 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Militia (provisions) 12151 (vii); Public Works—Generally (armouries) 10895; Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10966 (vi).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6124

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. (B. 161) 1° m., 7307 (iv).

Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 4356, 4372 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4171 (ii).

BELAND, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*

Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U.S., and other Countries (Ques.) 1510 (i).

Cotton, Raw, Imported from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution (ques. of priv.) 3486 (ii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2579 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Distribution to Members (remarks) 605 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3552 (ii).

Pulp Wood, Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4808 (iii).

Pulp Wood, Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Rehm, Fred. and Frank Patent Relief (B. 110) 1°*, 3896 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*

Adams, Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5798 (iii).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).

Architects on Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).

—— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4143 (ii).

Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman, &c. (Ques.) 1937 (i), 2217 (ii).

Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Birnie and Noble, Advances to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging (Ques.) 4244, 5083 (iii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 190 (i).

Canadian Timber used in Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., Payments *re* Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

'Castle,' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 6641 (iv).

Chicoutimi Dredging, Tenders *re*, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11397 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) 5623 (iii).

—— Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Power, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7599 (iv).

*See* 'Marine,' &c.

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1048

*See* 'Travelling.'

Committee Meeting, Rep. in Toronto 'Globe,' Ques. of Priv., 2382 (ii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1151 (i).

—— Production of Originals, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1425 (i).

——Production in Committees, 1427 (i).

—— taken from Pub. Accounts Com. (remarks) 2305, 2308 (ii).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Surrender of Title (remarks) 3850 (ii).

—— Commission to Mr. Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

—— Protests *re* Sale (remarks) 10918 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11830, 11859 (vi), 12995; on M. for 3°, 13247 (vii).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.C. *re*, Inquiry for, 6853, 6927 (iv), 8696 (v).

—— Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com., 5924 (ii).

—— Renewal without Tenders (remarks) 6633 (iv).

Dredging at Fort William, Amounts paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 8839 (v).

*See* 'Boone,' &c.

Dredging at Midland, &c., Tenders *re*, Advertisements for (remarks) 7195 (iv).

—— O.C. *re* Renewal, &c., 6741 (iv).

*See* 'Midland.'

Dredging in Quebec Harbours, 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Dredges registered in Canada, &c. (Ques.) 11497 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4677 (iii); in Com., 10767 (vi).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Eclipse Co. of Ottawa, Payments to (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

—— Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup.. 7469 (iv).

Fisheries Regulations, Violations of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5782 (iii).
*See* 'Birnie,' &c.

Foresters Order, Charges in 'Le Canada,' Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3614 (ii).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 654 (i)

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 980

—— Report from Mr. Birnie (remarks) 5729 (iii).
*See* 'Birnie.'

'Golspie' Str., Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1084 (i).

G.T.Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res 2254 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12676 (vii).

Griffith Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c (Ques.) 1508 (i).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture (Ques.) 5791 (iii).

Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

—— Divisional Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

—— Name of Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 3037 (ii).

Hunter, Mr. J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Pub. Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1459 (i).

Inspector of Public Works, Apptmts. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iii).

I. C. R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4423 (iii).

Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 640, 1037 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).

—— Investigation, Defalcations of Mr. Roy, &c. (remarks) 10741 (vi).

—— Investigations, Evidence (remarks) *re* Printing, 10916 (vi).
*See* 'Sorel.'

Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 566 (i).

Midland Dredging Co., Statement *re* Mr. McMullen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).

Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbours, Expenditure *re* Dredging, 1907 (Ques.) 8181 (iv).

—— Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3428 (ii).

Midland Towing and Wrecking Co., Contract *re*, Cor. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations (Ques.) 5650 (iii).
*See* 'Georgian Bay,' &c.

Office Specialty Co. and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Amounts paid to (Ques.) 3039 (ii), 4244 (iii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 3242 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii), 5785 (iii).
*See* 'Eclipse.'

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10335 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging (Ques.) 11496 (vi).

Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse-power (Ques.) 5471, 5656 (iii).

—— Incorrect Answer (remarks) 5566 (iii).

Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

—— Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 3038 (ii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Contract *re* Extension (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

—— Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

—— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 8617 (v).
*See* 'Dredging,' &c.

Port Colborne Elevator and Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

Postal Service, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7259 (iv).

Pound-net Licenses, Granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c. (M. for copies*) 2795 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration re M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2747 (ii).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents (remarks) 1383 (i).

—— on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 2160 (ii).

—— Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3082 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Public Works Estimates, Preparation of, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5924 (iii).

Public Works in Harbours and Rivers, Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., Notice of Amt., 3751 (ii).

Registrar of Grey County, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Telford) 11303 (vi).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4667 (iii).

*See* 'Documents.'

St. John, N.B., Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 11700 (vi).

——— Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 11496 (vi).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8562 (v).

Sorel Public Works, Investigation *re* Pay Rolls, &c. (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

———Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8295 (v).

——— Final Rep. (remarks) 10794 (vi).

——— Irregularities *re* (remarks) 5408 (iii).

——— Ref. to Judge Cassels (remarks) 7938 (iv).

*See* 'Marine,' &c.

'Speedy' Str., Purchase, Services, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i), 3844 (ii).

Stoney Lake, Damage Claims (Ques.) 5565 (iii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5564, 5649, 5786 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10584, 10615 (vi).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12224; Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227 (vii); (surveys) 10338 (vi); Welland (Port Colborne) 12211 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5678 (iii); (surveys) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 980; Printing and Stationery (salaries) 612; (Ass't. Dep. Min.) 1459 (i), 5699 (iii); Public Works (salaries) 639 (i), 5699 (iii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Fisheries (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5759 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lime Kiln crossing 13323; (pensions) 13324 (vii); (salaries) 4756 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant, &c.) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrol) 3989 (ii); (patrol boats) 4750; (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii).

Marine (hospitals) 5782 (iii).

Militia (salaries and wages) 12147 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1079 (i), 5766 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2947, 2952; (obstructions) 3211; (removal of

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

obstructions) 3156; (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221; (wrecks) 3151, 3205 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5512 (iii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8878 (v); (North Bay inspectors) 13152 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Chilliwack) 13338; (Cranbrook) 13338 (vii); (Cumberland) 10865; (Fernie) 10866 (vi); (Grand Forks) 13338; (Greenwood) 13338 (vii); (Ladysmith) 10867; (Quesnel) 10868 (vi); (Revelstoke) 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10872 (vi), 10339 (vii); (Victoria immigration) 10874 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Man. (Dauphin) 8519 (v); (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Neepawa) 13336; (Portage la Prairie) 13336 (vii); (Selkirk) 8550 (v); (Souris) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10959 (vi); (Winnipeg warehouse) 8571 (v).

Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Grand Falls) 13328 (vii); (St. John, military) 7186 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Antigonish) 7122; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax customs) 7162; (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Parrsboro') 13327 (vii); (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv); (Wolfeville) 13327 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Dom., renewals) 7467; (Glencoe) 7489 (iv); (Mitchell) 13332; (North Bay) 13332; (Park Hill) 13332; (Peterborough) 13332; (Port Arthur) 13332; (Sarnia) 13333; (Seaforth) 13332; (Simcoe) 13333; (Sudbury) 13333; (Tilsonburg) 13333; (Uxbridge) 13333; (Walkerville) 13333; (Waterloo) 13333 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (improvements, &c.) 5707 (iii); (Mint) 1458; (Museum) 1489 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7183 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaskaville) 13329; (Grand Mère) 13329 (vii); (Grosse Isle) 7290 (iv); (Joliette) 13329 (vii); (Knowlton) 7290 (iv), 13329; (Lachute) 13329 (vii); (Lévis) 7296 (iv), 13329; (Magog) 13329; (Megantic) 13330; (Plessissville) 13330; (Point St. Charles) 13330; (Roberval) 13330; (St. Thérèse) 13330; (Shawenegan) 13330 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Battleford) 8577; (Edmonton) 8579 (v); (Estevan) 13336 (vii); (Humboldt) 8585 (v); (Lethbridge) 13336 (vii); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v), 13337 (vii); (Medicine Hat) 8601 (v); (Moosejaw) 13336 (vii); (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601; (Saskatoon) 8603 (v), 13337; (Strathcona) 13338 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson River) 13352; Que. and Ont. (generally) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Lower Newcastle) 11695; (St. John) 12013 (vi); (St. John improvements) 5708 (iii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11207; (Baddeck) 11219; (Barachois) 11224; (Bay St. Lawrence) 11224; (Big Lorraine) 11224; (Breton Cove) 11224; (Charlos Cove) 11225; (Church Point) 11225; (Cow Bay) 11225; (vi); (dredging) 13341 (vii); (McPherson's Cove) 11229; (Parrsborough) 11259; (Port Hood) 11277; (Port Joli West) 11279; (Pugwash wharf) 11280; (Round Hill wharf) 11282 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Georgian Bay survey) 13326; (Lakefield) 13350; (Meaford) 12103; (Michipicoten) 13350; (Midland and Tiffin) 12103 (vii); (Point Edward) 5714 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 12144; (Port Colborne) 12146; (Rainy River) 12136; (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Tiffin dredging) 5709 (iii), 13351 (vii); (Tobermory) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse à la Barbe) 12028; (Batiscan) 12029; (Bic) 12030; (Bonaventure) 12036; (Cap St. Ignace) 12030; (Chateauguay) 12030; (Clarke City) 12031; (Lake Aylmer) 12032; (Lake Megantic) 12033; (Lake St. Francis) 12033; (Lake St. John) 12033; (Lavaltrie) 12033; (Lotbinière) 12033; (Malbaie) 12034; (Matane) 12034; (Nicolet) 12034; (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034; (Ouelle Rivière) 12037; (Piché Point) 12035; (Richelieu) 12038; (Rivière du Lièvre) 12037; (Rivière du Loup) 12036; (Rivière Maskinonge) 12037; (St. Alphonse) 12041; (Ste. Anne de Monts) 12041; (St. Francis) 12041; (St. Louis) 12040; (St. Maurice) 12041; (Saguenay) 12040; (Yamaska dredging) 12043 (vi); (Yamaska river) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 12145 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5552 (iii).

Sussex Street Property Purchase, Payment to Jos. Riopelle (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

Tenders, Advertisements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7478 (iv).

Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).

Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co. (Ques.) 8892 (v).
*See* 'Dredging.'

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).
*See* 'Documents.'

Travelling Expenses of Minister at Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii)
*See* 'Colonial.'

Trent Valley Canal, Holland River Dredging, Advertisements, &c. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).
*See* 'Holland.'

Vautelet, Mr., Payments to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Victoria Harbour, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 8893 (v).
*See* 'Dredging, &c.'

Wiarton Dredging, 1907, Tenders, &c., (Ques.) 6236 (iv).

——— Payments to Mr. Bowman, &c. (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith, Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2888 (ii).

Yarmouth, N.S., Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 11500 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4722 (iii).

Architects on Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7125 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10921 (vi).

Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3038 (ii).

——— Lease to McIntyre and Robert Syndicate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13475 (vii).

——— Water-power, Copy of New Lease (remarks) 946 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Inquiry for Copy, 1740 (i).

Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 2392 (ii).

——— Commencement of, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 7212 (iv).

Budget, The, 5357 (iii).

Campaign Literature (French) distributed in Prov. of Que. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10352 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6162, 6173, 6203 (iii); in Com., 6426 (iv).

Canada and Germany Treaty (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12867 (vii).

Canadian Newspapers, Drawback *re* American Surtax (Ques.) 5203 (iii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12842, 12848 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6870 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12882 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11251 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ques.) 685 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10717, 10727; in Com. on Res., 11360 (vi); in Com., 12177 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Translation into French (remarks) 6222, 6925 (iv), 11312 (vi), 13477 (vii).
Civil Servants, Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).
Clerks of Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
*See* 'Intercolonial.'
Côté, Boivin & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 12650 (vii).
Cotton Strikers, Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3492 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. *re* Salaries (remarks) *re* Conc., 12504 (vii).
——— (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10245 (v).
——— Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8897 (v).
*See* 'Hansard.'
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 9474 (v).
Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1180 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1849 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 80 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 1682 (i).
——— B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4573 (iii); on M. for 2°, 8681 (v); in Com., 11824, 11831, 11857 (vi), 13010 (vii).
Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5013 (iii).
Dredging in Ont. and Quebec, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging in St. Lawrence, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2896 (ii).
*See* 'Riviere la Graisse.'
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).
Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvement of (Ques.) 6399 (iv).
Fort William Terminals Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6223 (iv).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
French Canadian Ministers, Attack *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4200 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1223 (i); in Com., 3582, 3636 (ii).
——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).
*See* 'Can. and France.'
French Translation of Govt. Statutes, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3179 (ii).
Gaudette, Victor, Employmt. by Govt., Payments to (Ques.) 515 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3634 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10312 (vi).
——— Rep. of (remarks) 12836 (vii).
G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2238 (ii).
Halifax Garrison, Discontent *re* Pay, &c. (remarks) 5660 (iii).
'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9128 (v).
*See* 'Debates.'
Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Clerical and Lay Agents, &c. (Ques.) 6922 (iv).
Ingonish Island Lightkeeper, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8618 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 835 (i).
Intercolonial Conference in London, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 13225, 13511 (vii).
*See* 'Colonial.'
I.C.R., Employees Provident Fund Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4577; in Com., 4995 (iii).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Change of Name to Govt. Rys., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6246 (iv).
——— Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made (Ques.) 11936 (vi).
——— Sunday Cars, Instructions *re* (Ques.) 10734 (vi).
——— Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Employmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6400 (iv).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 968 (i).
Judges of Man. and Ont., Salaries (B. 206) (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13048 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12401 (vii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
'Labour Gazette,' Cost of Printing, &c. (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Lacas, Mr., Payments to, by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).
'Le Soleil, Par. *re* Voting by French Members, Ques. of Priv., 7992 (iv).
Letter Carriers, Contract for Boots, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).
MacIlreith, Payment to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv).
Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of Moneys of Mr. Walter Dick (Ques.) 11936 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appmt. of Counsel for Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7327 (iv).
—— Investigation by Minister, &c. (remarks) 6636 (iv).
—— Mr. Perron's Duties (Ques.) 10743 (vi).
—— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6847 (iv).
—— Proceedings, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).
—— Translation of Evidence (remarks) 11204 (vi).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3026 (ii).
Matane River Fishing, Complaints (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7252 (iv).
Montreal Post Office, Addition, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 6922 (iv).
—— Defalcations, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 7197 (iv).
Monuments to McGee and Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).
New York Central Ry., Complaints *re* Discrimination (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).
—— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard (Ques.) 11702 (vi).
Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras (Ques.) 11936 (vi).
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).
Notre Dame du Portage, Expenditure *re* Wharf (Ques.) 6400 (iv).
Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4701 (iii).
Order Papers, French and English Editions (remarks) 6853 (iv).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).
—— Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office (Ques.) 11702 (vi).
—— Issue of Pass to travel on I.C.R. Express (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 8610 (v).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, &c., released since 1896, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2854 (ii).
Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).
Patent Medicines Bill, Govtl. Intention *re* (Ques.) 356 (i).
—— (remarks) 608 (i), 2594 (ii).
—— Committee of Inquiry (Ques.) 3899 (ii).
—— (remarks) *re* Apptmt. to Com., 10689 (vi).
Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7933 (iv).
Priv., Ques. of, Par. in 'Citizen' *re* Pamphlet by Jesuit Priest, 10427 (vi).
Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid before and after Adjustment (Ques.) 8616 (v).
Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3142 (ii).
Quebec Judges, Additional, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).
—— Apptmt. of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).
—— Apptmt. to Superior Court (remarks) 11825 (vi).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6225 (iv).
Ques. of Priv., Anti-Catholic Article in 'Leader,' 8604 (v).
Railway Act (commission, ass't chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4965 (iii).
—— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10638; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. for 3°, 11608 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).
Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).
—— on 1st Rep., 13510 (vii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 3319 (ii), 13081 (vii).
Ricard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).
Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, &c., Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).
—— inquiry for ret., 2896, 3689 (ii).
—— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 686 (i).
Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds, &c. (Ques.) 6399 (iv).
—— Postmaster, Resignation and Salary (Ques.) 6399 (iv).
Ross Rifle, Correction of Mr. S. Hughes Speech, Ques. of Priv., 9126 (v).
—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9332 (v).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).

—— Expenditure and Collections, &c. (Ques.) 1935 (i).

—— Expenditure by Public Works (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

Ste. Anne de Sorel Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

St. Fulgence Pier, Paymaster's List, Signatures, &c. (Ques.) 1115 (i).

—— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1130 (i).

St. Helen's Island Sale (remarks) in Com. on B. 218, 13417 (vii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 895, 1121 (i).

St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Sabourin, Maj., Cor. between Lt.-Col. Malette and Dept. (M. for copy*) 3434 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4580 (iii).

School Statutes, Saskatchewan Province, on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6862 (iv).

Sorel Irregularities, Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8296 (v).

—— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet (remarks) 6988, 7099, 7938 (iv).

Soulanges Canal, Floods at Valleyfield (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).

—— Investigation *re* Charges against Overseer (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3756 (ii).

Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 671; (census and statistics) 673 (i), 12879 (vii); (exhibitions) 10601 (vi), 12889; (live stock) 12896 (vii); (Year-Book) 678 (i).

Canals—Generally—(additional remuneration) 13174 (vii); (salaries) 10325; (statistical branch) 10318 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (slope walls) 5663 (iii).

Canals—Soulanges (floods, &c.) 10339 (vi).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (Port Colborne) 12212 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5674, 5678 (iii); (surveys) 12208; (widening) 12211 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries, &c.) 637; Inland Revenue (salaries) 646 (i); Marine and Fisheries (Ass't Dep. Min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 977, 1014 (i); Militia (salaries) 8872 (v); Mines, 646 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8873 (v); (salaries) 8872 (v); Public Works (salaries) 643 (i), 12917 (vii); Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227, 9262 (v).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Surveys (oil borings) 13163 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13169 (vii).

Immigration (U. S. labourers) 13169 (vii).

Justice—Administration of. Supreme Court (contingencies) 12917 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5775 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13152 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4200 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1907 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 10287 (v).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (Cotton strikers) 13156; (Marine investigation) 13169 (vii).

N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8863; (salaries) 8863 (v).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1086 (i).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5514 (iii); (wrecks) 3187, 3201 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 12918 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10876; (Victoria immigration) 10876 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10892; (repairs) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8528 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7111; (Bridgewater) 7136; (Halifax customs) 7155; (Halifax quarantine) 7171; (Inverness) 7172; (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7811 (iv); (Park Hill) 13332 (vii);

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (deptl. buildings) 13478; (heating) 13340 (vii); (skylights) 7816 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7286; (Dundee) 7286; (Farnham) 7288; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Knowlton) 7290; (Lachute) 7293; (Lévis) 7294; (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Edmonton) 13336; (Moosejaw) 13337; (Saskatoon) 13337; (Strathcona) 13338 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 13339 (vii).

Public Works Harbours and Rivers N.S. (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268

Public Works—Marine (ship channel) 5035 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (gratuities) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Telegraphs (Yukon) 13178 (vii).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Cape Beale) 5732 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10383 (vi); I.C.R. (Halifax accommodation) 5549 (iii); (supplies) 10336; Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10330; (extra clerks) 10345; (statistical branch) 10328; Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry. on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 917 (i).

Toronto Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13417 (vii).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Officials, Passes, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).

Valleyfield, Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv).

——— Floods on Lake St. Francis, Damage, &c. (rearks) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).

——— (remarks) 7996 (iv).

——— Post Office Clock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).

——— Regiment Organization, Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copy*) 3434 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2519, 2679 (ii).

T. Lindsay Co., Amount of Goods purchased, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (v).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4581 (iii).

Ventilation of H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).

Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks, 13066 (vii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5127 (iii)

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6915 (iv).

Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of (Ques.) 11232 (vi).

Presbyterian Church Widows' and Orphans' Fund (B. 23) 1°*, 430 (i) ; in Com. 2788 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598 (vii).

BLACK, Mr. J. B.. *Hants.*

Canada Temperance Act. Amt. (B. 187) 1°*, 10717 (vi).

Cigarettes, Sale and Prohibition of, on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 5251 (iii).

Coasting Privileges, Prop. Res., on Order being called, 2795 (ii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, Establishment of (prop. res.) 2562 (ii).

French Translation of Govt. Documents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3184 (ii).

Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S. (Ques.) 8894 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Round Hill wharf) 11282 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10697 (vi).



BLACK, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c. (remarks) 10277 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup. 4717 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3855 (ii)

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5382, 5408 (iii).

Aud. General, Salary B. 208 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12645 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10944 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4502 (iii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5945 (iii).

Bole Drug Co., Supplies furnished to Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).

Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).

Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector on Welland Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).

British Pensioners, Notice of Deductions, &c. (Ques.) 7501 (iv).

Bronze Coat-of-arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).

Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10356 (vi).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2768 (ii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11254 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10752 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of (prop. res.) 5087; on M. to resume debate, 5251 (iii).

——— Resolution of W.C.T.U. of Brampton (read) 7278 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11347; in Com., 11368, 11655 (vi), 12166, 12183 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Number distributed (remarks) 6060 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5638 (iii).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4556 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members on M. for Sup., 1871 (i).

——— Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7761 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Documents, Instructions to Minister of Marine (remarks) 7810 (iv).
*See* 'Pub. Accts,' &c.

Dog-Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S. (Ques.) 1126 (i).

Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11834; (amt.) 11835 (vi); 12943 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act. Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11523, 11181 (vi).

Dredging Contracts, O. Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6777 (iv).

Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to (Ques.) 3239 (ii).

——— Amounts paid to (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).

——— Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13272 (vii).

Falconer, Kenneth, Arrangement *re* Balance of Pay (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

Fire Extinguishers, &c., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7666 (iv).

——— Cor. on File, Custody of Documents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7761 (iv).

Fraser, Mr. A. W., Payments to, for Legal Services (Ques.) 2979 (ii).

Fruit (apples) Inspection, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2754 (ii).

Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt. (Ques.) 355 (i).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).

Govt. Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10989 (vi).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6256 (iv).

G.T.P., Accidents to Employees (remarks) 7447 (iv).

——— Accidents on Construction, Reports *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6655 (iv).

——— Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8748 (v).

Halifax Customs House, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 7211 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 3°, 4544 (iii).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensation, paid, &c. (remarks) 13085 (vii).

House of Commons Accountants, &c., Increase *re* Salaries under C. S. Bill (remarks) 13528 (vii).

Immigrants, Number entering Canada, Bonuses paid, &c. (Ques.) 5256 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6475 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2454 (ii).

Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond (Ques.) 5792 (iii).

Inverness Public Building, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5997 (iii).

'King Edward,' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour (Ques.) 13063 (vii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11247 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4008 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) 7389 (iv).

——— Leave of Absence for Mr. Watson (remarks) 10918 (vi).

——— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6892, 7228; (M.) to ref. to Com., 7226 (iv).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5718 (iii).

Milford Haven Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13503 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 5003; on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5059 (iii).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4697 (iii); in Com., 10849 (vi).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4106 (ii).

'Petrel,' Str., Supplies purchased, &c. (M for ret.) 7937 (iv).

Petroleum Bounty B. 192 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12644 (vii).

Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 10513 (vi).

Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 8175 (iv).

Postmasters, Rural, Salary Increases, &c. (Ques.) 183 (i).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present agreement and previously (Ques.) 315 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation (prop. res.) 3070; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 103) 3145 (ii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
—— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4952 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps, Letter (read) 8694 (v).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4981 (iii).
Registrar of Grey County, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Telford) 11303 (vi).
Rolla L. Crain Co., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 3239 (ii).
—— (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
Ross, Mr. D., Resignation as Member (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11106 (vi).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 98) 1° m., 3315 (ii); in Com., 4580 (iii).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c. (Ques.) 6918 (iv).
—— Piers at Richmond, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction (remarks in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
—— Item *re* Expenditure of $658.03 (Ques.) 11937 (vi).
—— Total Cost (Ques.) 11019 (vi).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5547 (iii).
Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Incomplete Answer (remarks) 12551, 12661 (vii).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5445 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3785, 3818 (ii); in Com., 12611 (vii).
Speakers Expenses in House of Commons, Comparison, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission, on Amt. (Mr. Fielding) to prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5826; (amt.) to Amt., 5847, Neg. (Y., 46; N., 90) 5877 (iii).
Superannuation and Retirement Act, Payments under (Ques.) 7989 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (seed branch) 5504 (iii).
Canals—Carillon (dams) 12768 (vii); (statistical branch) 10323 (vi); Lachine (repairs) 5673; (slope walls) 5668; Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5674 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 624, 634; Public Works (salaries) 640 (i).
Excise (provisional allowances) 819; (travelling expenses) 816 (i).
Geological Survey (oil borings) 13166 (vii).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12739 (vii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5041, 5774 (iii); (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii).



BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).
Marine (hospitals) 5783 (iii); (ice-breakers) 1901 (i); (Hudson Bay patrol) 3997 (ii); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4753; (patrol boats) 4749; (Sorel property) 4752 (iii).
Militia (annual drill) 5746 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5784 (iii); (seed grain) 2780 (ii).
N.W.M. Police (pensions) 8871 (v).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522; (maintenance) 5510 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cranbrook) 10864; (Cumberland) 10865; (Vernon) 10870 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10887; (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 10954; (Winnipeg military) 10973 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7112, 7118; (Bridgewater) 7137; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax customs) 7144; (Halifax Military) 7143 (iv); (Lunenburg) 13326 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10977 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7457; (Dom., renewals) 7468; (Glencoe) 7486 (iv); (Kingston) 10909 (vi); (Leamington) 7816 (iv); (Markham) 13331 (vii); (North Bay) 7813; (Owen Sound) 7817; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7827; (Simcoe) 7830 (iv); (Walkerville) 13334 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives fittings) 5700 (iii); (rents, &c.) 10985; (repairs, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 7280; (Cookshire) 7281; (Grosse Isle) 7289 (iv); (Knowlton) 13329 (vii); (Magog) 7306; (Montreal examining warehouse) 7425 (iv); (Montreal pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii); (Montreal Post Office) 7411; (Montreal station C) 7422; (Nicolet) 7429; (Quebec citadel) 7430; (Que. arsenal) 7435; (Quebec drill hall) 7431; (St. John's) 7444 (iv); (Sherbrooke) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke drill hall) 7439 (iv); (Three Rivers) 13330 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 11220; (Digby) 11226 (vi); (dredging) 13341 (vii); (Parker's cove) 11258; (Parrsboro) 11259; (Port Hastings) 11267; (Port Hood) 11269; (Portuguese cove) 11279; (Round Hill) 11285; (Tancook island) 11231 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Belle River) 12090; (Blanche River) 12091; (Brighton) 12133; (Port Credit) 12101; (Tobermory) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11079; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11106 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Marconi) 12143; (Yukon) 13179 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10191 (v); (rolling stock) 5553 (iii), 12257 (vii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Act) 12264 (vii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Tenders, Advertisements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7475 (iv).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10699 (vi).

*See* 'Cigarette.'

Travelling Expenses of Min. to Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3997 (ii).

U. S. Warships on Great Lakes, Inquiry *re* Armaments, &c. (Ques.) 7502 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6124 (iii).

Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c. (Ques.) 2391 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 5800, 5802 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.) 5476 (iii).

——— Total Expenditure since 1895 (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

Wheat, Frozen, Shipping from Man. and N.W. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 825 (i).

Woollen Industry, Legislation *re* Relief (remarks) 12772 (vii).

BOLE, Mr. D. W., *Winnipeg.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of, Inquiry *re* (prop. res.) 3853 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7939 (iv).

Drug Contracts with Govt., Ques. of Priv., 5562 (iii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds (read) on Debate on Dom. Elections B. 115, 7942 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3993 (ii).

Winnipeg Bank incorp. (B. 19) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 2787 (ii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W., K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia and Defence), *Kings N.S.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4399, 4498 (iii).

British Pensioners, Notice of Deductions from Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 7502 (iv).

Canadian Patriotic Funds (B. 216) in Com., 13320 (vii).

Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec (Ans.) 9273 (v).

Cold Storage Co., Connection with: *See* 'N.B.,' &c.

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re* (Ans.) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation of (Ans.) 3238 (ii).

Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction (Ans.) 1111 (i).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Eastman Rifle Match, Investigation *re* Accident (Ans.) 1125 (i).

Esquimalt and Halifax Garrison, Equipment, &c. (Ans.) 1293 (i).

——— Transfer to Canada (Ans.) 1288, 1293 (i).

Fortifications, Construction of, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6646 (iv).

Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Garrison Commons, Date of Sale, &c (Ans.) 354 (i).

*See* 'Ordnance,' &c.

Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c. (Ans.) 9713 (v).

Govt. Business (remarks) 12504 (vii).

Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, &c. (Ans.) 10015 (v).

——— Replacement of, by Imp. Troops (Ans.) 1288 (i).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip to (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Insurance Commission's Rept., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 9337, 9461 (v).

Kentville Rifle Range, ref. to in Budget debate, 5290 (iii).

Lancaster Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).

Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe (Ans.) 10014 (v).

——— Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 6645 (iv).

Military Camp in Eastern Townships, proposed Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Militia Allowances, Arrears of (Ans.) 9274 (v).

Militia—Board of Officers, Pay and Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 2165 (ii).

Militia Camps, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

——— (stmnt.) 9835 (v).

Militia Dept., Attack *re* Boots furnished, Ques. of Priv., 10739 (vi).

——— and Civil Service Commissioner's Report, Statement in Com. of Sup., 12505 (vii).

——— at Quebec, Working Hours for Masons (Ans.) 10791 (vi).

——— Report (presented) 4494 (iii).

——— Threats *re*, &c. (remarks) 13584 (vii).

Militia, Apptmts. as Generals, Number and Qualifications (Ans.) 5086 (iii).

Militia Food Supplies, on Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).

Militia, Memorandum of General Lake (M.) *re* placing on Table, 12770 (vii).

Militia Pay, Arrears, Reasons for, &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Militia Permanent Corps, Apptmt. of Commission *re* Pay (Ans.) 1293 (i).

Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c. (remarks) 352 (i).

Militia Stores, Inspection of (Ans.) 8181 (iv).

——Rural Battalions, Care of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5738 (iii).

Militia Supplies at Halifax, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 6406 (iv).

Minnedosa Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10890 (vi).

N.B. Cold Storage Co., and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).

*See* 'St. John.'

Niagara Camp, Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 2163 (ii).

Niagara Lands, Sale for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).

Ordnance Lands—Toronto—Sale (B. 218) in Com. on Res., 13417 (vii).

Petawawa Camp, Training of Troops, &c. (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Plains of Abraham, Lease to Ross Rifle Co. (Ans.) 1348 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3072 (ii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4894 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps (remarks) 8695 (v).

—— City Corps, &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).

—— Food supplied (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).

—— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8855 (v).

—— Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance (Ans.) 7992 (iv).

—— Representation of Veterans (remarks) 7998 (iv).

—— Transportation of Troops (remarks) 8384 (v).

Rankin, Col., Resignation of (remarks) 11406 (vi).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 2025 (ii).

Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co. (Ans.) 1123 (i).

Rifle Range at Charlottetown, Purchase Price (Ans.) 6233 (iv).

R.M.C., Investigation into conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).

Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re* (Ans.) 11495 (vi).

—— Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt. (Ans.) 5786 (iii).

—— Bayonets, Date of Contract, O.C., &c. (Ans.) 6235 (iv), 8176, 8442 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Consignment to N.W.M. Police, Where manufactured (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

—— Contract *re* Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vii).

—— memorandum *re* agreement (read) 13553 (vii).

—— Contract Price, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 8174 (iv).

—— Cor. with Imp. Govt., Rep. in British War Office, Disappearance from Library of House, Ques. of Priv., 4961 (iii).

—— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles (Ans.) 3237 (ii).

—— Extension of Cove Fields Lands, &c. (Ans.) 4405 (iii).

—— Extravagance of Militia Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 8953 (v).

—— Interchangeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 3899 (ii).

—— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

—— Number delivered as per Contract, Cost per Rifle (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

—— Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, &c. (Ans.) 168 (i).

—— Number reported Unfit for Use (Ans.) 3841 (ii).

—— Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Accident at Rockliffe Range (Ans.) 10515 (vi).

—— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908 (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

—— Provisions for Bayonets, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

—— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of (Ans.) 3237 (ii).

—— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c. (Ans.) 365 (i).

—— Tests in England, Reps., &c., Ques. of Priv., 8167 (iv).

—— Tests, Rep. of Col. Gaudet (Ans.) 9714 (v).

—— Total Number in Use in Canada (Ans.) 5786 (iii).

*See* 'Dom. Arsenal.'

Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. Johns, Tenders *re* Supplies (Ans.) 5788 (iii).

St. Helen's Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B 218, 13418 (vii)

St. John Fusiliers, 62nd, Annual Drill, Delay in Payments to (Ans.) 847 (i).

St. John Cold Storage, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3580 (ii).

*See* 'N.B.'

Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of (Ans.) 9273 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

S. A. War, Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c. (Ans.) 1111 (i).

——— Medals for 3rd Contingent (Ans.) 1110 (i).

——— Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3769, 3819 (ii).

Sub-target Machines ordered, Dates, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 171 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Militia (salaries) 8871 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4136 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5732 (iii), 10286 (v), 13540; (customs dues) 12156; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (gratuities) 13177; (pay and allowances) 12147; (properties) 12148; (provisions, &c.) 12150; (Quebec reviews) 13176; (rifle and artillery grants) 12152; (Ross rifle contract) 13543; (R. M. College) 12152, 13177; (salaries and wages) 12147; (Stoney Creek monument) 13177; (warlike stores) 12148 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886; Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10955; (Winnipeg, military) 10970; (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi); (Guelph armoury) 7678; (Hamilton drill hall) 7693; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700 (iv); (Kingston, militia stores) 10908 (vi); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7703; (London, military) 7706 (iv); (Quebec cliffs) 12148 (vii).

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5207, 5258 (iii).

——— Number ordered, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 569 (i).

Thirteenth Hussars, Service Medal *re* Fenian Raids (remarks) 13533 (vii).

Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iv).

Valleyfield Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv).

Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from, by Govt. (Ans.) 356 (i).

Western Rifle Association, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Carleton, Ont.*

Address, The, 23 (i).

——— on M. to consider (remarks) *re* Questions, 8 (i).

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth, in Com. on Res., 4846 (iii).

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4717 (iii).

Algoma Steel Co., Orders from Govt. for Steel, &c. (remarks) 8606 (v).

All-Red Line, Omission of (remarks) on the Address, 28 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12432, (amt.) 12439; neg. (Y. 48; N. 108) 12499 (vii).

Anglo-American Treaty with G.B., Information *re* (remarks) 6985 (iv).

——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 9715 (v).

——— Further Information (remarks) 7447 (iv).

——— Information *re* Presenting, 8516 (v).

——— Tel. *re* (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Appeal Court of B.C., B. 165 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 8466 (v); in Com., 10863 (vi).

Architectural Institute of Canada on M. (Mr. Ethier) to refund Fees, 11234 (vi).

Asiatic Labour in B.C.: Ques. of Privilege, 6526 (iv).

Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10934 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4389; in Com., 4400 (iii).

*See* 'Que. Tercentenary,' &c.

Behring Sea Commission, Expenses of Sir Charles Tupper (remarks) 2883 (ii).

——— Correction *re*, 4669 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13571 (vii).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3470 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5949 (iii).

Boundary Delimitations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9743 (v).

Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9 (Ques.) 13226 (vii).

Bridge Subsidies to Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13313 (vii).

B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re* (remarks) 5728 (iii).

Buildings, Cost of Construction (remarks) 12661 (vii).

Business of the House, Precedence *re* Questions (remarks) 431 (i).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii).

*See* 'Govt. Business.'

Cabinet Changes (remarks) on the Address, 24 (i).

Campaign Funds, Charges by Min. of Pub. Works (remarks) on the Address, 26 (i).

Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10353 (vi).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Res., 6201 (iii); in Com., 6414 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12855 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13058 (vii).

Canada and U.S. Treaty Negotiations, Completion of, &c. (remarks) 937 (i).

——— Boundaries Treaty (remarks) 7834 (iv).

*See* 'Fisheries,' &c.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13494; on M. for 2°, 13506 (vii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 202 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12847 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6871 (iv).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept (remarks) 6059 (iii).

*See* 'Marine,' &c.

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Cable *re* Removal by G. B. (remarks) 13228 (vii).

'Champlain,' Str., Use of by Political Agents (remarks) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10747, 11021 (vi).

Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 554 (i).

*See* 'Asiatic,' 'Japanese,' &c.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10719, 10724; on M. for 2°, 11338; in Com. on Res., 11355; in Com., 11364, 11561, 11640 (vi), 12164; on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, Correction in Hansard *re* Increases, 11494 (vi).

——— Inquiry for, 8516 (v).

——— Resolutions *re* (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Rep., Inquiry for, 1317 (ii), 4963, 5408, 5567 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5623 (iii).

——— Policy of the Govt. *re*, on M. to Adjn. House, 5882 (iii).

——— Delay in Printing, &c., Investigations *re*, on M. to Adjn., 6143 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers (Amt.) on M. for Sup., 7506; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 99) 7618 (iv).

*See* 'Marine and Fisheries,' &c.

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com of Sup., 9193 (v).

Colchester Election (remarks) on the Address, 39 (i).

Cold Storage Co.: *See* 'N.B.,' &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).

Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor, &c. *re* Govtl. Action (Ques.) 174 (i).

Committees, Sel. Standing (remarks) on M (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).

——— Organization &c. (remarks) 507, 560 (i).

——— Sitting concurrently with House, on M. (Mr. Finlayson) 9579 (v).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12203 (vii).

——— Information *re* Break, 11121, 11406 (vi).

Criminal Code Amendts., on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 9282 (v).

Criminal Code (Ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13317 (vii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Customs Defalcations at Huntingdon, B.C., Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9442 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Kennedy) 9460 (v).

Customs Duties on Militia Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Supply (remarks) 10134 (v).

*See* 'Supply.'

Customs Inspectors, Suggestion of Civil Service Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).

Customs Statistics, Duplicating with Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 9549 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from, Ques. of Order *re* Reading, &c., 8462 (v).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13539 (vii).

Debates, Official Reps., Conc. in without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

Debt of Canada, Portions falling due, &c. (Ques.) 315 (i).

——— Portions maturing in 1908 (Ques.) 315 (i).

Detroit Tunnel, Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials, (M. for O. Cs., &c.*) 5477 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Surrender of Title, Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 3849 (ii).

——— Name of Govt. Agent (Ques.) 5084 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Dokis Indian Reserve, Surrender of Timber, O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 5087 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1140 (i), 1617, (amt.); Production of, 1622; agreed to, 1667 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1801 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. deb. 1844 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7859 (iv), 8423 (v); in Com., 11798, 11828; (amt.) 11922 (vi), 12956; on M. for 3°, 13232 (vii), on M. for 3° (amt.) 13251; on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

Dom. Elections Bill and Obstruction Tactics (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).

Dom. Lands Survey B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 231; in Com., 754, 949 (i); Sen. Amts., 3755 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127, 11153 (vi); in Com., 11158, 11165, 11408, 11510, 11948; Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 11977 (vi); on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, 12395 (vii).

*See* 'Lands,' &c.

Doukhobors, Homestead Lands, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Tel. from Sec. Board of Trade (read) 7620 (iv).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7628 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O. C., on Inquiry for, 6854 (iv).

——— O.C., *re* Rule *re* Producing (remarks) 6927 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 9773, 10259 (v).

Drill Halls Ret., Inquiry for, 5659 (iii).

Drury, R. L., Apptmt. as Japanese Agent (remarks) 4769 (iii).

——— O.C. *re* Apptmt. Inquiry for, 4963 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4687 (iii); in Com., 10763 (vi).

Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Cor. with Govt. *re* Legislation (remarks) 1861 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13261; in Com. on Res., 13279; in Com., 13419 (vii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5485 (iii).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt. (Ques.) 1117 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Esquimault Naval Station, Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance (M. for copies) 1128 (i).

Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry *re* Further, 12503 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of, Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Conc., 5920 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act Amt.B. 116 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8503 (v).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13459 (vii).

Financial Stringency, &c. (remarks) on the Address, 35 (i).

*See* 'Wheat,' &c.

Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 5249 (iii).

Fisheries Boundaries Treaty between U.S. and Can., Information *re* (remarks) 2023 (ii), 6844 (iv).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1712 (i).

Fishing Bounties paid to Cape Breton Fishermen, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Fishing Licenses: *See* 'Whale,' &c.

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1393 (i), 3514 (ii); in Com., 3582, 3642 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty Bill (remarks) *re* Discussion, 3754 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delay *re* Canadian Tariff &c. (remarks) 13534 (vii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 1206 (i).

——— on Preparation of Statement *re* Duty Units (remarks) 943 (i).

——— (remarks) on the Address, 28 (i).

French SS. Subsidy: *See* 'Can. and France,' &c.

French Translation of Govt. Documents &c (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3181 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10556 (vi).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayments of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 668 (i).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5496 (iii).

——— B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12555 (vii).

Govt. Business, Introduction of Govt. Bills (remarks) 10258 (v), 11826 (vi).

Govt. Business (remarks) 10403, 10511 (vi), 12163 (vii).

——— Ry. Subsidies (remarks) 12504 (vii).

——— Suppl. Estimates, &c. (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Govt. Legislation &c. (remarks) 7721 (iv), 10303, 11123 (vi).

Govt. Officials and Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections in N.B., on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6280 (iv).

Grain Bill: *See* 'Man. Grain,' &c.

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2226 (ii); in Com., 12070 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co.: *See* 'Major's Hill Park.'

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr Crawford) in Com., 9463 (v).

G.T.P. Ry., Cost of Construction (Statement) in Com. of Sup., 12238 (vii).

——— on M. (Mr. Graham) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).

——— Reply to Min. of Rys., 12682 (vii).

——— Cost inclusive of Terminals, &c., (Ques.) 9265 (v).

——— (remarks) on the Address, 37 (i).

——— Total Cost, &c. (remarks) 5728 (iii).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 10393, 10916, 11407, 11939 (vi).

G.T.P. Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c. (Ques.) 5563 (iii).

G.T.P., Engineering Staff, Resignation of Mr. Hodgins (Ques.) 366, 516 (i).

——— (M. for cor.*) 558 (i).

——— Charges *re* Classifications, &c. (remarks) 6844, 6925 (iv).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Com., 7213 (iv).

G.T.P., La Tuque Branch, Flooding by Water (remarks) 8607 (v).

——— Mountain Division, Incomplete Ret (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).

——— Ret., Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

——— Supplies via American Routes (remarks) 9027 (v).

*See* 'Indian,' &c.

Gunn, Mr. B. B., Decease of (remarks) 431

Halifax Garrison, Disbandment of &c. (remarks) 1208 (i).

——— Discontent *re* Pay, Par. in Press, 5659 (iii).

*See* 'Esquimalt.'

Halifax Immigration Frauds, Dismissal of Mr. J. Bernstein (remarks) 8605 (v).

——— Charges *re* (remarks) 9334 (v).

*See* 'Immigration,' &c.

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3710 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Lennox) to ref. back to Ry. Com., 3229 (ii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).

*See* "Chinese," &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Hindus in B.C., Deportation from B.C., &c. (remarks) 5338 (iii).

House of Commons Act (members) Amt. (B. 66) 1° m., 1346 (i); 2° m., 5226 (iii).

House of Commons, Allotment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5728 (iii).

——— Rules and Hours for Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 590 (i).

*See* 'Rules.'

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).

Immigrants, Fraudulent Circular issued &c. (remarks) 606 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 769 (i).

——— B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii); in Com., 6431 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7066 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1328 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1298 (i).

Immigration Irregularities at Halifax, Investigation *re* (remarks) 5567 (iii), 6465 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Robertson (remarks) 9127 (v).

——— Restitution *re* (remarks) 5659 (iii).

——— Statement *re* (remarks) 4963 (iii).

*See* 'Halifax,' &c.

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13129 (vii).

Indian Reserves, Land Grant to G.T.P. Ry. Co. in B.C., O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6471 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833; on M. to ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

——— Civic Elections at Halifax, Interference of Employees (remarks) 6845 (iv).

——— Employes in Prov. of Quebec, Interference in Provincial Elections (remarks) 9777 (v).

——— Employees and Municipal Elections (remarks) 2885 (ii).

——— Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

——— Truro Sewerage Frontage, (M. for cor.*) 5800 (iii).

*See* 'Govt. Rys., &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Irrigation Act, Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 955 (i); on M. to withdraw, 2974 (ii).
——— B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).
Japanese in B.C., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lemieux) 12659 (vii).
Japanese Immigration (remarks) on the Address, 32 (i).
——— Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission (remarks) 1208 (i).
——— Cor. *re* Limitation, &c., Inquiry for, 94 (i).
——— Debate in Japanese Diet, Rep. *re* (remarks) 4737 (iii).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 947 (i).
——— Parliamentary Control of, 2025, (amt.) 2043 (ii). Neg. (Y. 45; N. 100) 2158 (ii).
——— Statement by Postmaster General (remarks) 1424 (i).
——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1602, 1614 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs. Cor. Papers, &c. (M. for copies) 854 (i).
Japanese Treaty, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1928 (i.)
Joly, Sir Henry, Lt. Gov. of B.C., Cor. &c. sent to by Govt. (M. for copies*) 554 (i).
Judges in Man. and Ont., Salaries B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 12551; in Com., 13050 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12399 (vii).
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Woods, Disposal of, &c. (remarks) 13587 (vii).
Kun, Agnes Ballum, Exercise of Clemency by Justice Dept. and Res. of Town Council of Sydney (read) 9334 (v).
——— Release of (remarks) 9580 (v).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1026 (i).
Lands Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526 (vi).
*See* 'Dom. Lands,' &c.
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10952 (vi).
Life Saving Stations, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).
Literature distributed through Mails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9103 (v).
Loans to Govt., Temporary, &c., Outstanding, Rates of Interest, (Ques.) 235 (i).
——— since Oct., 1906, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 314 (i).
Lobster Fishing at Pictou, Inquiry for Ret., 12772 (vii).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of (remarks) 230 (i).
Major's Hill Park, and G.T.R. Hotel (remarks) 1425, 1585 (i).
*See* 'G.T.R.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Consent of Legislature, &c. (remarks) 936 (i).
——— Bill *re* Extension (remarks) 1741 (i), 2882 (ii), 11706 (vi).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 12790 (vii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12569 (vii).
Man. Voters Lists, Affidavits quoted by member (remarks) 7949 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Ass't. Judge in Exchequer Court (remarks) 11311 (vi).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 6845 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel for Civil Service Commissioners, on M. for Sup., 7322 (iv).
——— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. Hse., 8458 (v).
——— Delays, &c., on M. for Sup., 9725 (v).
——— Deputy Minister, Resignation, Acceptance of (remarks) 7621, 7938, 7995, 8088 (iv).
——— Evidence *re* (remarks) 8516 (v).
——— Evidence presented day by day to Hse. (remarks) 8293 (v).
——— Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6526 (iv).
——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10742 (vi).
——— Officials, Suspension *re* C. S. Report (remarks) 6004 (iii), 6846 (iv).
——— Postponement of by Judge Cassels (remarks) 8385 (v).
——— Proceedings, Public, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3029 (ii); in Com., 3034 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) on M. (Mr. Blain) to ref. back to Com., 7227; in Com., 7242 (iv).
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinion of Justice Dept. (M. for copies*) 5477 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).
Militia Camps, Holding of, &c. (remarks) 9779, 9835 (v).
'Montcalm' Str., Collision, Investigation *re* (remarks) 8172 (iv).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9478 (v).
*See* 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Motions, Unopposed, and Business of the House (remarks) 8896 (v).
National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13498 (vii).
*See* 'Que.,' &c.
N.T. Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9420 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3054 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3670 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co's. B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) on Senate Amts., 10511 (vi).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid *re* Immigration (remarks) on M. for Sup., 770 (i).

Northwest Territories Act Amt. B. 210 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13052 (vii).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co's. B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7725 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4697 (iii); in Com., 10856 (vi).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 12550; on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8606 (v).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co's. B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6229 (iv).

Pakenham Mail Bags, Destruction of, &c. (remarks) 1425 (i).

Patent Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12625 (vii).

Peace Union, Interparliamentary Union, Meeting at Ottawa (remarks) 13582 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3168 (ii).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv).

P.E.I. Public Works Expenditure, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Ret., 2172 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 12628 (vii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4654 (iii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10692 (vi).

Private Bills, Discrepancy in Fees between Senate and House of Commons (remarks) 10122 (v).

Provincial Subsidies, Increased Payments, &c.(Ques.) 173 (i).

Public Acounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3080 (ii).

——— Meetings and Adjournments (remarks) 1442 (i).

——— Sittings concurrently with House (remarks) 9504 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Public Bills and Orders, Precedence of (remarks) 2941, 3405 (ii).

Public Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Public Works Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) 5661, 5730 (iii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4945 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Cor., Plans, Specifications, O.Cs., &c. (M. for ret.*) 605 (i).

Quebec Bridge Disaster (remarks) on the Address, 30 (i).

——— Report, Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 5914 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Rep., 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii).

——— Printing of (remarks) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Moneys contributed *re* Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion (Ques.) 5566 (iii).

——— Par. in Toronto Globe *re* Change of Site (remarks) 7931 (iv).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13417; in Com., 13491 (vii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co's. B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).

Quebec Tercentenary, Number of Troops, &., (remarks) 10259 (v).

Questions, Precedence of &c. (remarks) 350 (i).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) on Par. in 'Globe,' 2383 (ii).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4965 (iii).

——— (compensation) Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 5246 (iii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3397 (ii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 583 (i).

——— on ques. of Order, ref. to debate in Senate, 577 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4659 (iii); in Com., 8511 (v), 10636; on Amt. (Mr Monk) to M. for 3°, 11606; on M. for 3°,11614; (amt.) 11619; Amt. neg. (Y. 40, N. 74) 11631 (vi).

Ry. Mortgages: *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., Applications and Constructions, 13478 (vii).

——— Inquiry for, 12771 (vii).

——— Applications for, Memorandum *re* (remarks) in Com., 13304, 13315 (vii).

Returns delayed, &c. (remarks) 13082 (vii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Returns delayed, on Inquiry for, 2384 (ii), 6847 (iv).

—— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Toronto Globe, 4660 (ii).
*See* 'Documents,' &c.

Ross Rifle Co., Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M. for Sup., 9073 (v).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9331 (v).

—— Report from Public Accounts Com., Delay, &c. (remarks) 5728 (iii).

Rules of the House, Proposed Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2985 (ii).
*See* 'House of Commons.'

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3011 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) 5546 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. MCraney) in Com., 8564, 9069, 9167 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Agreement with Govt. *re* Sale of Homestead Lands, Letter (read) 9127 (v).

—— Information *re* (remaks) 9280 (v).

—— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10102 (vi).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1382 (i).

—— Extension of Time of Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

—— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10121 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5417; (amt.) 5460 (iii).

S. A.Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3762 (ii), 12595; in Com., 13048; (amt.) 12612; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

Stanstead By-election, Disappearance of Papers (remarks) 8087 (iv).

—— on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).

—— on M. for Com., 8888 (v).

Sub-target Machines, on M. to ref. papers to Pub. Accts. Com. (remarks) 946 (i).

Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission, on prop Res. (Mr. Foster) 5820 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5831 (iii).

Supply B. 220 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13579 (vii).

Supply—Conc., 5499 (iii).

—— Estimates, Basis of Appropriations (remarks) 5919 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Supply—Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9909 (v).

—— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10034 (v).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ross) 10025
*See* 'Dom. Elections B. 115,' &c.

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 672; (census, &c.) 674 (i); (dairying) 10397 (vi); (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Canals—Generally (salaries) 10325; (staff and repairs) 10304 (vi).

Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries, &c.) 616 (i); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 978 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9536 (v); Miscellaneous (cruisers) 9578 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9226, 9441 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10062 (v); (salaries) 10040 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9878 (v); (deportations) 9882 (v); (literature, &c.) 9948 (v).

Militia (annual drill) 10286 (v); (rifle ranges) 12505 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3147, 3185 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5510 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 9103 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military)10973; (Winnipeg warehouse) 8568 (v); Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 11112; Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10378 (vi); (construction) 12238 (vii); (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5550 (iii); (Windsor Branch) 10145 (v).

Railways — Miscellaneous (extra clerks) 10342 (vi); (inspections, &c.) 10341 (vi); (legal expenses) 10363 (vi).

Supreme Court Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. Ayles worth) in Com., 5497 (iii).

Technical Schools, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12660 (vii).

Telegraph and Telephones and Man. Boundaries, Legislation, Inquiry for, 3012 (ii).

Telephones and Telegraphs, Control by Ry. Commission (remarks) on the Address, 37 (i).
*See* 'Ry. Act Amt.'

Timber Berths, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) Ques. of Order *re* reading Evidence before Pub. Accounts, 11308 (vi).

Timber Licenses, Inquiry for Ret., 1739 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2527 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10701 (vi).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep. and Ry. Commission Reps., Printing of, &c. (remarks) 7 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'

Under-Secretaries of State (remarks) on the Address, 25 (i).

U.S. Warships passing through Canadian Canals (remarks) 5338 (iii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178,on M. for 2°, 12508 (vii).

Whale Fishing Licenses granted in B.C., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10284 (v).

Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W. and Financial Aid, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2182 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10532 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9636 (v).

Yukon Moral Reform, Inquiry for Dr. Shearer's letter, 10303, 11122 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act. Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8188 (v),10519 (vi).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *Algoma West.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c. (Ques.) 892 (i).

Alien Labour, Protection to Canadians, Pet. (read) in Com. of Sup., 12156 (vii).

Archives Dept., Index Cards, Quantity purchased, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 6057 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjourn House, 5906 (iii).

—— (remarks) on Presentation, 5644 (iii).

Coal Lands in N.W.T., Lease granted, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

Copper Cliff Post Office, Charges against Postmaster Kilpatrick (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. on Election Bill, 11913 (vi).

Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c. (Ques.) 1736 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

Dredging Contracts, Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 1736 (i).

—— Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6634 (iv).

Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1129 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7949 (iv); 11739; in Com., 11818, 11905; (amt.) 11931 (vi); in Com., 12926; on M. for 3° (amt.) 13230; neg. (Y. 60; N. 99) 13249 (vii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Fort William or Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T.P. Ry. Co. (Ques.) 5256 (iii).

G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale, B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12077 (vii).

G.T.P., Steel Rail Contracts, Importations, &c. (Ques) 12775 (vii).

—— Steel Rails, Purchases, Prices, Firms, &c. (Ques.) 10738, 10790 (vi).

—— Supply Transportation, Award of Contracts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2171 (ii).

—— Ties purchased in U.S., &c. (remarks) 1443 (i).

—— Transportation of Supplies, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1932 (i).

Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Rebuilding (Ques.) 7210 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, 13095; (amt.) 13122; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 101) 13138 (vii).

—— (remarks) *re* Telegram of Mr. Sifton, 13528 (vii).

—— Withdrawal from Sale, &c. (Ques.) 2396 (ii).

I.C.R. Officials, A. T. LeBlanc, &c., Accounts, Vouchers, &c. *re* Travelling Expenses, &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).

—— Steel Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re* (Ques.) 9269 (v).

Manitoulin & North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Reps. *re* &c. (Ques.) 893 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Cost of, &c. (Ques.) 6054 (iii).

Ontario, North, Division of Prov. (remarks) 8294 (v).

Port Arthur Dredging, Contracts, Securities, &c. (Ques) 697 (i).

Prefontaine, Hon. R., Date of Sailing for England, Acting Minister of Marine, &c. (Ques.) 7732 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3125 (ii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3085 (ii).

Public Buildings and Works, Initiated since 1896, (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

Ques. of Priv., Stmnt. of hon. member for Thunder Bay *re* Misleading House, 7995 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, 11610 (vi).

Ry. Act Amt., (remarks) 12194 (vii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Returns, Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c. (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

'Sault Express,' Amounts paid for Advertising, &c. (Ques.) 696 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 853, 1129 (i).

Sault St. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 898 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13470 (vii).

*See* 'G.T.P.' &c.

Seed Grain Distribution, Extension to Unorganized Territories (remarks) 5408 (iii).

——— O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6635 (iv).

Spanish River Dredging, Amount of Expenditure (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Steel Concrete Co., Payments to by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

*See* 'Walker.'

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5872 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 635 (i); Labour Dept. (salaries) 12156 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4015 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 1072 (i); (life-saving stations) 2972; (wrecks) 3152, 3195 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5524 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1452, 1474; (Museum) 1498 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (legal costs) 5557; (Pictou) 5559 (iii).

Timber Berths, East Saskatchewan, Conditions of Sale to Owners, &c. (Ques.) 3839 (ii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1050, &c., Bonuses, Rentals, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

——— Nos. 1048, &c., on Order for Ret. (amt.) 850 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3318 (ii).

Timber Berths, Original Documents, &c. (M. for ret.) 2983 (ii).

*See* 'Indian Lands.'

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on M. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).

Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re* (Ques.) 3842

——— Payment by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 5085 (iii).

*See* 'Steel.'

Yukon Placer Mining Act, Grants *re*, Claims, Names, &c., for one year (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*

'Challenge' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed (Ques.) 12651 (vii).

Dorval, Dredging at Yacht Club Wharf (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Dredging Work at Rigaud River, &c. (M. for cor.*) 6240 (iv).

Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* Violations, &c. (Ques.) 6639 (iv).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3461 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c. (M. for reports*) 6239 (iv).

BRABAZON, Mr. G. H., *Pontiac.*

Georgian Bay Canal, Survey, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1997 (i).

——— Final Report of Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 240 (i).

Immigrants, Total Number entering Canada for ten Months, Deportations, &c. (Ques.) 240 (i).

BRISTOL, Mr. E., *Toronto Centre.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3866

Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by U. S. Customs Officers (remarks) 11121 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11669 (vi).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1638 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1797 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126; in Com., 11815, 11843; (amt.) 11820 (vi); in Com., 12920; on M. for 3°, 13234 (vii).

French Treaty, going into Effect (Ques.) 8614 (v).

Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c. (Ques.) 9712 (v).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3705, 3720 (ii).

Japanese Immigration, Parliamentary Control, &c., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2056 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605, 1663 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appointment of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7354 (iv).

BRISTOL, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9502 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. (B. 82) in Com., 4997, 5052; (amt.) 5056 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1442 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1454, 1470 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).

Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Co., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8807 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8700 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) 11309 (vi).

Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties (Ques.) 8616 (v).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9679 (v).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*

Brockville Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3897 (ii).

Budget, The, 5980 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10753 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).

Deep Waterways Commission, St. Lawrence, Damming at Long Sault (remarks) 13142 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1825 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11140 (vi).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12554 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6905 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2098 (ii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2904 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10398; (exhibitions) 10591 (vi); Canals, Welland (electric lighting) 12205 (vii); Public Works, Miscellaneous (telegraph branch) 11098 (vi).

Technical Students, Employment on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3297 (ii).

BRODER, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Williamsburg Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12205 (vii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P., (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Rouville.*

'Arctic,' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June 1904, to June, 1907 (Ans.) 185 (i).

———Trip in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup. 4012 (ii).

Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction (Ans.) 3849 (ii).

Beauchemin, A., Employment at Sorel (Ans.) 5467 (iii).

*See* 'Sorel,' &c.

Becancour River Dredging, Commencement of, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 7213 (iv).

Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re* (Ans.) 1733 (i).

——— Expenses of Sir C. H. Tupper (explanation) 4669 (iii).

Bellechasse Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 4830 (iii).

Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 6238 (iv).

——— Ret., Delay, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ans.) 3241 (ii).

Bernier, Capt., Islands flagged *re* Arctic Expedition (Ans.) 5208, 5466 (iii).

Birnie and Noble, Advances to, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 987 (i).

*See* 'Fishing,' &c.

Briar Island Marine Signalling, Change of System (Ans.) 9266 (v).

B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re*, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).

B.C. Fishing, Licenses issued to Packers Associations (Ans.) 8173 (iv).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Travelling Expenses from June 30th, 1906 (Ans.) 1347 (i).

*See* 'Marine,' 'Travelling,' &c.

Bronte Harbour Wharfage, Dues collected (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to (Ans.) 5467 (iii).

Campbellton Harbor, Gas Buoys, Tender *re* (Ans.) 8612 (v).

Can. Ensign: *See* 'Red Ensign.'

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6161, 6173, 6198; 1°*, 6215 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 5108 (iv).

*See* 'Franco,' &c.

Canada Shipping Act, Amt. B. 17 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 3420 (ii).

——— (B. 183) 1°*, 10119 (v); in Com., 12851, 13052 (vii).

Canso Medical Officer, Successor to Dr. Brine (Ans.) 1736 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing (Ans.) 681 (i).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. (remarks) 6060 (iii).

*See* 'Marine,' &c.

'Castle' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 6641 (iv)

Champlain, Str., Emplymt. by Political Agents, (explanation) 9280 (v).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5890 (iii).

——— Statement *re* Marine Dept., 5620 (iii).

——— Translation (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 11300 (vi).

Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. from Board of Trade, P.E.I. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 8379 (v).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 999, 1040 (i).

*See* 'Travelling.'

'Coquitlam,' Str., Compensation *re* Seizure (Ans.) 2389 (ii).

Cowie, F.W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 5649 (iii).

Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 7731 (iv).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).

Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services (Ans.) 1736 (i).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1149 (i).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Subsidy Grant (Ans.) 8184 (iv).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso (Ans.) 5651,5779, 5790 (iii), 8179 (iv).

Dog-Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S. (Ans.) 1126 (i).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt. (Ans.) 1117 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of Cor. 1128 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Falconer, K., Payments to for Services (Ans.) 8890 (v).

——— Payment of Balance of Account (Ans.) 10516 (vi).

——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4000 (ii).

Fire Extinguishers purchased by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7640 (iv).

——— (personal explanation) 7663 (iv).

——— Production of Original File (remarks) 9281 (v).

——— Quotations from, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7765 (iv).

——— on Inquiry for Original Papers, 8902 (v).

Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations with Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 6849 (iv).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1723 (i).

Fisheries Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c.; (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Fisheries between Dom. and Provs., Jurisdiction *re* (Ans.) 2395, 3429 (ii).

——— Conference *re* (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

——— Negotiations with Provs., Instructions to Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 4407 (iii).

——— Protection Service, Amounts expended since 1885 (Ans.) 1118 (i).

Fisheries in Lake Winnipeg, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2390 (ii).

Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

Fish Hatchery at Selkirk, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ans.) 3240 (ii).

Fishing Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Name &c. (Ans.) 1684 (i).

Fishing Licenses in B.C., Granted to Japanese (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

Fishing Rights in Matane River, &c. (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

——— Complaints, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).

Fishing Privileges, Lesser Slave Lake, Lease &c. (Ans.) 6398 (iv).

Fish Island, Name of Present Lightkeeper (Ans.) 6058 (iii).

Fog Signal Co., Payments to (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor, &c. (Ans.) 3427 (ii).

France and Canada SS Subsidy, (prop. res.) 3493 (ii).

*See* 'Can. and France.'

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 927 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1384 (i); in Com., 3609, 3636 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4335 (iii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper (Ans.) 8383 (v).

Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt by Govt. (Ans.) 515, 1120 (i).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 981 (i).

——— on Rep. of Mr. Birnie (remarks) 5729 (iii).

*See* 'Birnie, &c.

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6282 (iv).

Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 10731 (vi).

——— Maintenance and Supplies, in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

——— Pay of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 10736 (vi).

——— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c. (Ans.) 5468 (iii).

*See* 'Cowie,' &c.

Hackett, Capt., Tug *re* Lime Kiln Crossing, Remuneration, &c., (Ans.) 7729 (iv).

Halliday Bros., Lighthouses, Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 6236 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 3°, 4543 (iii).

Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

'Hurona-Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 358 (i).

Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 1128 (i).

Ice-Breaker for Northumberland Straits, Progress *re* Construction (Ans.) 1734 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).

Ingonish Light-keeper, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8618 (v).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6477 (iv).

I.C.R. Employes and Provincial Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9778 (v).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Crew during Winter &c. (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

——— Purchase Price, Staff, &c. (Ans.) 3434 (ii).

Life-Saving Boats in B.C., Purchase of &c. (Ans.) 684 (i).

Life Saving Stations, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).

Lighthouse Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).

Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3837 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Lighthouses in Quebec, Classification, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i).

Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Charter of Steamers, &c. (Ans.) 11299 (vi).

Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re* (Ans.) 9477 (v).

Lobster Fishery Overseers in Lunenburg, &c., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2794 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries, Issue of Licenses, *re* (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

Lobster Fishery Regulations, Pet. from Fishermen's Union N.S. (Ans.) 6644 (iv).

Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts (Ans.) 10256 (v).

Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland County (Ans.) 9473 (v).

——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 4404 (iii).

Lobster Fishing Licenses in P.E.I., on M. (Mr. Martin) for Cor., 5475 (iii).

Lobster Fishing at Pictou, on Inquiry for Ret., 12772 (vii).

Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c. (Ans.) 10257 (v).

Lobsters, Undersized, Caught at Lunenburg, &c., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2793 (ii).

Lockery & McCombel, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ans.) 7198 (iv).

Louisburg, Bait Freezer, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 4406 (iii).

——— Harbour Dues for 1906, &c. (Ans.) 7503 (iv).

——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 3428 (ii).

——— Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c. (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Lyall & Sons, Storage of Refuse on Harbour Property (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

Marconi Co. and Commercial Press Business (Ans.) 513 (i).

Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Operation of, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Marconi System, Regulation *re* Rates, &c. (Ans.) 174 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Acting Deputy (remarks) 11939 (vi).

——— Dep. Minister, Resignation and Acceptance (remarks) 7938 (iv).

——— Letter *re* (read) 8088 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Ret. *re* Mr. Falconer's Accounts, laid on Table, 4223 (iii).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 510 (i).

——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7325 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 6845 (i).

——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron (remarks) 6926 (iv).

——— Defalcations of Mr. Roy (remarks) 10741 (vi).

——— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8452 (v).

——— Deputy Minister, Suspended Officers, Date of Apptmt, &c. (Ans.) 6982 (iv).

——— Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6636 (iv).

——— Investigation, Public &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).

——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10742 (vi).

——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6846 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries, Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refund, &c. (Ans.) 8889 (v).

Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St. (Ans.) 13062 (vii).

Marine and Militia Stationery Supplies, Purchase *re* Book-keeping (Ans.) 6234 (iv).

Markey Fishing Leases, Copy laid on Table, 11404 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3022; in Com., 3034 (ii).

Meaford Harbour, (B. 158) 1° m., 7195 (iv); in Com., 8510 (v).

Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept. (Ans.) 11701 (vi).

Montcalm, Str., Amount expended, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

——— Purchase Price, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 8441 (v).

'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended, &c. (revestigation *re* (remarks) 8087, 8171 (iv).

——— Accident (remarks) 10121 (v).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Contract *re* Cement (Ans.) 7199, 7499 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Cleaning, &c. (Ans.) 8888 (v).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3456 (ii).

Motion, Unopposed, and Business of the House (remarks) 8896 (v).

Naval Instruction, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c. (Ans.) 1119 (i).

Naval Stations in Canada, Maintenance of, Arrangements with G. B. *re* (Ans.) 1118 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations (Ans.) 5651 (iii).

Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry, Rate, &c. (Ans.) 1120 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3980 (ii).

'Petrel' Str., Amounts paid for Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 7937 (iv).

Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c. (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 10255 (v).

Prefontaine, Hon. Mr., Date of Sailing for England, &c. (Ans.) 7732 (iv).

Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 984 (i).

P.E.I. Cable Service, &c. (remarks) 8516 (v).

P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c (Ans.) 360 (i).

——— Life-Saving Station, Establishment of (Ans.) 681 (i).

P.E.I. Lighthouse Supplies, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 358 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer (Ans.) 2546 (ii).

——— Georgetown and Cape George Route, Test *re* (Ans.) 895 (i).

——— Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 8444 (v).

——— Progress *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 365 (i), 5796 (iii).

——— Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

——— Signing of Contract (Ans.) 10254 (v).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1109 (i).

——— 'Str. Stanley,' Route, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i), 6160 (iii).

——— Total Quantity of Freight, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Withdrawl of Str., &c. (remarks) 1207 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).

Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Changes *re* (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10663 (vi).

Red Ensign, Flying on Merchant Vessels, Authority for (Ans) 12776 (vii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 1018, 1740 (i), 2025, 2886, 3318 (ii).

——— Delayed (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Rideau Canal, Buoys, &c., Contract *re* Lighting (Ans.) 8613 (v).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Russian Govt., Compensation to B.C. Schooners (Ans.) 683 (i).
St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis (Ans.) 3230 (ii).
——— Expenditure and Collections (Ans.) 1935 (i).
Ste Anne de Sorel, Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c. (Ans.) 7732 (iv).
St. Lawrence Route, Wrecks, Collisions, &c. (Ans.) 10739 (vi).
St. Louis, Mr., Payments to, by Marine Dept (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
St. Peters Post Office, on Inquiry for Ret., 2787 (ii).
Salmon Fishing Licenses in B.C., Number, Condition, &c. (Ans.) 5652, 5998 (iii).
——— Gardner's Inlet, &c. (Ans.) 5652 (iii).
——— Payments *re* (Ans.) 5651 (iii).
Salmon Net Fishing, Priviliges in Restigouche River (Ans.) 13518 (vii).
Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &c. (Ans.) 351 (i).
Shad Hatchery at Windsor, N.S. (Ans.) 8894 (v).
Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).
Shipping Master, Quebec, Apptmt of, &c. (Ans.) 11700 (vi).
Shipping, Statistics *re* Tons registered (Ans.) 2790 (ii).
*See* 'Canadian Shipping Act,' &c.
Signal Dues at Halifax (B. 152) 1°m., 6457 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8510 (v).
Sorel Pay Lists, Alleged Padding, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7938 (iv).
——— Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8295 (v).
——— Final Rep. (remarks) 10794 (vi).
——— Investigation *re* Pay Rolls, &c. (Ans.) 4768 (iii).
——— Papers laid on Table, 5477 (iii).
——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet (remarks) 7099 (iv).
——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet laid on Table, 8170 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Irregularities (remarks) 5408 (iii).
Sorel Shipyards, Mr. Desbarats, Connection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
Soulanges County Wharfage Dues, Amount received, &c. (Ans.) 9277 (v).
Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, Cor. with Aud. Gen. (Ans.) 4405 (iii).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 4825 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 4670 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
——— (statement) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
'Stanley,' Str., Passenger Accommodation (Ans.) 687 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Steamboat Inspection Report (presented) 3896 (ii).
Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Payments to *re* Auditing, Dept. of Marine (Ans.) 3233 (ii).
Submarine Signal at Negro Point, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5202 (iii).
Summerside Harbour and Str. Stanley (remarks) 6160 (iii).
Supplies purchased for Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5829 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 977 (i).
Fisheries (dogfish works) 13325 (vii); (inspectors, &c.) 12261 (vii); (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).
Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13169 (vii).
Immigration (agents) 9853 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 5039 (iii); (aids to navigation) 5040, 5773 (iii); (lighthouses) 12262 (vii); (lightkeepers) 13323 (vii); (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii); (maintenance, &c.) 5039 (iii); (pensions) 13324 (vii); (pilotage pensions, &c.) 5046 (iii); (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii); (repairs) 5039 (iii); (salaries) 4755, 5039 (iii); (signal service) 5045 (iii); (Thunder Bay icebreaker) 5041 (iii); (wireless stations) 5045 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries (dockyard) 5039 (iii); (dredging plant, &c.) 4754 (iii); (hospitals) 5782 (iii); Hudson Bay Patrolling) 3985 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1885 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii); 12262 (vii); (Patrol Boats in Hudson Bay) 4747 (iii) (Sorel property) 4751 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Marine investigation) 13169 (vii).
Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1078 (i), 5763 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2942, 2952; (life-saving awards) 2972 (ii); (masters and mates) 2969 (ii); (naval schools) 3153 3222 (ii); (obstructions) 3211 (ii); (tidal service) 3215 (ii); (winter mail service) 3217 (ii); (wrecks) 3147, 3184, 3195, (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Elmwood) 13335 (vii).
Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii); (St. Lawrence channel) 5035 (iii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11082 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bonaventure) 12036 (vi); (Peribonka) 12036 (vi); (Piche Point) 12035 (vi).
Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3294

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 915 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 922 (i).

Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of (Ans) 4586 (iii).

Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River (Ans.) 9476 (v).

Trap Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iv).

Travelling Expenses of Minister, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4122 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 986 (i), 3985 (ii).

'Victor,' Tug, Repairs to, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Reid) 9775 (v).

'Vigilant,' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision (Ans.) 683 (i).

Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contracts with Marine Dept. (Ans.) 3230, 3843 (ii).

——— Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re* (Ans.) 3843 (ii).

Washington Fisheries Commissioners, Expenses *re* (Ans.) 1732 (i).

Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of, &c. (Ans.) 2165 (ii).

Watson, Mr., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Fraud (remarks) 6848 (iv).

*See* 'Marine,' &c.

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6121 (iii).

Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Signals (Ans.) 9274 (v).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Granting of Licenses, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A McLean) 10269 (v).

——— Moneys due, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 5996 (iii).

Wharfs, Piers, &c., Amount of Revenue collected (Ans.) 2391 (ii).

——— Expenditure, on Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).

Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Wireless Tel. Stations on Pacific Coast, Erection of (Ans.) 683 (i).

BROWN, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*

Pontiac Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 155) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 195) 1°*, 11589 (vi).

BUREAU, Hon. J. (Solicitor General) *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Convict Labour, Control of, Sales of Articles, &c. (Ans.) 238 (i).

Hansard, Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

BUREAU, Hon. J.—*Con.*

Judges, Supreme Court, Quebec Apptmnt. on Commissions (Ans.) 358 (i).

Justice, Deptl. Report (presented) 185 (i).

'Le Soleil,' *re* Voting of French Members, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7994 (iv).

Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion (Ans.) 357 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 10396 (v); Justice (Exchequer Court) 5506; (salaries) 5505 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Arctic cruise) 4012 (ii); Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522 (iii); (maintenance) 5509 (iii).

BURROWS, Mr. T. A., *Dauphin.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8357 (v).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11172, 11445, 11526; (amt.) 11943 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10822 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12812 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12568 (v).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2772 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2772 (ii); Public Works— Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8531 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr Lake) 2378 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Winnipeg 'Telegram,' 9023 (v).

——— Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8734 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8751 (v).

CALDWELL, Mr. T. B., *Lanark, N.*

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5446 (iii).

CALVERT, Mr. W. S., *Middlesex, W.*

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82, on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5062 (iii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 3° m., 1929 (i).

CALVERT, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).

West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 430 (i).

CARNEY, Mr. M., *Halifax.*

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 764 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10595 (vi); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4160 (ii).

CARON, Mr. J. B. T., *Ottawa.*

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4026 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11344 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2005 (i).

Northern Empire Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 86) 1°*, 2160 (ii).

Royal Mint of Canada, Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* (M. for copy*) 5210 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4026 (ii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, (N.B.)*

Anse St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8401 (v); in Com., 13021 (vii).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6798 (iv).

Fraser Lumber Co.'s (B. 8) 1°*, 231 (i).

Govt. Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10990 (vi).

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep., 12293 (vii).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12405 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

N.B. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1108 (ii).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9929 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5441 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12619 (vii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.— *Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10899 (vi); N. S. (Shelburne) 7177 (iv); Ont. (Kingston) 10913 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John surveys) 13348 (vii); (St. John tidal waters) 12005 (vi); N.S. (Port Hood) 11276 (vi); Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12112 (vii).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. (amt.) 11964 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5014 (iii).

——— Manner of Living, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5752 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6334 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 3314 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 26) 1°*, 430 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12580 (vii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1353 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (general expenses) 5752 (iii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *Huron, E.*

Address, The, 263 (i).

Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada (Ques.) 686 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6214 (iii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2573 (ii).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1651 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11945, 11953 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5007 (iii).

Fishing Licenses issued in Saskatchewan Lakes, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559, 697 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. 2896 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1238 (i).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10564 (vi).

Hudson Bay Co., Original Land Registers of Lord Selkirk's Estate, &c. (Ques.) 4403 (iii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6834 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*

McGee, Hon. Thomas D'Arcy, Monument *re* (remarks) 6288 (iv).

Mint Building, Ventilation of, &c. (Ques.) 3036 (ii).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9945 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii); in Com., 12623 (vii).

'Petrel,' Str., Supplies, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 7937 (iv).

Postmasters' Assessments, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 6458 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on M. (Mr. McLean) to conc., 13353 (vii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses, Number granted in B.C., Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 5998 (iii).

Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &c. (Ques.) 351 (i).

S.A. SS. Subsidy, Amount to Elder-Dempster Co. (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12607 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 622 (i); Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5759 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4184 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*

Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tels., &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1702 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Georgetown and Cape George Route, Test *re* (Ques.) 895 (i).

——— Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4630 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11695 (vi).

CHRISTIE, Mr. P., *Ontario, S.*

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vii).

Cattle, Exports and Imports from Canada to G.B. (Ques.) 6460 (iv).

Cattle Registered, Importations from U.S., from 1904-7 (Ques.) 6238 (iv).

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7266 (iv).

CHRISTIE, Mr. P.—*Con.*

Railway Commission (ass't. chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3930 (ii).

Sheep Quarantine by U.S. (remarks) 13537 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock) 12895 (vii); (seeds) 12893 (vii).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *Essex, S.*

Address, The, 254 (i).

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4385 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5120 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11825, 11859; (amt.) 11881 (vi).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 3194, 3226, 3621, 3692, 3737 (ii), 4224 (iii); 3° m., 4357, 4536 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6474 (iv).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Patent Medicines, B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12627 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings and Adjournments (remarks) 1440 (i).

——— 3rd Rep. (M. to conc.) 2159 (ii).

——— Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3131 (ii).

Tobacco, Protection *re* Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 913 (i).

Walker, Andrew, Relief (B. 124) 1°*, 5336 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6126 (iii).

Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.'s (B. 108) 1°*, 3834 (ii).

Windsor Pump and Foundry Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 72) 1°*, 1424 (i).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8494 (v).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S., *Kent, W.*

Address, The, 194 (i).

Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6465 (iv).

*See* 'Militia.'

Bounties paid by Govt. since 1896 (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

——— (Ques.) 895 (i).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Brome County Employees, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

Budget, The, 6527 (iv).

Canned Foods, &c., Inspection Regulations, Names of Counties, &c. (Ques.) 514 (i).

——— Cor. *re* Regulations, &c. (M. for copies*) 557 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy, B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6174 (iii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11254 (vi).

Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert (Ques.) 11495 (vi).

Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8894 (v), 9266 (v).

Chilvers, Francis W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 10515 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12164 (vii).

Colchester Point, Essex Pier, Amount expended (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

Concrete Wharfs, Dissatisfaction in Ont. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).

Detroit River Tunnel, Duties on Construction Material, &c. (Ques.) 1116 (i).

——— Material imported, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

——— Material entered free of Customs Duties (Ques.) 10254 (v).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 10417 (vi).

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs Dept. at Windsor (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Documents, Original, Ques. of Priv., 6010 (iii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5031 (iii).

Dredging Contracts, Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6634 (iv).

Essex County Junior Judge, Apptmt. of &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Falconer, Payments to *re* Auditing Accounts of Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4178 (ii).

Floods at Chatham, Damage &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4742 (iii).

Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

Glencoe Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

Hackett Dock, Purchase of, at Amherstburg (Ques.) 7730 (iv).

Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered (Ques.) 9280 (v).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13092 (vii).

Immigrants deported from Chatham, Names and Cause, &c. (Ques.) 5796 (iii).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Immigrants at Chatham, Complaints *re* Deportation of (Ques.) 6922 (iv).

Immigrants distributed in West Kent, Certificates, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Immigration Agents appointed in Ontario, Names, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1129 (i).

Immigration Agents, Special Prizes, &c. (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Immigration Forms, Number returned by Farmers, &c. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

Immigration Officers in Kent County, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 514 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 3172 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3041 (ii), 4223 (iii).

Indian Department, Extravagant Management (remarks) on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11066 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr Templeman) in Com., 6470 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

Lime Kiln Crossing, Charter of Capt. Hackett's Tug, Remuneration *re* (Ques.) 7729 (iv).

Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Lady Evelyn' (Ques.) 5799 (iii).

Marcoun, Mr. Frank, Commission *re* Settlement of Claims, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

Meats and Canned Food Inspectors, Number appointed, Names, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).

Meat Inspection Regulations, Meetings at Chatham (remarks) in debate on Address, 196 (i).

Meat Inspection Act Violations, Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).

Militia, Purchase of Blankets, Return *re* (remarks) 5914 (iii).

*See* 'Blankets.'

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 793 (i).

Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs, Windsor (Ques.) 5200 (iii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Pepin, J. A., Emplymt. at Windsor Customs (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Perdue, Dr M. B., Apptmt. as Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 173 (i).

Piggeries at Experimental Farm (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4931 (iii).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3928 (ii).

Rankin, Col., Resignation of (remarks) 11405 (vi).

Returns, Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4665 (iii).

Ruscomb River Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c. (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 12894 (vii); (Meat and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii); (seeds) 12892 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Fisheries (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (administration) 12732 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii); (Thunder Bay icebreaker) 5042 (iii).

Marine, &c.—Public Works (ship channel) 5038 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (naval schools) 3154 (ii); (obstructions) 3212 (ii); (wrecks) 3188 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8524 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Dom. renewals, &c.) 7479 (iv); (Glencoe) 7487 (iv); (Guelph armoury) 7678 (iv); (Kingston R. M. C.) 7704 (iv); (Leamington) 7705 (iv); (Markham) 7712 (iv); (North Bay) 7712 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Station C.) 7420 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8599 (v); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v); (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 11273 (vi); (Port Royal) 11278 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Belle River) 12090 (vii); (McGregor's Creek) 12103 (vii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11073 (vi).

Tecumseh Park Breakwater, Dangerous Condition (remarks) 12657 (vii).

Thames River Wharf, Damages to (remarks) 7506 (iv).

Tilbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 908 (i).

Wallace, Michael J, Emplymt in Customs at Windsor (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

Waugh, James, Refund to Govt. *re* Immigration Agent (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6138 (iii).

Wilson Cordage Co., Cor. Accounts, &c. (M. for copies*) 1129 (i).

Windsor, Detroit and Belle Isle Ferry Co., Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Expiration of Franchise (Ques.) 1940 (i).

COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*

Address, The, 123, (amt.) 147 (i); Amt. Neg. (Y. 95: N. 56) 274 (i).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12448 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10940 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4391; in Com., 4400 (iii).

Bell Memorial Association, Grant, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).

Brantford Srike, Cor. with Justice Dept. (Ques.) 10016 (v).

Budget, The, 5314 (iii).

Buffalo Herds for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).

Butter Imports, Quantity, Countries of Origin, &c. (Ques.) 1116 (i).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6176 (iii).

Canadian Associated Press B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12407 (vii).

Cataract Power Co., Welland Canal, Amount diverted at DeCew Falls, &c. (Ques.) 897 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12183 (vii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9736 (v).

Customs Dept. and Civil Service Rep. *re* on M. for Sup., 10428 (vi).

Customs Seizure for 1905-7, Reasons, Fines, &c (M. for ret.*) 4588 (iii).

——— Customs Dept., Criticism, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10428 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10825 (vi).

Dominion Power Co.'s Bill, Inquiry for, 10919 (vi).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1237 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3556 (ii); in Com., 3617 (ii), 3640 (ii).

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations (Ques.) 5200 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12555 (vii).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2240 (ii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6661 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12725 (vii).

COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4227 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6451 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of, to Agents, &c. (prop. res.) 1295 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6998 (iv).

Indian Schools, Dr. Bryce's Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 625 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6490 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2074 (ii).

Newspaper Rates, List of Publications (M. for copy*) 1295 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10704 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8857 (v).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4659 (iii) .

Saskatoon, Saskatchean, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4238 (ii)

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (seed branch) 5501 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 625 (i).

Indians—(destitute, relief) 5762 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5756 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10891 (vi); Ont. (Brantford) 7455 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2873 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12855 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5097 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10721 (vi); in Com., 11386 (vi); 12167 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7982 (iv), 7998 (iv), 11727 (vi); in Com., 11802 (vi), 11833 (vi), 12958 (vii); on M. for 3°, 13235 (vii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5030 (iii).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6803 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3635 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6659 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12678 (vii).

——— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1445 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3702 (ii), 3719 (ii).

Hudson Bay Ry. (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. Foster) *re* Financial Review, 13467 (vii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12561 (vii).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).

Niagara, St. Catherines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5064 (iii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4914 (iii).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4971 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5664 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4054, 4132 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt (Mr. Lake) 2345 (ii).

COPP, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby*

Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 1108 (i); in Com., 4231 (ii); on Senate Amts., 5785 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 5412, 5519 (iii).

Townsend, Arthur James, Relief (B. 196) 1°*, 11589 (vi).

CRAWFORD, Mr. J., *Portage la Prairie.*

Address, The, 316 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11986 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8076, 8089 (iv); in Com., 13007 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Ry Co.'s (B. 151) 1°*, 6287 (iv).

——— on Order for Com., 7141 (iv); in Com., 7667, 8125 (iv), 8552, 8609, 8741, 9377, 9461 (v).

Grazing Land leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co., Number of Acres (Ques.) 13062 (vii).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9132 (v).

CRAWFORD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6382 (iv)

Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1, 1896 (Ques) 13512 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3381 (ii).

Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to complete, &c. (Ques.) 4242 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1364 (i).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5523 (iii)

Public Works--Buildings--Man. (Dauphin) 8521 (iii); (Neepawa) 8537 (v).

Timber Berths, Awarded between June 1904 and July 15th, 1896, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii).

——— Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2676 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York (N.B.)*

Blackhall, Mrs., Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6878 (iv).

Civil Service Act. Amt B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11558 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1861 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13028 (vii)

Elections in N.B., Federal Govt. Patronage, on M. for Sup., 3043 (ii)

Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St John, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr Crawford) in Com., 9464 (v).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12710 (vii).

——— Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9266 (v).

Immigration in N.B., Co-operation with N.B. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).

I.C.R., Claim Agent, E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

——— Deterioration in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10147 (v).

——— Freight Rate Discrimination against Fredericton, N.B., Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 2558 (ii).

——— Moncton Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1509 (i).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12403 (vii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).

Mail Service in N.B. and N.S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12796 (vii).

Moncton Shops, Payments to E. A. Wallberg (Ques.) 8892 (v).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 9714 (v).

Post Office Services Ret., Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4916 (iii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6227 (iv).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10639 (vi).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9830 (v).

St. Mary's Indian Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

Seed Grain for N.W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12597 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 12889 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 621 (i); Mines (salaries) 647 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Immigration (deportations) 9886 (v).

Indians—N.B. (agents salaries) 13170 (vii); (salaries) 12736 (vii); (schools) 13170 (vii).

Militia (gratuities) 13178 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2942 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Neepawa) 8537 (v); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8573 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fredericton) 13328 (vii); (Moncton) 13328 (vii); (Quarantine, water service) 7187; (St. John) 7186 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7119; (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv) (Halifax customs) 7156 (iv); (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Shelburne) 7173 (iv); (Westville) 7179; (Yarmouth) 7182 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 7679 (iv); (Kingston artillery park) 7701 (iv); (Kingston, hospital)

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

7702 (iv); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7704 (iv); (North Bay) 7718 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dom. Arsenal) 7438 (iv); (Dundee) 7287 (iv); (Farnham) 7287 (iv); (Knowlton) 7291 (iv); (St. John's) 7444 (iv); (St. John's military) 7442 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta (Battleford) 8578 (v); (Edmonton) 8579 (v); (Estevan) 8581 (v); (Humboldt) 8584 (v); (Moosejaw) 13337 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Buctouche) 11684 (iv); (Campbellton wharf) 11685 (vi); (Campbellton 13344 (vii); (Caraquet wharf) 11685 (vi); (Dover wharf) 11692 (vi); (Madawaska) 11696 (vi); 13344 (vii); (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (Moncton) 11696 (vi); (New Mills) 13345 (vii); (Richibucto) 11698 (v); (St. John river) 11698 (vi); (St. John, surveys) 13346 (vii); (St. John, tidal waters) 12008 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11216 (vi); (Baddeck) 11220 (vi); (Cow Bay) 11225 (vi); (Portuguese cove) 11279 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10384 (vi); (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 12758 (vii); (claims dept.) 10176 (v); (double tracking) 12250 (vii); (Fredericton improvements) 12758 (vii); Halifax accommodation) 12227 (vii); (Indiantown branch) 12258 (vii); (locomotives) 10156 (v); (machinery) 12257 (vii); (Moncton car shops) 12251 (vii), 12256 (vii); (Pictou accommodation) 12230 (vi); (Sackville) 12235 (vii); (salaries) 10147 (v); (supplies) 10191 (v).

Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claim) 12762 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 10389 (vi).

Venoit, Mr. P. G., Complaints *re* Interference in Politics (Ques.) 6406, 7730 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Mr. C. L. Smith's Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2794 (ii).

——— Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2886 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10534 (vi).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John (City).*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3862 (ii).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12469 (vii).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to, in Com. of Sup., 4026 (ii).

Aud. General, Salary B. 208 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12645 (vii).

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11990 (vi).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6173 (iii).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W. —*Con.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12852 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12183 (vii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11983 (vi).

Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884, &c. (Ques.) 2217 (ii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4686 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1722 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1236 (i); on M. for 1°, 3494 (ii); in Com., 3593 (ii), 3637

Franco-Canadian Treaty, and Favoured Nation Clause (Ques.) 514 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res, 2222 (ii); in Com., 12081 (vii).

Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 10015 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* Municipal Offices, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10493 (vi).

Imports from France, Value for five years, &c. (Ques.) 1124 (i).

I.C.R., Claims *re* Damages, Settled and Unsettled, &c. (Ques.) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).

——— Employees, Names and Number taken in Jan. and Feb. in N.B. (Ques). 5793 (iii).

——— Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

——— Moncton Workshops, Tenders *re* Leasing, &c. (Ques.) 5800 (iii).

——— Number employed in N.B. for Jan. Feb., &c. (M. for ret.*) 6241.

International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stock, &c. (Ques.) 4246 (iii).

Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c (Ques.) 10257 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 12795 (vii), 12829 (vii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9494 (v).

Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

New Brunswick Cold Storage Co., Lease of Land to, Cost and Terms, &c. (Ques.) 563 (i).

——— Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9313 (v).

*See* 'Trueman.'

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

N.B. Credit, Amount &c. (Ques.) 1937 (i).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. Patronage (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3050 (ii).

Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10032 (v).

Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry, Rate, &c. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

Patent Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12624 (vii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. 10692 (vi).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4958 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10648 (vi).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in House of Com., on M. for Sup., 9780 (v).

——— Ques. of Priv., 9891 (v).

Rifle Range, Charlottetown, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 6233 (iv).

Ryan, Mr. G. M., Ry. Mail Supt., Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 7504 (iv).

St. John Fusiliers, 62nd, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c. (Ques.) 846 (i).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1561 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com on Res,, 3787 (ii); in Com., 12596 (vii).

Sussex Military Camp (remarks) 9836 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10569 (vi); (Year Book) 678 (i).

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13175 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries, &c.) 639 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9541; Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9229 (v).

Fisheries (dogfish reduction works) 13325; (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Geological Survey (maps, &c.) 12260; (specimens) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9972 (v).

Indians—N.B. (schools) 13172 (vii).

Labour Dept.—(Gazette) 12261 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5040 (iii); (lifeboats) 13323; (lighthouses) 12262; (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii); (salaries) 5039 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Cumberland) 12263.

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4026 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1908 (i).

Marine—Public Works (ship channel) 5036 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5736 (iii); Dom. arsenal) 12155; (gratuities) 13177; (provisions, &c.) 12150; (R. M. College) 12152; (warlike stores) 12149 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (Civil Service Commissioners) 13168; (Olympic Games) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3221 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1082 (i); (ice-breakers) 2961; (life-saving awards) 2973; (masters and mates) 2969; (Naval Schools) 3153, 3223; (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3194, 3196 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors, N.B.) 13153 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (St. John) 13329 (vii); (St. John, quarantine station) 5703 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston militia stores) 10908 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. (additions) 1487; (mint) 1451, 1483; (museum) 1497 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 7290 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John harbour) 12012 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11218; (Caribou Island) 11225; (Cow Bay) 11226; (Round Hill) 11282 (vi).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096; (clerical assistance) 11100; Deep Waterways Commission) 11102; (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10186 (v); (double tracking) 12236, 12250; (Halifax accommodation) 12229 (vii); (legal services) 10190 (v); St. John accommodation) 12257 (vii); (salaries) 10154 (v).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Trueman, Mr., and N. B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9344 (v).

*See* 'N.B. Cold Storage.'

Uniforms, Official, and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8484 (v).

DELISLE, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*

Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency, &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Lacoste, Sir Alexander, Amount of Pension, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).

Money Lenders, Operating in Public Buildings, &c. (Ques.) 1738 (i).

DEMERS, Mr. J., *St. John's and Iberville.*

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3576 (ii).

Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, Quantity imported from G. B. for 1904-5-6-7 (Ques.) 1506 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. John's military) 7442 (iv).

DESJARDINS, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*

Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan (Ques) 6980 (iv).

Peat Industry, Employment of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12487 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1177 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8143 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2012 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com of Sup., 662 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4922 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4056 (ii); Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1098 (i).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 77) 1°*, 1584 (i).

Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3573 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6490 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Year Book) 679 (i).

Tobacco Industry, Amts. to Inland Revenue Act, &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).

——— (M. for copies) 899 (i).

DUGAS, Mr. F. O., *Montcalm.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8282 (iv); in Com., 11863 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt., B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6493 (iv).

Tobacco, Foreign, Refund, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4402 (iii).

DYMENT, Mr. A. E., *Algoma East.*

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 137) 1°*, 5913 (iii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 138) 1°*, 5913 (iii); in Com., 8610, 9070 (v).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2195 (ii).

ELSON, Mr. P., *Middlesex, E.*

Address, The, 304 (i).

Binder Twine, Purchasers Names and P. O. Addresses (Ques.) 9715 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy, B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6209 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5098 (iii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5011 (iii).

Lord's Day Act, Violations at Ottawa *re* Horse Racing on Sunday (remarks) 3753 (ii).

Opium, Amount received *re* Duties, Pet. from B.C. *re* Prohibition, &c. (Ques.) 8614 (v).

Ry. Semaphores, Standard Ladder and Posts, &c. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Salmon Fishing Licenses, B.C., Payments *re* (Ques.) 5651 (iii).

Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 9714 (v).

Sheep Quarantine by U. S., &c. (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10575 (vi).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671, 8553 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12866 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 755 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6750 (iv).

Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13273 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2893 (ii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6267 (iv).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6653 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833 (i).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, (prop res.) 2435 (ii).
—— Passes issued to P. S. Archibald, (Ques.) 2387 (ii).
N. B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3058 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13482 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch, B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 12629 (ii).
P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2713 (ii).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).
Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor, I. C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10154 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10595 (vi).
Militia (gratuities) 13178 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).
Railways—I. C. R. (inspecting auditor) 10154 (v); (double tracking) 12237 (vii); (St. Cyrille diversion) 12757 (vii).
Tobacco, Violation of Act, Ques. of Order, in Com. of Sup., 9242 (v).
William, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 2388 (ii).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Architectural Institute of Can., Refund of Fees (M.) 11234 (vi), 11404 (vi).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3488 (ii).
Geological Survey, Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13575 (vii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3459 (ii).
Ry. Act (land surveys) Amt. (B. 30) 1° m., 560 (i).
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13482 (vii).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 911 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's (N.S.)*
Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 352, 363 (i).
Address, The, 94; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 531 (i).
Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4719 (iii).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12465 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps, &c. (Ans.) 2593 (ii).
Anglo-French Exhibition, Purchase of Goods, &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).
—— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 8444 (v).
Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification by British Govt. (remarks) 11706 (vi).
*See* 'Franco,' &c.
Apples seized at Port of Montreal, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5381 (iii).
—— on M. (Mr. Ethier) to refund Fees, 11234 (vi).
Aud. Gen.'s Deptl. Rep. (Vol. i)—(presented) 7 (i).
—— (Vol. ii)—(presented) 766 (i).
—— (Vol. iii)—(presented) 6 (i).
Aud. General, Salary (B. 208) Prop. Res., 12502; in Com. on Res., 12645, 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 12645 (vii).
Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).
—— Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of (Ans.) 11232 (vi).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 160) 1° m., 7307 (iv); 2° m., 10919; in Com., 10933 (vi).
Bank Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4298 (ii).
Banks, Aid to: *See* 'Dom. Notes Bill,' 'Wheat,' &c.
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure (remarks) 9336 (v).
Belleville Harbour, Total Revenue, &c. (remarks) 2593 (ii).
Belleville—Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8556, 8609 (v).
Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Blue Books, Distribution of (remarks) 432 (i).
Boards of Trade Act Amt. (B. 133) 1°*, 5337 (iii); 2° m. and in Com., 11987 (vi); in Com., 12593 (vii).
Bonusing System, on Notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 6289 (iv).
Boone Co., Payments to (remarks) 5083 (iii).
Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9 (Ans.) 13226 (vii).
Bridge Subsidies to Ry. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13312 (vii).
British Columbia Bank incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Sloan) on M. for 2°, 1469 (i).
B.C., Revenue contributed to Dom. from 1872-3 to 1905, on M. (Mr. D. Ross) for Ret. 3436 (ii).
British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3621 (ii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Bronze Coat-of-arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).

Budget, The, (M.) for Com. on Ways and Means (annual statement) 5137 (iii).

——— (remarks) 519, 560 (i), 4316, 4670 (iii).
*See* 'Financial Review.'

Business of the House, Precedence *re* Questions (remarks) 430 (i).

Campaign Literature franked by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10352 (vi).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6174, 6194 (iii); in Com., 6412 (iv).

Canada and Germany Treaty (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).

——— Trade Relations (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 209) prop. Res., 12392 (vii); in Com. on Res., 12646; 1°, 12649; in Com., 13053 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 187) on M. to place on Order Paper, 13493; 2° m, 13506 (vii).

Canadian Associated Press (B. 201) prop. Res., 12052 (vii); in Com. on Res., 12408 (vii); in Com., 12644 (vii); 2° m., 12837; in Com., 12848 (vii).

——— Memorial from Pres'dt. J. Ross Robertson (read), 12837 (vii).

Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subvention, &c. (Ans.) 5080 (iii).

Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c. (Ans.) 5208 (iii).

Canadian Loans, Rate of Interest (remarks) 12194 (vii).
*See* 'Loans,' &c.

Canadian Weather Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. M. S. Schell) in Com., 5174 (iii).

Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 6647 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12881 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).

Cigarette, Anti-Legislation *re* (remarks) 7279 (iv).

Civil Servants, Increases *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) prop. Res., 11300 (vi); in Com. on Res., 11359 (vi); in Com., 11402, 11641 (vi), 12185 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, on Inquiry for, 8516 (v).

——— Resolution *re* (remarks) 11017 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Rep., on Inquiry for, 90, 938, 1740 (i), 3043, 3317 (ii), 4316, 4832, 4963, 5408, 5491, 5567 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4495 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission's Rep., presented, 5620 (iii).

——— Number distributed, &c. (remarks) 5723, 6060 (iii), 6222 (iv).

——— Translation, &c. (remarks) 6222, 6926 (iv), 13477 (vii).
*See* 'Marine,' &c.

Civil Service Commission's Report, Policy of Govt. (remarks) on M. to Adjn. House, 5883 (iii).

Civil Service System, Re-organization of, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9158 (v).

Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c. (Ans.) 6924 (iv).

Cold Storage Cos., Grants to (Ans.) 1938 (i).

Colonial Conference, 1907, Total Expenditure by Govt. (Ans.) 512 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).
*See* 'Intercolonial,' &c.

Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, &c., Cor. *re* Govtl. Action (Ans.) 174 (i).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 104) 2°* and in Com., 5492 (iii).

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained (Ans.) 1112 (i).

Co-operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 659 (i).

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s B. 180 (Mr. Tisdale) in Com., 9962 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10143 (v).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11984 (vi).

Customs, Outside Service (salaries) 9221 (v).

Debates, Official, Adoption of 2nd Rep. (remarks) 12505 (vii).

——— 4th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to Conc., 8835 (v).

——— Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8898 (v).

Debt of Canada, Portions falling Due (Ans.) 315 (i).

——— Portions maturing 1908 (Ans.) 315 (i).
*See* 'Loans,' &c.

Detroit River Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10482 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1805 (i).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11202 (vi).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt., on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to Amt. (Mr. Lake) on M. for 3°, 11977 (vi).

Dom. Liabilities due to N.B. from 1869 to 1884, &c. (Ans.) 2217 (ii).

Dom. Loans and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c. (Ans.) 313 (i).

Dominion Notes Issue (grain advances) (B. 159), 1° m., 7307 (iv); 2°*, in Com., 10795 (vi).

*See* 'Seed Grain,' &c.

Dom. Notes Outstanding, Oct. 1907, Total Amount (Ans.) 692 (i).

*See* 'Loans.'

Dom. Power and Development Co.'s (B. 173) on Conc. by Senate, 12549 (vii).

Dominion Revenue from 1873 to 1907 (Ans.) 1734 (i).

Draper, Mr., and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Office (Ans.) 687 (i).

——— (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).

Dry Docks Subsidy (B. 119) M. for Com. on Res., 4314 (iii); in Com. on Res., 4675 (iii); 1°*, 4689 (iii); in Com., 6911 (iv), 10761; on Senate Amts., 11633 (vi).

Easter Adjournment (M.) *re* 6843 (iv).

Employees of Parliament, Religions, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5480 (iii).

Estimates of 1908-9 (presented) 554 (i).

——— Suppl. (1908) presented, 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii).

——— Suppl. (1909) presented, 12503 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of, Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5920 (iii).

Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c. (Ans.) 840 (i).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13442 (vii).

*See* 'Budget.'

Financial Stringency: *See* 'Wheat,' &c.

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5780 (iii).

Foresters Subsidiary High Court B. 62 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5175 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty (B. 57), Res. prop., 941; (M.) for Com. on prop. Res., 1213 (i); on M. for 1°, 1421 (i); 2° m., 2220, 3502; in Com., 3582, 3636; 3°m., 4317, agreed to (Y. 103; N. 5) 4376 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 930 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Goods and Minimum Tariff, on M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 851 (i).

——— Delay in Approval, &c. (Ans.) 12655 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delays *re* Canadian Tariff (remarks) 13535 (vii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 1206 (i), 3754 (ii).

——— Distribution to Members (remarks) 606 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 12651 (vii).

——— Favoured Nation Clause and Foreign Countries (Ans.) 845 (i).

——— German Surtax, Effect, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Going into Effect (Ans.) 8614 (v).

——— Imports from U.S., Exclusion, &c. (Ans.) 846 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 570 (i).

——— Information in Detail (remarks) 1585 (i).

——— Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

——— Mess from His Ex. (presented) 6 (i).

——— and Most Favoured Nation Clause (Ans.) 514, 564 (i).

——— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Preparation of Stmnt. (remarks) 8 (i).

——— Printing and Distribution, &c. (remarks) 94 (i).

——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).

——— Shipments from Canada, &c. (Ans.) 4763 (iii).

——— Stmnt. *re* Papers to be distributed 848 (i).

——— U.S. Exports, &c. (Ans.) 896 (i).

*See* 'Mess. from His Ex.'

Fruit Inspection, in Closed Packages, &c. (Ans.) 2982 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3623 (ii).

Govt. Business (remarks) 13207 (vii).

——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 11123 (vi).

——— Suppl. Estimates, &c. (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Govt. Securities *re* Dom. Notes, &c. (Ans.) 6235 (iv).

Grain Shipments from the West, Financial Aid, &c. (remarks) 608 (i).

*See* 'Dom. Notes Bill.'

Grand Bend Wharf, Contract (Ans.) 5653 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Bond Issue, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 8441 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12694 (vii).

——— Guarantee Bonds (B. 171) 1° m., 8835 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 10771 (vi).

——— Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Deductions (Ans.) 1937 (i).
—— Medical Fees, Deductions *re* (Ans.) 9473 (v).
—— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).
—— Route, Change of, Financial Reasons, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' Ques. of Priv., 8089 (iv).
—— Securities *re* Construction Contracts (Ans.) 357 (i).
—— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1445 (i).
Gunn, B. B., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 431 (i).
Halifax Garrison, Discontent *re* Pay, &c. (remarks) 5660 (iii).
Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* accepting Municipal Offices (Ans.) 3430 (ii).
—— Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).
Hay and Straw Embargo, by G. B. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).
Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
Immigrants stranded in Toronto (remarks) 429 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. (B. 42) 1° m., 827 (i); 2° m., 1741, (M.) to ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1743 (i).
Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*, 1107 (i).
—— Information *re* (remarks) 7099 (iv).
—— Introduction of (Ans.) 9272 (v).
—— (Remarks) 8386 (v).
Insurance Commission, Total Expenditure, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).
—— Evidence, Sale of, for private Profit (Ans.) 6059 (iii).
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c. (Ans.) 241 (i).
Insurance, Supt., Salary (B. 200) in Com. on Res., 12407 (vii).
Intercolonial Conference, Expenses of Canadian Ministers (Ans.) 13511 (vii).
—— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 13225 (vii).
*See* 'Colonial,' &c.
I.C.R., Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10128 (v).
—— Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907 (Ans.) 4245 (iii).
Judges Salaries, Application *re* Payments (remarks) 11018 (vi).
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Lands, Disposal of (remarks) 13587 (vii).
Labour unemployed, Protection to (Ans.) 10735 (vi).
Lead Bounties (B. 191) prop. Res., 9773 (v); in Com. on Res., 10952; 1°*, of B., 10953 (vi); 2° m., 11235; in Com., 11243 (vi); 3° m., 12054 (vii).
Lead Bounty Bill, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11408, 11705 (vi).
Lithographing and Printing, Expenditure by Govt. Outside of Canada (Ans.) 1506 (i).
Live Stock, N.B., Information *re* Figures, &c. (Ans.) 1507 (i).
Loans, Temporary, since Oct. 1906, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 314 (i).
Loans, Temporary, Total Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 314 (i).
Loan of August, 1907, Names of Banks where discounted (Ans.) 564 (i).
Loan negotiated in London, Conditions *re* (Ans.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 13584 (vii).
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal (Ans.) 11501 (vi).
Loan, Temporary or Advances, Rates of Interest (Ans.) 12654 (vii).
*See* 'Dom. Loans,' &c.
Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 2977 (ii).
Lumber Duties from U.S., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 9509 (v).
McGee, Hon. Thos. D'Arcy, Monument to (remarks) 6288 (iv).
MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 689 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Extension (remarks) 6222 (iv).
—— on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12794 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7330 (iv).
—— Deptl. Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6526 (iv).
—— Distribution of Evidence (remarks) 10789 (vi).
—— Evidence, Printing, &c. (Ans.) remarks) 8517 (v), 11301 (vi).
—— on Inquiry for Evidence (Mr. Foster) 11203 (vi).
—— Leave of Absence for Mr. Watson (remarks) 10918 (vi).
—— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).
*See* 'Civil Service,' &c.
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Number and Names of Establishments (Ans.) 1505 (i).
Military Camps, &c. (remarks) 9838 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Mint Building, Ventilation of (Ans.) 3036 (ii).

Mint, Date of Operation, Value of Coinage, &c. (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

——— Gold Coins, &c. (Ans.) 2593 (ii).

Mint, on Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 941 (i).

Mint, Royal, Sums expended, Apptmts., &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).

Money-Lenders operating in Public Departments (Ans.) 1738 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts, Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c. (Ans.) 1932 (i).

——— Payment of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 2979 (ii).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Amount of Deposit in Govt. Hands (Ans.) 3485 (ii).

N.B. Credit, Amount of (Ans.) 1937 (i).

Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10020 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 10025 (v).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9221 (v).

Old Age Annuities (B. 120) in Com. on Res., 4690; 1°*, 4702 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 10848 (vi); 3° m., 12053 (vii); on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

Old Age Pensions Bill (M.) to withdraw, 3654 (ii).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2433 (ii).

Ordnance Property, Toronto, Sale Bill (prop. res.) 13226 (vii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908, &c. (Ans.) 11500 (vi).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182, 6228 (iv).

Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of (remarks) 610 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloane) to Com. of Sup., 3978 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty (B. 199) in Com. on Res., 12406 (vii); in Com., 12644 (vii).

Pianos rented, &c. for Speaker's Rooms (Ans.) 563 (i).

Post Office Savings Bank Deposits, Increase of Interest (Ans.) 691 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2744 (ii).

——— Communication with C. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13353 (vii).

P.E.I. and G.B., SS. Subventions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12754 (vii).

P.E.I., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12636 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

P.E.I., Subsidy, Deduction *re* Hillsborough Bridge (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present agreement, &c. (Ans.) 315 (i).

——— Amounts paid before and after Adjustment (Ans.) 8616 (v).

——— Dates of Payments, Sums owing, &c. (Ans.) 564 (i).

——— Date of last Payments, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

——— Increased Payments, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).

Public Accounts (presented) 6 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3110 (ii).

——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 9504 (v).

——— on M. to Conc. in 3rd Rep., 2160 (ii).

Public Bills and Orders, Govt. Business (remarks) 13493 (vii).

——— Precedence of, &c. (remarks) 3404 (ii).

Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) 5730 (iii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7146 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4937 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Deficit, &c. (Ans.) 6459 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 2394 (ii).

——— Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 2553 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion, &c. (Ans.) 5566 (iii).

——— Corrected answer, 6059 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Report, on Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec Bridge and G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rentals, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 583 (i).

——— B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11605 (vi).

Railway Commissioners Board Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8511 (v).

Religious Fanatics in Man. (remark) 12161 (vii).

Representation of the Mar. Provs. in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9839 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) 9892 (v).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 6010 (iii).

Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Price, &c. (Ans.) 5654 (iii).

Royal Mint, Amount of Gold and Silver Coins (Ans.) 8613 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Royal Mint, Ques. of Order *re* Govt. Apptmts., 1461 (i).

St. John Cold Storage Co., Names of Stockholders, &c. (Ans.) 1938 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5547 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563, 8610, 9068, 9167 (v).

Seed Grain Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2780 (ii).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2770 (ii).

*See* 'Grain,' &c.

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2916 (ii).

Senate Sittings, Number of Days, Cost, &c., for 1895, 1906-7 (Ans.) 1114 (i).

Shipping Rings, Combinations, &c. (remarks) 5919 (iii).

—— Royal Commission *re* (remarks) 5916 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5520 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers, Land Grants (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

South Huron By-Election, Amount paid Returning Officer (Ans.) 9270 (v).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 41 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6183 (iii).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8849 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5822; (amt.) 5826, Agreed to (Y. 93; N. 43) 5879 (iiii).

Supply—(M.) for Com., 554 (i).

Supply (B. 96) *re* Seed Grain, 1° m., 2°*, and in Com., 2782 (ii).

—— (B. 136) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5957 (iii).

—— (B. 186) 1°*, 2°*, and 3°*, 10510 (vi).

—— (B. 220) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 13579 (vii).

Supply, Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1884 (i).

—— Charges of Obstruction by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9895 (v).

*See* 'Obstructions,' &c.

—— Conc. (M.) 5499, 5915, 5919 (iii).

—— Discussion *re* Estimates (remarks) 5661 (iii).

—— Estimates, Basis of Appropriations (remarks) 5920 (iii).



FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10588 (vi).

Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 5562 (iii); (Receiver General) 12160 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 635 (i); Finance (Artz, J. G.) Conc., 13578 (vii); (Ross, H. T.) 12914 (vii); (salaries) 637 (i); Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 610 (i); Interior (salaries, &c.) 617 (i), 9708 (v); Militia (salaries, &c.) 611 (i); Printing and Stationery (salaries) 612 (i); Privy Council (Bennetts, F. K.) 12902 (vii); Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12756 (vii); Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii); Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9577 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9253 (v).

Finance (Treasury Board) 5562 (iii).

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508 (vi); (printing, &c.) 10507; (provincial voters' lists) 10508 (vi); (sessional clerks) on Conc., 13578 (vii).

Inspection of Staples (inspectors) 12264 (vii).

Insurance (Supt.'s office) 12160 (vii).

Justice (Exhequer Court) 5507 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13152 (vii); (China and Canada, &c.) 13152 (vii); (G. B. and Canada) 12728 (vii); (P.E.I. and G.B.) 12264 (vii); (St. John and Cumberland) 12263; (subsidies) 12262 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4017 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5662 (iii); (customs dues) 5662 (iii); (supplies, &c.) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Brantford monument, Telephone) Conc., 13567 (vii); (charwomen) 10509 (vi); (Civil Service Commission) 13168 (vii); (cotton strikers) 13162 (vii); (Jamaica Earthquake) 5784 (iii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (Olympic Games) 13167 (vii); (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii); (seed wheat) 2770 (ii); (Yukon, Bank of Commerce) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3152 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5514 (iii).

Post Office (stamps, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Emerson) 8535 (v); (Winnipeg warehouse) 8571 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1453, 1472 (i); (rents, &c.) 11004 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dom. Arsenal) 7437; (Knowlton) 7292 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Baddeck) 11220 (vi); (Lakevale channel) Conc., 13568 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Railways Generally (extra clerks) 10344 (vi); I.C.R. (collection of revenues) 5694 (iii); (Moncton—Truro, additional line) 12760 (vii); (salaries) 10128 (v); Ry. Commission (Quebec Bridge) 12770 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Senate (salaries) 10489 (vi).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Act) 12264 (vii).
Temporary Govt. Loans, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 234, 235 (i).
Town Site, Section 32, Erection of Public Buildings (Ans.) 1348 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers from March, 1907 (Ans.) 562 (i).
*See* 'Colonial,' &c.
Uniforms and Customs Refunds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).
Wallberg, E. A., Payments by Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 5086 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods (B. 178) on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).
——— (remarks) 13416 (vii).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 554 (i), 13579 (vii).
Ways and Means—The Budget, 5137 (iii).
Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6118 (iii).
Wednesday Evenings and Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9486 (v).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).
West India Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations (remarks) 1860 (i).
Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Total Expenditure since 1895 (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
Wheat Transportation from West, Financial Aid, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).
——— Bank Negotiations (Ans.) 171 (i).
——— Financial Aid, &c. (Ans.) 1938 (i).
——— Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copies of Papers, &c., 899 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copies of Cor. &c., 2176 (ii).
——— Special Arrangements *re* Shipments of Feed Wheat with Ry. Cos. (Ans.) 893 (i).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution at Thetford Mines, Customs Frauds, &c. (remarks) 9894 (v).
Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
——— Dom. Revenue and Expenditures from March 31st to June 30th, 1907 (Ans.) 1346
——— Expenditures, Total Expenditure (remarks) *re* Question, 1128 (i).
——— Judges Salaries (remarks) 11123 (vi).
——— Money Transmission, Rates, *re* &c. (Ans.) 2979 (ii).
——— Revenue and Expenditure, Total Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

FINLAYSON, Mr. D., *Richmond, N.S.*
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re* (Ques.) 1733 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12872 (vii).
Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* (Ques.) 5655 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11865 (vi).
Public Accounts Com., Sittings concurrently with Hse. (M.) 9579 (v).
Washington Fisheries Commission at Washington, Expenses *re* (Ques.) 1732 (i).

FISHER, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*
Accountants for Marine Dept., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4111 (ii).
Address, The, 213 (i).
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (prsented) 7 (i).
Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative (Ans.) 8611 (v).
——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co. (Ans.) 8615 (v).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5385 (iii).
Archives Dept., Index Cards purchased, Names of Firms, &c. (Ans.) 6057 (iii).
Blankets purchased, Ret., on Inquiry for, 6465 (iv).
Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 3231 (ii).
Brockville, Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).
——— Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of (Ans.) 3234 (ii).
Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada (Ans.) 686 (i).
Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6202 (iii).
Canned Goods Inspection Act Amt. (B. 147) 1° m., 6221; in Com., 6870 (iv).
Canned Goods Inspection Act, Enforcement of (Ans.) 3846 (ii).
Canned Goods Inspection Regulations, Names of Counties, &c. (Ans.) 514 (i).
Cattle Embargo by G. B., Removal of, Action of Govt. since 1896 (Ans.) 2168 (ii).
——— Par. in Montreal Gazette, 13081 (vii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12880 (vii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 6223 (iv).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2767 (ii).
Census (complete) of the N.W. Provinces Report (presented) 3422 (ii).
Census Map, Publication of (Ans.) 4406 (iii).
Central Experimental Farm, Sale of Cattle, &c. (Ans.) 2389 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert (Ans.) 11495 (vi).

Chartered Banks of Canada, Report (presented) 8086 (iv).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5109 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 189) in Com. on Res., 11350; 1° m., 10717; 2° m., 11315; in Com., 11362, 11536, 11634 (vi), 12163; on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, Physical Fitness (remarks) 11018 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
*See* 'Marine.'

Civil Service Act Amt. Bill, (remarks) 11124 (vi).

Civil Service Examiners' Report (presented) 8086 (iv).

Cold Storage Establishment in East Elgin, Assistance to (Ans.) 352 (i).

Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta (Ans.) 1685 (i).

Cold Storage, Number constructed, Applications, &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).

Cold Storage Ret., Letter of Mr. McKeown, on Inquiry for, 4223, 4407 (iii).
*See* 'N.B.'

Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March 1908 (Ans.) 6404 (v).

Co-operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to (Ans.) 4406 (iii).

Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs. (Ans.) 7990 (iv).

——— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade (Ans.) 8182 (iv).

——— Establishment of (Ans.) 2593 (ii).

——— Number under control of Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Rep. (presented) 1018 (i).

——— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 4585 (iii).

Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c. (Ans.) 2166 (ii).

Fruit Inspection (apples) Complaints *re* (remarks) 2756 (ii).

Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 516 (i).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Amt. (B. 148) 1° m., 6221 (iv); in Com., 10553 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act, Prosecutions *re* Apples, &c. (Ans.) 4831 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. (B. 123) 1°*, 5337; in Com., 5495 (iii).

——— (B. 197) 1°*, 11990 (vi); 2°*, in Com., 12554 (vii).

Govt. Steamers, Built in Canada (stmnt.) 11124 (vi).

Grain Commissioners Report, on Inquiry for, 4224 (iii).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture (Ans.) 5791 (iii).

High Commissioner's Office, Increase of Salaries (Ans.) 10737 (vi).

Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered (Ans.) 9280 (v).

——— Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13089 (vii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10498 (vi).

House of Commons Accountant, &c., Increase of Salary under C. S. Bill (remarks) 13528 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. (B. 148) in Com., 6900 (iv).

Inspectors of Food Products, Number of Apptmts. (Ans.) 353 (i).

Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, &c. (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, &c., Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2123 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 880 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigations, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7351 (iv).
*See* 'C. S. Commission.'

Meats and Canned Foods Inspection Act Amt. (B. 149) 1° m., 6221; in Com., 6890, 7244; 3° m., 7215 (iv).

Meats and Canned Foods Inspectors, Number appointed, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i).

Meat Inspection Regulations, &c., Meetings at Chatham (remarks) in Debate on Address, 213 (i).

Moberley, Mr. H. J., Payments to, by Govt. (Ans.) 3818 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9321 (v).

N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt. (Ans.) 9272 (v).

Order, Ques. of, *re* Montreal Liquor Licenses, Remarks of Hon. Mr. Scott, 4065 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Perdue, Dr. M. B., Duties and Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7668 (iv).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry for 1018, 1740 (i), 2385 (ii).

Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 6000 (iii).

Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I. (remarks) 3690 (ii).

Sheep Quarantine by U.S., &c. (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13537 (vii).

Smith, Mr. W. M., Dom. Fruit Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 2393 (ii), 5085 (iii).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Appmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5860 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture (Archives) 671; (census, &c.) 673 (i), 12879 (vii); (dairying) 10397; (exhibitions)10569 (vi), 12889; (fumigating stations) 12879 (vii); (Imperial Institute) 10623 (vi); (live stock) 12895 (vii); (Meats and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii); (Patent Record) 672 (i); (Seed Control Act) 5500 (iii); (seeds) 12891 (vii); (Year Book) 677 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878 (vii); (salaries) 645; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4044 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 13340 (vii); Que. (Cookshire) 7283; (Grosse Isle) 7290; (Knowlton) 7291 (iv).

Quarantine (public health) 5504 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10390 (vi).

Timber Marking Act Amt. (B. 193) 1° m., 11120 (vi); in Com., 12408 (vii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Tuberculin Tests, Results of, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).

Wheat Frozen, Shipments from Man., &c., on M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn., 826 (i).

Woollen Industry, Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c. (Ans.) 7504 (iv).

FORGET, Mr. R., *Charlevoix.*

I.C.R. 'Ocean Limited,' Date of Beginning and ending of running (Ques.) 6054 (iii).

——— Trains and Official Cars, &c. (Ques.) 5474 (iii).

Post Office Savings Banks, Increase of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).

St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster (Ques.) 5795 (iii).

FORGET, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont (Stanley Island pier) 5721 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *Toronto, North.*

Accountants for Marine Dept., Payment to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4110 (ii).

Address, The, 66 (i).

Advertisements in Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 509 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Advertising in Mar. Prov. Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 936 (

Agricultural Implements, Amounts of Rebates, &c. (Ques.) 1112 (i).

Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

All-Red Route (remarks) in debate on Address, 87 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12419, 12488 (vii).

——— Purposes of Mr. White's Duties in England (remarks) 608 (i).

——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude (remarks) 947 (i).

——— Statement *re*, Negotiations (remarks) 366 (i).

American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c. (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Analytical Index to Debates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10504 (vi).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification of by British Govt. (remarks) 11705 (vi).
*See* 'Franco, &c.

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 600 (i).

'Arctic' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904, to June, 1907 (Ques.) 184 (i).

——— Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 13573 (vii).

Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Plant in St. John, N.B., Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 7307 (iv); on M. for 2°, 10924; in Com., 10933 (vi).

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4309 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure (remarks) 9335 (v).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4380; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).

Belleville Hospital Site, Inquiry for Ret., 7506 (iv).

Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports Flagged by him (Ques.) 5208, 5466 (iii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, Changes *re* (remarks) 194 (i).

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1291 (i).

Boundary Delimitations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9743 (v).

Brass Importations, &c. (remarks) 6233 (iv).

Briar Island, N.S., Marine Signalling, Change of System (Ques.) 9266 (v).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Advances *re* Travelling Expenses for Priv. Sec., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses since July, 1904 (M. for ret.*) 1689 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Buchanan Town Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10086 (v).

Budget, The (reply) 5163; (M.) to adjn. debate, 5199; (rsmd.) 5260 (iii).

——— (remarks) 519, 559 (i); 4316, 4670 (iii).

Budget Speech sent out by Deptl. Clerks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10349 (vi).
*See* 'Financial,' &c.

Buffalo Herd, Location in Elk Park, &c. (Ques.) 5208 (iii).

——— Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10103 (v).

——— Purchased for Parks, Authority for Expenditure (Ques.) 896 (i).

Business of Hse. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 10688 (vi).

Cabinet Appointments (remarks) in debate on Address, 80 (i).

Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c. (Ques.) 5207 (iii).

Canadian Loans, Rate of Interest (remarks) 12194 (vii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12841, 12850 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11253 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10753 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11351; on M. for 1°, 10718, 10727; in Com., 11369, 11549, 11634 (vi), 12164 (vii).

——— (remarks) 11124 (vi).

Civil Service Commission, Instructions to Judge Cassels, Inquiry for, 7505 (iv).

——— Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7543 (iv).

Civil Service Commission, Rep., Inquiry for, 938, 1740 (i), 2787, 3043 (ii), 4315, 4495 (iii).

——— Number printed, &c. (remarks) 6222 (iv).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5884 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5631 (iii).

Civil Service System, prop. Res. (M.) to drop, 6242 (iv).

——— (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9132 (v).

Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death, &c. (Ques.) 8179 (iv).

Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 11300 (vi).

Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 8379 (v).

Cold Storage Ret., Missing Letter (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Cold Storage Co., Ques. of Priv. *re* Minister's Stmnt. *re* Insurance Commission, 9337 (v).
*See* 'N. B. Cold Storage,' &c.

Colonial Conference (remarks) in debate on Address, 82 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 998 (i).
*See* 'Imperial.'

Committee Meetings, Rep. in 'Globe,' on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) 2383 (ii).

Congdon, Mr. F. T., Stmnt. *re* Administration of Estates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10111 (v).

——— (remarks) 13420, 13518 (vii).

——— Instructions *re* Estates Trusts (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained (Ques.) 1112 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11981 (vi).

Customs Defalcations, Punishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9455 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10133 (v).

Customs, Receipts and Expenditures, 1907-8 (Ques.) 12655 (vii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9732 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from, Ques. of Order, *re* Stmnts., 8460 (v).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8898 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10248 (v).

Deep Waterways Commission, Inquiry *re* Proceedings (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Detroit River Tunnel, Customs Tariff *re* Materials, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10472 (vi).

——— (remarks) 13526 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1135 (i).

——— Notice of Motion, on Order being called, 2794 (ii).

——— Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1766 (i).

———Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1628 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1851 (i).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 8179 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8321 (v); in Com., 11828, 11895 (vi), 12945; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 13257 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126 (vi).

——— in Com., 11163, 11165, 11203, 11408,11503, 11453, 11940; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11978 (vi); on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).

Dom. Loan and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c. (Ques.) 313 (i).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10796 (vi).

Doukhobors, Condition of, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2218 (ii).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4679 (iii).

Dunsmuir, Lt. Gov. of B. C. and Natal Act, &c. (remarks) 1738 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239, 4577 (iii).

Estimates, Insufficient Votes, *re* Public Works, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5923 (iii).

Falconer, K., Payments by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).

Falconer, K., Payment to for Services (Ques.) 8890 (v).

——— Emplymt. by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

'Fielding' Dredge, Number of Days Working (Ques.) 7199 (iv).

Financial Review, (amt.) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).

*See* 'Budget.'

Fire Extinguishers purchased by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7646 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7784 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Original Papers, 8901 (v).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7664 (iv).

——— Production of Original Papers (remarks) 9281 (v).

Fish Exportations from Man., Value, &c. (remarks) 4241 (iii).

Fisheries Negotiations with Provs., Instruction to Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Fort William Terminals Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6224 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1253 (i); on M. for 2°, 2220; in Com., 3582 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4341 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Discussion *re* prop. Res. (remarks) 942 (i).

——— preparation of stmnt *re* duty units, 943 (i).

——— Delays in Ratification (remarks) 13536 (vii).

——— Distribution of, to Members (remarks) 606 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 570 (i).

——— Information in Detail asked for, 1585 (i).

——— and Most Favoured Nation Clause, &c. (Ques.) 564 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 931 (i).

——— Printing and Distribution (remarks) 93 (i).

——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).

——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 86 (i).

——— Stmnt. *re* Tariffs (remarks) 8 (i).

——— U. S. Exports, Articles, &c. (Ques.) 896 (i).

Geological Survey Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 4230 (iii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 991

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Girouard, Mr., Resignation from Yukon Council (remarks) 11634, 11938 (vi). *See* 'Yukon.'

Gold Commissioner's Office, Yukon, Number of Clerks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

Govt. Employees, Interference in Elections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11908 (vi).

Govt. Ownership, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 75 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for three years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1512 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1099 (i).

Grain Transportation from the West, Financial Aid, Explanation in the Senate (remarks) 607 (i).

G. B., Australia and Canada, &c., Fast Line Steamers, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2227 (ii); in Com., 12061 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8134 (iv).

——— Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8837 (v); in Com., 10772 (vi).

G.T.P. Ry., Bond Issue, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 8440 (v).

——— Commissions issued to Inspectors (remarks) 9716 (v).

——— Contracts, Date, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6458, 6636 (iv).

——— Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections (Ques.) 6234 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. (Mr. Graham) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).

——— Liquor Prohibition Sale: Inquiry for Ret. 2024 (ii).

——— Miles under Construction, &c. (Ques.) 165 (i).

——— Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

——— Prohibition Zone, Cor. Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

——— Purchase of Rails for Eastern Division, &c. (Ques.) 9263 (v).

——— Securities *re* Construction Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 356 (i).

——— Transcontinental Commission, Total Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 13226 (vii).

Halifax Platform of Conservative Leader (remarks) in debate on Address, 66 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4224 (iii).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims *re* Damages (remarks) 5791 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Hillsborough Bridge Claims, on Inquiry for Ret., 3691 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Ret., Inquiry for, 2882 (ii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests against by Immigrants, Par. in Ottawa Citizen, 5488 (iii).

——— Tel. *re* Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Homestead Patents, Settlement Conditions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10095 (v).

Honey Imports, from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c. (Ques.) 8177 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii), 10495 (vi).

——— Rules for Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 591 (i).

——— and Senate, Cost outside of Indemnities (Ques.) 4760 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction of, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 166 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii).

Imperial Conference, 1907, Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 511 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Minister, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1513 (i). *See* 'Colonial.'

Imports and Exports, ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907 (Ques.) 350 (i).

——— Values from June, to Dec. 1907 (Ques.) 1112 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8 (Ques.) 13063 (vii).

Indian Schools, Rep. of Dr. Bryce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6467 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833; on M. for 2°, 1742 (i).

Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*, 1107 (i).

——— Discussion *re* (personal explanation) Par. in Montreal 'Star,' 1860 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 7099 (iv), 8386 (v).

Insurance Commission, Rep. *re* Political Literature, Ques. of Priv., 10792 (vi).

——— Rep., Ques. of Priv., 9461 (v).

——— Total Expenditure of Commission, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).

I.C.R., Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).

——— Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Circular Letter *re* Payments of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10127 (v).
——— Claims for Damages, by A. W. Belyea, &c. (Ques.) 9472 (v).
——— Employees, and N.B. Elections (remarks) 3317 (ii).
——— Extension Policy (remarks) in debate on Address, 73 (i).
——— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Reid) for Ret., 6242 (iv).
——— Transportation, &c. on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4424 (iii).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 970 (i).
——— B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).
Japanese Immigration into B.C. (remarks) in debate on Address, 77 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Attacks on Prov. Govt., 1763 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2101 (ii).
Lacas, E., Payments to, by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 980, 1035 (i).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of (Ques.) 8176 (iv).
Lafferty, Thos., Payment *re* Removal of Snags in St. John River (Ques.) 8379 (v).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526; in Com., 10528 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10952 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11235; in Com., 11243; on M. for 3° (remarks) 11250 (vi), 12054 (vii).
——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11407 (vi).
Lead Production, by Lead Producers, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11705 (vi).
Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Steamers chartered, &c. (Ques.) 11299 (vi).
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal (Ques.) 11501 (vi).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where discounted (Ques.) 564 (i).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, &c. (personal explanation) 13582 (vii).
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rates of Interest outstanding, &c. (Ques.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts: *See* 'Dom. Loans.'
'Lord Kitchener' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ques.) 7198 (iv).
MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to for Legal Services (Ques.) 695 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12789 (vii).
Marconi Co., and Commercial Press Business, (Ques.) 512 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Change of Book-keeping System, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 510 (i).
——— O.Cs., Cor., &c., *re* System (M. for copies*) 852 (i).
——— ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, Acting Deputy (remarks) 11939 (vi).
——— Deputy Minister, Date of Apptmts. of Suspended Officers, &c. (Ques.) 6982 (iv).
——— Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7335 (iv).
——— Amounts paid Counsel (Ques.) 8837 (v).
——— Delay in Investigation, &c., C. S. Report, &c., M. to adjourn (remarks) 8445 (v).
——— Evidence *re* (remarks) 11203 (vi).
——— Evidence, Distribution of (remarks) 10789 (vi).
——— Evidence and Reports, Printing, &c. (remarks) 11301 (vi).
———Issue of Judge Cassels' Commission (remarks) 6466 (iv).
——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10741 (vi).
——— Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refunds, &c. (Ques.) 8889 (v).
——— Public Investigation, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).
——— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries Returns, Inquiry for, 2883 (ii).
Marine Signalling at Briar Island, Change of System (Ques.) 9266 (v).
Militia Depts., Threats by Min. of Militia (remarks) 13583 (vii).
Militia Schools, Garrisons, &c., Amounts paid for Provisions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1512 (i).
Militia Stores, Inspection of, &c. (Ques.) 8181 (iv).
Mines Branch, Acting Director, Additional Salary (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses from March, 1907 (Ques.) 562 (i).
Mint, Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c. (Ques.) 11296 (vi).
——— Sums expended, Apptmnts., &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).
——— Total Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).
'Montcalm,' Str., Investigation *re* Accident (remarks) 8171 (iv), 9715 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Accident (remarks) 10121 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9483 (v).
Motions, Unopposed (remarks) 8839 (v).
National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13500; in Com., 13502 (vii).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).
N.B. Cold Storage Bait Co., Ministerial Interests, &c., on M. for Sup., 9283; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 9425 (v).
*See* 'St. John,' &c.
N.B. Elections, Interference of Govt. Officials (remarks) 3579 (ii).
——— Telegram (read) *re* Interference, 3229 (ii).
——— M. to adjn. House, 3657, 3678 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3060 (ii).
*See* 'Govt. Officials.'
Newspaper Advertising, Amounts paid (Ques.) 509 (i).
Niagara Lands, Sale for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 5060 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid and Claims, &c. (Ques.) 167 (i).
Obstruction Tactics, Discussion of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9220 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10033 (v).
——— Order, Question of (Mr. D. Ross) 10024 (v).
Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10332 (vi).
Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4691 (iii); in Com., 10850 (vi).
Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2425 (ii).
Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908, &c. (Ques.) 11499 (vi).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896 (M. for ret.) 2822; (amt.) to Ret., 2846 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 9579 (v), 12919 (vii).
Patronage *re* Civil Service, &c. (M.) to drop, 6243 (iv).
*See* 'Civil,' &c.

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 11300 (v).
Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10704 (vi).
Preston, W. T. R., Employment by Govt. (Ques.) 360 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2743 (ii).
Printing in 'Sun,' &c., Inquiry for Ret., 5661 (iii).
Prisoners, Released, &c.: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Protection Tariff, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 74 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Dates of last Payments, &c. (Ques.) 237 (i).
——— Sums owing, &c. (Ques.) 564 (i).
——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 79 (i)
Public Accounts Com., Meetings of (remarks) 945 (i).
——— Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3106 (ii).
——— Production of Original Documents (remarks) 4496 (iii).
*See* 'Documents,' &c.
Public Lands of Dom. (remarks) *re* in debate on Address, 70 (i).
Public Works, Applications *re*, Useless Expenditures (remarks) in Com., 5923 (iii).
——— Deptl. Salaries in Hamilton, Delays (remarks) 10016, 10119 (v).
——— Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).
Quebec Bridge Commissioners' Report, Inquiry for, 4494 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).
Quebec Bridge and G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rental, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).
Quebec Bridge, Salaries to Officials (Ques.) 13517 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Army and Navy Veterans Association (remarks) 7448, 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).
Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 10633; in Com., 10638; on M. for 3°, 11613 (vi).
Railway Estimates, Obstruction of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10129 (v).
Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).
Ry. Subsidies, on prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 13069 (vii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Returns, Inquiry for, 1018, 1740 (i), 2385, 2882, 3318 (ii), 4223, 4832, 6010 (iii), 13081 (vii).

Returns ordered and lost in H. of C., placed in Record Dept. (remarks) 2882 (ii).

—— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv. 4663 (iii).

Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure (Ques.) 5467 (iii).

Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion in Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).

Ross Rifles, Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, Advances, &c. (Ques.) 168 (i), 8180 (iv).

—— Contract for Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).

St. John Cold Storage Ret., Inquiry for, 2309, 3690 (ii).

—— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3580 (ii). *See* 'N.B. Cold Storage.'

St. Louis, H., Employment by Govt., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i), 2977 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4232, 4579 (iii).

School Lands Exhange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 8086 (iv); on M. for 2°, 8472 (v).

Seed Grain buying and distribution, Information *re* (remarks) 13420 (vii).

—— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10122 (v).

Senate, Number of Sittings, Cost, &c., for 1895 and 1906-7 (Ques.) 1114 (i).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1574 (i).

—— (remarks) in debate on Address, 70 (i).

Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to (Ques.) 1112 (i).

—— Payments to (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5410 (iii).

'Sir Wilfrid Laurier' Dredge, Completion, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5207 (iii).

Smith, Mr. Obed, Status in London (remarks) 5491 (iii).

Spain, Commander, Expenses *re*, Inquiry for Papers, 4670 (iii).

—— Aud. Gen.'s Rep. *re* (Ques.) 4405 (iii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1033 (i).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8847 (v).

Sub-target Machines, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 171 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Sub-target Machines, Papers referred to Com. for last Session (remarks) 945 (i).

—— Return, Ref. to Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 312 (i).

Supplies for Govt. Contracts, Tenders, Appmt. of Purchasing Commission (prop. res.) 5802; Neg. (Y. 44; N. 99) 5880 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5838 (iii).

Supply, Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1884 (i).

Supply (seed grain) B. 96 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).

Canals—Generally (extra remuneration) 5697 (iii); (salaries) 10325; (statistical offices) 10317; (surveys) 10340 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5663; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (piers and bridges) 12207; (Port Colborne) 12212 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5675 (iii); (surveys) 12207; (widening) 12211 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 636 (i); Finance (Artz, J. G.) 13578 (vii); (salaries) 637; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 610; Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623 (i); Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries, &c.) 619 (i); 9693 (v); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 976, 1033; Militia (salaries) 611 (i), 8871 (v); Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 614; Privy Council (salaries, &c.) 610; Public Works (salaries) 639; Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9229, 9444; (ports, &c.) 9220 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10054; (homesteads) 10086 (v).

Geological Survey (explorations, officers, &c.) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508; (contingencies) 10502; (printing, &c.) 10507; (Library of Parlt.) 10504; (salaries) 10501 (vi); (salary increases) 13562 (vii); (Sergeant-at-Arms) 10503 (vi); (sessional clerks) on Conc., 13577 (vii).

Immigration (general expenses) 5754 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrols) 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii); (ice-breakers) 1885, 1904 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752; (Sorel property) 4751 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5662, 5732 (iii), 10289 (v), 13540 (vii); (customs dues) 5662 (iii); (Ross rifle) 13542 (vii); (supplies, &c.) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (charwomen) 10509 (vi); (seed grain) 2773 (ii).

N.W.M. Police (compensations) 8870; (pay of force) 8863; (pensions) 8870; (salaries) 8863 (v).

N.W.T. (Govt salaries) 10116; (school grants) 10117 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1086 (i); (ice-breakers) 2969; (life-saving awards) 2972; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Post Office (extra assistance) 9112; (inspectors) 9108; (uniforms, &c.) 9110 (v).
Public Works (Ass't. Dep. Min.) 5698 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Alberta (Edmonton) 5705 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Fernie) 5706 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8519; (Dauphin) 8520 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10955; (Winnipeg military) 10969 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives fittings) 5700; (improvements) 5707; (rents, &c.) 5707 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Quebec (Montreal pneumatic postal station) 5703 (iii); (Montreal station C) 7419; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11210; (Baddeck) 11219; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hood) 11273; (Porter's Lake) 11263 (vi).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Architects' branch) 11096; (cement testing) 11088; (clerical assistance) 11099, 11100; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11101 (vi); (gratuities) 5730; (graving docks) 5731 (iii); (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Ashcroft-Dawson) 5731; (B.C., Cape Beale Lines) 5731; (cable service) 5731 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (collection of revenues) 5695 (iii); (salaries) 10126; (train service) 10159 (v).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; (unprovided items) 10328 (vi).
Senate (salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).
Yukon (Govt. salaries) 10107 (v).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 5206 (iii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon (Ques.) 1126 (i).
Thirteenth Hussars, Service Medal, *re* Fenian Raids (remarks) 13533 (vii).
Timber Leases *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8703 (v).
Timber Licenses, Applications to Mr. Mackenzie's Govt. (M. for ret.*) 3242 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 3038 (ii).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
——— Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Copies, 2855 (ii).
Timber Limit Grants to Messrs McLeod, Lundy, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
——— Statement quoted by Mr. Turriff, Inquiry for, 2386 (ii).
Timber Sales, Opening of Tenders, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff), Ques. of Order, 11304 (vi).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10700 (vi).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Construction by Govt. (remarks) 5565 (iii).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (remarks) 2594 (ii).
Torrens Land Title Fund, Information (remarks) 10916 (vi).
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Expenses in Salaries, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 13517 (vii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers at Colonial Conference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii).
——— Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers from March, 1907 (Ques.) 562 (i).
Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 994 (i).
Trent Canal, Newmarket Canal, Reps., Surveys, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, on M. Sup., 7651 (iv).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 237 (i).
Washington Treaty Negotiations and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of, &c. (Ques.) 2165 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).
Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11233 (vi).
Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c. (Ques.) 512 (i).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B. C., Licenses granted, on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10283 (v).
Wheat Transportation, Financial Aid by Govt. (M.) for Copies of Memorials, Cor., &c., 899 (i), 2173 (ii).
Wheat Transportation from West, Negotiations with Banks, &c. (Ques.) 171 (i).
*See* 'Bank,' 'Financial Stringency'
Whitehorse Townsite, Portions sold and retained, &c. (Ques.) 11496 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11166 (vi).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1131 (i).
*See* 'Congdon,' &c.
Woollen Industry, Reply to Manufacturers Ass'n. by Prime Minister (remarks) 13420 (vii).
Woollen Industry, Pet. *re* (remarks) 13518 (vii).
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10529 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. for Sup., 9580 (v).

——— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Incomplete Return (remarks) 5785 (iii).

Yukon-Congdon, F. T., Investigation *re* Estates and Trusts (Ques.) 12050 (vii).

*See* 'Wiley.'

——— Election Conspiracy, Cor., &c., *re* Trial (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1114 (i).

——— Expenditures, Total Amount (remarks) *re* Question, 1128 (i).

——— Revenue and Expenditures from March 31st to June 30th, 1907 (Ques.) 1346 (i).

Yukon Financial Administration, Rep. of Mr. Beddoe (M. for copy*) 1132 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

Yukon, Govt. Officials, Re-arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

——— Lithgow, J. V., Girouard, J. E., and F. T. Congdon, Emplymt. by Govt., Date of Apptmt., &c (Ques.) 5999 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10519 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law, Instruction to N.W.M.P. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).

——— Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 512 (i).

——— White Horse Ter., Original Grants of Lands. Names (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).

——— Whiskey Permit Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

——— Wiley vs. Congdon, O.C.s., &c., *re* Charges (M. for copies) (amt.) 1691 (i).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W., *Kings and Albert, N.B.*

Anse St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Architects on Public Works, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10923 (vi).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7669 (iv).

Budget Debate, Ques. of Order, 6616 (iv).

Buildings, Architectural Designs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Campaign Literature (French) sent by Justice Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10354 (vi).

Campbellton Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re* (Ques.) 8612 (v).

Campbellton Wharf, Tender *re* Piling Supply (Ques.) 8612 (v).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vii).

Cigarette Restraint Bill (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13015 (vii).

Civil Servants, Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11362, 11553 (vi); on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) on Presentation, 5640 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9187 (v).

Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 695 (i).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13540 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11842 (vi), 13033 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11162, 11165, 11475, 11508, 11964 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10823 (vi).

Doukhobors Bonuses *re* Immigration (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 9952 (v).

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5782 (iii).

Foresters, I. O., Charges in 'Le Canala,' Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Fraser, Mr. Donald, Dismissal from Customs, &c. (Ques.) 5473 (iii).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12677 (vii).

G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12072 (vii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6391 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).

Indian Lands, B.C., and Provincial Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 629 (i).

Insurance Commission, Evidence, Sale of for Private Profit (Ques.) 6059 (iii).

I.C.R., Answer to Questions (remarks) 13415 (vii).

——— Earnings and Expenses (Ques.) 13510 (vii).

——— Employees, Circular *re* Non-Payment, Par. in St. John Press, on M. for Sup., 10016 (v).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2465 (ii).

—— Gross Earnings for 1908 (Ques.) 13225 (vii).

—— Newcastle Station, Inspector of Work, &c. (Ques.) 13511 (vii).

—— Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 10514 (vi).

—— Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of (Ques.) 9712 (v).

Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co. (Ques.) 9472 (v).

Loggieville Dredging, Payments *re* (Ques.) 9472 (v).

Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12793, 12816 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Misconduct of Official, Remarks checked, 6633 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St., &c. (Ques.) 13062 (vii).

National Battlefields Commission (land) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13500; in Com., 13505 (vii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9328; (M.) to adjn. debate, 9330; rsmd., 9344 (v).

N.B. Elections, Mr. Pugsley's Political Connection with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7130 (iv).

—— Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3054 (ii).

N.B. Post Offices, Closing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

N.B. Ry. Mail Service Vacancy, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10331 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10854 (vi).

Parliament Grounds, Circular Letter from C. S. Association (read) in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7668 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13185 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3130 (ii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7153 (iv).

—— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4924 (iii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13491 (vii).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher (Ques.) 13225 (vii).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13485 (vii).

Rattenbury & Co., Govt. Agents *re* purchasing Oats in P.E.I., Assignment, &c. (Ques.) 12392 (vii).

Richibucto Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vii).

Ross Rifle Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9053, 9070 (v).

St. John River, Removing Snags, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3477 (ii).

Salmon Fishing by Nets, Privileges in Restigouche River (Ques.) 13518 (vii).

Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Prices, &c. (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598; in Com., 13047 (vii).

Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10607 (vi); (live stock) 12899; (seeds) 12891 (vii).

Canals—Generally (surveys, &c.) 10340 (vi); Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13174; Trent (damages) 12768 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878; Finance (Ross, H. T.) 12914; Marine and Fisheries (asst. dep. min.) 12915; Railways (Butler, Mr. M. J.) 12755; Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 650 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9240, 9260, 9444 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest rangers) 10041, 10051; (salaries) 10038; (surveys) 9987 (v).

Geological Survey (oil boring) 13165 (vii).

House of Commons (salary increases) 13567 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13170 (vii).

Immigration (agents, U.S.) 9965; (literature, &c.) 9950; (relief to settlers) 9985 (v).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12752; (salaries) 12736, 13170; (schools) 13170 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (pensions) 13324 (vii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Canada) 12728 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii), 10287 (v); (gratuities) 13177; (R.M. College) 13177; (Stoney Creek monument) 13177 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Bank of Commerce, Yukon) 13168; (Chinese riots) 13156; (Civil Service Commissioners) 13168; (Olympic games) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2954 (ii).

Penitentiaries—B.C. (land purchase) 12918 (vii).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 9107 (v), 13153 (vii)
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cranbrook) 13338; (Ladysmith) 13338 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (rents, &c.) 10982 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 10974 (vi); (Portage la Prairie) 13336; (Winnipeg) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10960; (Winnipeg military) 10970 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (Hillsborough) 13328 (vii); (Quarantine, steam sterilizer) 7187; (quarantine, water service) 7186; (St. John, military) 7186; (Tracadie, lazaretto) 7187 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7112; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax, customs) 7151; (Yarmouth) 7181, 7182 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7490; (Guelph, armoury) 7684; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7692; (Hamilton, post office) 7698; (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, hospital) 7702; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7702; (London, magazine) 7706; (London, military) 7706 (iv); (Niagara) 13332 (vii); (North Bay) 7811; (Owen Sound) 7817; (Port Arthur) 7825; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Welland) 7830 (iv).
Public Works—Building—Ottawa (elevator attendants) 11011; (grounds) 11012; (heating, &c.) 11010 (vi); (museum) 1504 (i); (rents, &c.) 10983; (Rideau Hall) 11005 (vi); (skylights) 7816 (iv); (telephones) 11012 (vi); (Victoria Museum) 13477 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 7279; (Cookshire) 7281; (Dom. renewals) 7286; (Farnham) 7287; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Lachute) 7294; (Lake Megantic) 7294; (Levis) 7298; (Longueuil) 7305; (Montreal, post office) 7417; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Montreal, warehouse) 7424; (Nicolet) 7428; (Plessisville) 7430; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419; (Quebec, citadel) 7430; (Quebec, Dom. arsenal) 7435; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (Quebec, hospital) 7433; (Quebec, immigrant) 7432; (Quebec, warehouse) 7432; (St. Hyacinthe) 7440; (St. John's) 7441; (St. John's, military) 7442; (St. Rochs) 7438 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Moose Jaw) 13337; (Prince Albert) 13337 (vii); (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 11005 (vi).
Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson River) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 12028 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver Harbour) 13344; (Dorchester) 13344; (Harvey) 13344; (Leonardsville) 13344; (Lorneville) 13344; (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (St. Andrews) 12011; (St. John) 12013; (St. John, tidal waters) 12000 (vi); (St. John, wharfs) 13345; (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Pugwash wharf) 11279; (Round Hill wharf) 11282; (Yarmouth) 11291
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Goderich breakwater) 13350; (Juniper Island) 13350; (McGillicuddy & Smeeth claims) 13350 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Souris) 13341; (Summerside) 13343 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 12028; (Anse a l'Ilot) 12029; (Barachois de Malbaie) 12029; (Batiscan) 12036; (Berthier) 12029; (Bic) 12030; (Bonaventure) 12036; (Chateauguay) 12030; (Chicoutimi) 12030; (Clarke City) 12031; (East Templeton) 12031; (Lake Aylmer) 12032; (Lavaltrie) 12033; (Les Eboulements) 12033; (Montmagny) 12034; (Nicolet) 12034; (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034; (Peribonka) 12035; (Petite Decharge) 12034; (Piche Point) 12035; (Richelieu) 12037; (Rimouski) 12035; (Rivière du Lievre) 12037; (St. Laurent) 12042; (St. Maurice) 12041 (vi); (Three Rivers, deep water wharf) 13349 (vii); (Yamaska, dredging) 12043 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. and Alta. (Lesser Slave) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096; (clerical assistance) 11099; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11102; (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Chicoutimi) 13179; (operating) 13178 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Fredericton) 12758 (vii); (locomotives) 10150 (v); (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Petit Rocher spur) 12759; (St. Cyrille diversion) 12756 (vii); (stationery) 10181 (v).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329 (vi).
Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claims) 12762 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (Que. Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup, 7653 (iv).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10533 (vi).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A., *Kootenay.*

Alberta and British Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 192) 1°*, 11120 (vi).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3474 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 350 (i).

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 606 (i).

Cannon, Catharine Ann Relief (B. 175) M. to remit Fees, 13510 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10760 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5128 (iii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1170 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8619 (v); in Com., 11894 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).

——— B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Fort William Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6225 (iv).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief (B. 139) 1°*, 5913; 2° m., 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6437 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6492 (iv).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 959 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 878 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11237; in Com., 11243 (vi); on M. for 3°, 12059 (vii).

Metal Shingle Patent Relief (B. 207) 2° m., 12649; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Private Bills, 12649 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4997 (iii).

Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 1108; 2° m., 1468 (i).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9224 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4929 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Conc., 13405 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13404 (vii).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

Railway Act (commission) Amt B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4967 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10653 (vi).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payments, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2920 (ii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5413, 5519 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3808 (ii).

Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3284 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10070 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1484 (i).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3993 (ii).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8489 (v)

GANONG, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3870 (ii).

Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

Cirkel, Franz, Remuneration *re* Geological Report *re* Graphite Properties, &c. (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

Glucose, Quantity imported from G. B. (Ques.) 6980 (iv).

Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6493 (iv).

I.C.R. Station, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 5466 (iii).

Leonardville Wharf, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Balance of Subsidy, Claims *re* (Ques.) 9270 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3667 (ii).

Pianos rented, &c., for Speakers' Rooms (Ques.) 563 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4935 (iii).

Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., &c., Amounts paid and still due (Ques.) 9269 (v).

GANONG, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 12412 (vii).

Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5040; (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5043 (iii).

Marine, &c., Public Works (ship channel) 5036 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10883; (Victoria immigration) 10883 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10897 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8533 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7497; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7705; (Leamington) 7705; (Markham) 7710; (North Bay) 7718 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11009; (rents, &c.) 11002 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10189; (train service) 10160 (v).

Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

White Head Wharf, Report *re* Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12923 (vii).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Act, Names on List (Ques.) 4582 (iii).

Lighthouses in Quebec, Classification, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).

——— Rep. of Inspectors, &c. (M. for copy*) 697 (i).

Literary Aid Fund, Proposed Govtl. Action (Ques.) 1286 (i).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Amount of Deposit with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3485 (ii).

Rivière du Loup Station, Improvement to (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Shipping Master, Quebec, Apptmt. of, Capt. Koenig's Duties (Ques.) 11699 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4757 (iii).

Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Vercheres.*

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re* (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 12265, Agreed to, 12389 (vii).

——— 1st rep. (presented) 8515 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works — Buildings — Que. (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4852 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., &c., Ques. of Order, 2809 (ii).

Dom. Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. (B. 84) 1°*, 1859 (i).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 891 (i).

Port Colborne Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3093 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12212; (surveys) 12207 (vii).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal (St. James).*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) on prop. Res., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4854 (iii).

Anglo-Canadian Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 126) 1°*, 5256 (iii).

Architects, Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10950 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 3419 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11538 (vi).

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. (B. 92) 1° m., 2543 (ii).

——— (trade restraint) Amt. (B. 96) 1° m., 2976 (ii).

Debates, Official (M.) *re* Correction in Res. on Committees, 824 (i).

——— 1st Rep. (presented) 2590 (ii).

——— 2nd and 3rd Reports of Committee (presented) 6979 (iv).

——— 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 7834 (iv); (amt.) 13224 (vii).

——— 4th Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 8835 (v).

——— 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10228 (v).

Debates, Official Reporters, and Civil Service Bill (remarks) in Com. on B. 189, 11539 (vi).

Dom. Guarantee Co., Limited (B. 127) 1°*, 5255 (iii).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13302 (vii).

Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Increase in Salary (remarks) in Com. on Bill 206, 12552 (vii).

Montreal Excise Officers, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, Attack of Hon. Mr. Scott, Ques. of Priv., 4064 (ii)

GERVAIS, Mr. H.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, Cor., Plans, &c. (M. for copies) 2996 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (provisional allowances) 817 (i).

Supreme Court Act (appeals) Amt. (B. 91) 1° m., 2542 (ii).

Travellers Life Assurance Co.'s Incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 606 (i).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

Chicoutimi Public Works Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13188 (vii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4886 (iii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s (B. 107) 1°*, 3834 (ii); in Com., 5386 (iii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *Kent, E.*

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4389 iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of Sale, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5253 (iii).

Floods at Chatham, Damages *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4743 (iii).

Giraud, Eugene Francois, Patent Relief (B. 52) 1°*, 1108 (i).

Immigration Agents in Ont., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 3176 (ii).

Immigration Distribution Agents, James S. Waugh, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 1690 (i).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9898 (v).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4970 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7486 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P., (Minister of Railways and Canals) *Brockville.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 892 (i).

Algoma Steel Co., Orders for Steel, &c. (remarks) 8606 (v).

Bear River Station Dwelling, P.E.I. Tender, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

——— Lease to Robert Co., &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).

——— Lease on Inquiry for, 1740 (i).

——— (remarks) 13475 (vii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Co. and G.T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2811 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552, 9066 (v).

'Bessie Butler' Str., Dimensions, &c., Use of by R. C. Clergy (Ans.) 12411 (vii).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2993 (ii).

——— Transfer of Power Plant, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Bridge Subsidies to Ry. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) 13310 (vii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service, on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. (remarks) 192 (i).

——— Connections with C.P.R. (remarks) 432 (i).

Brockville-Ottawa and Prescott Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i).

Buell, W. S., Employment *re* Telephone Commission (Ans.) 10011 (v).

Campaign Literature sent by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com. 4231 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 214) prop. Res., 13282; in Com., 13420 (vii).

Canadian Northern Ry., Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood Branch (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).

——— Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Mission (remarks) 13475 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

Canals, Statistical Branch, List of Officers (read) 10317 (vi).

Cataract Power Co., Amount of Water diverted at De Cew Falls (Ans.) 897 (i).

Central Ry. of Canada, Charter, Deposit, &c. (Ans.) 4767 (iii).

Charlottetown, Pipe Line to Tank, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5656 (iii).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction (Ans.) 517 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5894 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9207 (v).

Cold Storage Co. of N.B., Lease of Land to, &c. (Ans.) 563 (i).

Cold Storage Cars for I.C.R. *re* Dairy Produce, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1688 (i).

Cooper & White, Payments to Govt. for Land at Welland (Ans.) 3841 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Accident to Bank (statement, 11120 (vi).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Cornwall Canal, (remarks) 12660 (vii).
——— Rep. *re* Repairs, 12161 (vii).
——— Statement *re* Breakage, 11406 (vi).
Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with M'f'g. Cos., *re* Water Power (remarks) 13034 (vii).
——— Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
Cowly and Highwood, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Deep Waterways Commission, Damming of St. Lawrence at Long Sault (remarks) 13152 (vii).
Dom. Power Co.'s Bill, on Inquiry for, 10919 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c. (Ans.) 9711 (v).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 213) prop. Res., 13258; in Com. on Res., 13278; 1° of B., 13282; in Com., 13419 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (iii).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5483 (iii).
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Express Charges in Mar. Prov., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 518 (i).
Falconer, Kenneth, Emplymt. in Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
——— Payments by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6181 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3635, 3794 (ii).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6272 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— Accidents *re* Construction, Prevention of (remarks) 6850 (iv).
——— Accidents to Workmen, Investigation, &c. (remarks) 10624 (vi).
——— Apptmt. of District Engineer at Kenora (Ans.) 895 (i).
——— Branch Lines, B. 51 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141, 8137 (iv), 8552, 8609, 8742, 9381 (v).
——— Classifications of Districts 'B' and 'F,' Investigation *re* (Ans.) 12051 (vii).
——— Construction, Accidents to Employees (remarks) 7447 (iv).
——— Contracts, Dates, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6458, 6637 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections, &c. (Ans.) 6234 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Contract for Supplies to District No. 3 (Ans.) 1120 (i).
——— Cost of Construction (M.) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction, on Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 12247 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction (reply) on M. for Sup., 12662 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction (remarks) 10916, 11407, 11939 (vi).
——— Discrimination against Canadian Contractors (Ans.) 7936 (iv).
——— Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c. (Ans.) 5563 (iii).
——— Eastern and Western Limits, Establishment of (Ans.) 9265 (v).
——— Engineering Staff, Changes *re* (Ans.) 509, 681 (i).
——— Estimated Cost, Inclusive of Terminals, &c. (Ans.) 9265 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10395 (vi).
——— Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re* (Ans.) 9266 (v).
——— La Tuque Branch, Damages by Floods, &c. (explanation) 8894 (v).
——— La Tuque Branch, Damages by Flooding (remarks) 8607 (v).
——— Liquor, Prohibition of Sale, on Inquiry for Ret., 2024 (ii).
——— Medical Officer Parent, Payments to (Ans.) 8618 (v).
——— Miles under Construction, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).
——— Moncton and Winnipeg Section, Number of Miles located (Ans.) 2387 (ii).
——— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
——— and N.T. Ry., Disputed Question (Ans.) 6236 (iv).
——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).
——— Prohibition Zone, Reduction of (Ans.) 517 (i).
——— Protest *re* Land Acquisitions (Ans.) 6640 (iv).
——— Purchase of Rails, &c., for Eastern Div. (Ans.) 9264 (v).
——— Resignation of Major Hodgins, &c. (Ans.) 359 (i).
——— Return, on Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).
——— Steel Rail Contracts, Importations, &c. (Ans.) 12775 (vii).
——— Steel Rails, Names of Manufacturers, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 10790 (vi).
——— Steel Rails, Purchases, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 10738 (vi).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Steel Rails purchased, Corrected Answer, 13065 (vii).

——— Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes (remarks) 9026 (v).

——— Transcontinental Commission, Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 13226, 13517 (vii).

——— Transportation of Supplies, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1932 (i).

——— Winnipeg to Moncton Section, Number of Miles completed, &c. (Ans.) 6643 (iv).

Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Halifax and South-western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3226, 3621, 3702, 3726 (ii),4225; on M. for 3°, 4363, 4542 (iii).

Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connection (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Hillsborough Bridge, Total Cost *re* Construction (Ans.) 1686 (i).

——— Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) 1739 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2882, 3042, 3690 (ii).

Hodgins, Major, Resignation from G.T.P. Staff (Ans.) 516 (i).

Holland River Dredging, Divisional Engineer, &c. (Ans.) 4767 (iii).

——— Name of Inspector (Ans.) 3037 (ii).

——— Payments to Lake Simcoe Dredging Co. (Ans.) 2980 (ii).

Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1292 (i), 3237 (ii).

I.C.R., Accidents, Letter *re*, &c. (remarks) 6987 (iv).

——— Amqui Station, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 10012 (v).

——— Amqui Station, Vote *re* Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 12774 (vii).

——— Asphalt Platforms: *See* 'Stations.'

——— Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151, 10214 (v).

——— Book-keeping System, Cor. *re* Par. in St. John Daily Telegraph, 5260 (iii).

——— Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

——— Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10127 (v).

——— Claims Agent, Mr. E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3481 (ii).

——— Claims *re* Damages, Settled and unsettled (Ans.) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).

——— (remarks) 6002 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Concrete Pipe Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6640 (iv).

——— Connections with Quebec Central at Lévis (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).

——— Dartmouth Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

——— Delays to 'Maritime Express' (Ans.) 8615 (v).

——— Deterioration in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10149 (v).

——— Earnings and Expenses (Ans.) 13511 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13415 (vii).

——— Employees and Civic Elections in Halifax (remarks) 6845 (iv).

——— Increased Wages, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

——— Employees, and Municipal Elections (remarks) 2884 (ii).

——— Employees, Number and Names of Persons taken in N.B. during Jan. and Feb. (Ans.) 5793 (iii).

——— Employees Provident Fund Act, Names on List (Ans.) 4582 (iii).

——— Employees Provident Fund Amt. (B. 117) 1° m., 4576; in Com., 4994 (iii).

——— Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) 9777 (v).

——— Gross Earnings for 1908 (Ans.) 13225 (vii).

——— Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

——— Horses killed at Truro, Compensation &c. (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

——— Ice Supply Contract (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

——— Ice supplied by J. A. McDonald, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

——— Lac Saumon Station (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

——— Moncton Workshops, Tenders *re* Leasing (Ans.) 5800 (iii).

——— Motor Cars, Test *re* Operation, &c. (Ans.) 566 (i).

——— Newcastle Station, Inspector of Work, &c. (Ans.) 13511 (vii).

——— Notices printed in French, &c. (Ans.) 7936 (iv).

——— 'Ocean Limited,' Number of Trips, &c. (Ans.) 6054 (iii).

——— O'Shaughnessy, Pass to (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

———Oxford and Pictou Branch, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ans.) 10733 (vi).

——— Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene Train Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10158 (v).

——— Passes issued to Mr. P. S. Archibald, &c. (Ans.) 2387 (ii).

——— Pictou Branch, Transfer from Halifax Division, &c. (Ans.) 12774 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., answer to question (remarks) 12661 (vii).

——— Pictou and Copper Crown Co., Total Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ans.) 10734 (vi).

——— Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

——— Pictou Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 10790 (vi).

——— Rates, Increase in Winter to P.E.I. (Ans.) 5995 (iii).

——— Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

——— Revenue from Terminals, &c. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

——— Riviere du Loup Station Master (Ans.) 7445 (iv).

——— Rolling Stock, &c. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 5697 (iii).

——— Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

——— Stations, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts, *re* (Ans.) 5466 (iii).

——— Steel Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re* (Ans.) 9269 (v).

——— Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10734 (vi).

——— Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of (Ans.) 9712 (v).

*See* 'Audit,' &c.

——— Sunday Trains, Instructions *re* (Ans.) 10735 (vi).

——— Tatamagouche, Delay in Train Service (Ans.) 1292 (i).

——— Ties delivered, Change *re* Inspection (Ans.) 12052 (vii).

——— Trains, Hauling of Private Cars (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

——— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, on M. (Mr. Reid) for Ret., 6242 (iv). 10149 (v).

——— Transportation, &c. (annual statement) on M. for Sup., 4420 (iii).

——— Trois Pistoles Station (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

——— Truro Buildings, Name of Tenderers (Ans.) 6233 (iv).

——— Truro Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co. (Ans.) 1936 (i).

——— Truro Station, Unsanitary Condition (Ans.) 7211 (iv).

——— Williams, Mr., Emplymt. (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

——— Unopposed Returns (remarks) 5914 (iii).

International Ry., N.B., Directors, Stock, &c. (Ans.) 4246 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Inverness County Ry. Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12404 (vii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Lyall, Mr. Peter, Name of Contractor of G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg (Ans.) 7991 (iv).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 893 (i).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Moncton Shops, Payments to E. A. Wallberg (Ans.) 8892 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7659 (iv).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 9270, 9714 (v).

N.B. Elections, and Govt. Employees (remarks) 3317, 3579 (ii).

——— Interference by Dom. Govt. on M. (Mr. Foster), to adjn., 3662 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5049 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10512 (vi).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288, 13289 (vii).

Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).

Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse Power (Ans.) 5471, 5656 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5567 (iii).

Ottawa, Brockville & St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. 74 (Mr. Grant) on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Owen Sound Dredging, Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 9070 (v).

Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

Port Maitland Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender (Ans.) 691 (i).

——— Appmt. of Mr. W. W. Krick as Inspector (Ans.) 6919 (iv).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., Wharfs, Preventing Boats landing Cargoes (Ans.) 9274 (v).

P.E. I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 6642 (iv).

——— Bear River Stationmaster's Dwelling, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1737 (i).

——— Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3264 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13485 (vii).
——— Claims of Mr. James Maher, &c. (Ans.) 3834 (ii).
——— Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c. (Ans.) 1123 (i).
——— Contract *re* News Agency (Ans.) 8444 (v).
——— Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 8383 (v).
——— Earnings and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 848 (i).
——— Harmony and Elmira Branch Line (B. 202) prop. Res., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12408; 2° m., 12628; in Com., 12631 (vii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2751 (ii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Mr. Haney's Claim (remarks) 7100 (iv).
——— Montague Branch Extension (M.) to dsch. Bill, 11405 (vi).
——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Reps., Surveys, &c., on M. for Ret., 850 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Extension, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4829 (iii).
——— Station Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).
——— Time-Table, Protest *re* (Ans.) 1124 (i).
——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour (Ans.) 569 (i).
——— Tunnel, Rep. *re*, on Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
——— Tunnel, Information *re* (Ans.) 562 (i).
——— Winter Communication, Mail Service, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 1206 (i).
Provincial Elections, and Federal Ministers' Speeches (remarks) 8851 (v).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s (B. 217) prop. Res., 13080; in Com. on Res., 13416; in Com., 13491 (vii).
Quebec Bridge Accident, Material on Hand, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 1291 (i).
——— Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare (Ans.) 8173 (iv).
——— Names of Jurymen (Ans.) 7991 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Agreement *re* Rentals, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).
——— Horse or Vehicle Traffic (Ans.) 10739 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Commissioners' Report (presented) 4566 (iii), 10915 (vi).
——— on Inquiry for Rep., 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii), 6223 (iv).
——— Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 5914 (iii).
——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv), 8608 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, Distribution of Printed Evidence (remarks) 10302 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Co., Salaries to Officials (Ans.) 13517 (vii).
Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher (Ans.) 13225 (vii).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 581 (i); on Amt. to Senate Amts., 12192 (vii).
——— (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3412 (ii).
——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3389 (ii).
——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Kennedy) on M. for 2°, 939 (i).
——— (telegraph and telephones) Amt. (B. 118) 1° m., 4658 (iii); 2° m., 10625, 10633; in Com., 10636; 3° m., 10777; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 10783, 11124; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11622; on Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11633; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11607 (vi).
Railway Commission Act (Ass't Chief, &c.) Amt (B. 112) prop. Res., 3751; in Com. on Res., 3903; 1° m., 3933 (ii); in Com., 4964 (iii), 8510 (v).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals of (Ans.) 9271 (v).
Railway Commission, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Counsel Fees (Ans.) 10257 (v).
Railway Estimates, Vote for (remarks) 10007 (v).
Ry. Land Grants, Amounts and Names, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).
Railways and Municipal Agreements, &c. (remarks) 6988 (iv).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Amounts paid and still due (Ans.) 9269 (v).
Ry. Semaphores, Iron Ladders and Posts, &c. (Ans.) 239 (i).
Railway Statistics Report (presented) 1346 (i).
Railway Subsidies (B. 215) prop. Res., 13066; in Com. on Res., 13285; 1° m., 13315; in Com., 13478 (vii).
——— (stmnt.) re Railways under Construction, 13478 (vii).
——— Applications for, Memorandum *re*, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, Bridge Construction (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).

Ry. Surveys in Colchester County, Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

——— Correction *re* Answer, 5046 (iii).

Ry. Tracks crossed by Water Mains, &c. (Ans.) 690, 1109 (i).

Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c. (Ans.) 12412 (vii).

Riviere du Loup Station, Improvement to (Ans.) 5468 (iii).

Ste. Barbe, Damages *re* Floods (remarks) 6987 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Plans, Surveys, &c., 3005 (ii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8562 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4234, 4546, 4579 (iii).

Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13474 (vii).

Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* (Ans.) 9278 (v).

Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 9714 (v).
*See* 'Ry. Semaphores.'

Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Railway Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Soulanges Canal, Electric Power, Contract with Govt., &c. (Ans.) 10011 (v).

——— Investigation *re* Overseer (Ans.) 6407 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer, on Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).

———(Ans.) 12413 (vii).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Investigation (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

Souris Wharf, Permission to Build, &c. (Ans.) 7728 (iv).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).

Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).

Stoney Lake, Damage Claims (Ans.) 5565 (iii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5649 (iii).

Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Canals (additional remuneration) 13174 (vii).

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).

Canals—Generally (extra remunerations) 5697 (iii); (salaries) 10325; (staff and repairs) 10304; (statistical branch) 10317; (surveys) 10340 (vi).

Canals—Cornwall (break in bank) 12768; (gate lifter) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (slope walls) 5663; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii); (walls) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Murray (houses) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Quebec (steam road roller) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Rideau (improvements) 12227 (vii).

Canals—St. Lawrence (District office) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12223 (vii).

Canals—Soulanges (improvements) 12225 (vii); (Manning & Macdonald's claim) 5668 (iii).

Canals—Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227; (construction) 12225 (vii); (damages) 10308 (vi); (damages) 12768; (improvements) 12227; (Lindsay lock) 12227 (vii); (surveys) 10338 (vi).

Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12195; (piers and bridges) 12207 (vii); (Port Colborne) 10312 (vi), 12211 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5673 (iii); (surveys) 12207; (widening) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12755 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston) 10913 (vi); (Owen Sound) 7822; P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7185; Que. (Dominion Arsenal) 7437 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11085 (vi).

Railways—C.P.R. (compensation) 5561 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10378; (inspection) 10390 (vi).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12764 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10187 (v); (Amherst) 12233; (Antigonish) 12229; (bridges) 12259; (Chatham diversion) 12757 (vii); (claims dept.) 10177 (v); (collection of revenue) 5694 (iii); (double tracking) 12236, 12250; (facilities, &c.) 12259; (Fredericton) 12758 (vii); (Halifax, accommodation) 5548 (iii), 12227; (Indiantown branch) 12258 (vii); (legal costs) 5557 (iii), 10190; (locomotives) 10150 (v); (machinery) 12257; (Moncton, car shops) 12250; (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Mulgrave) 12229; (New Glasgow) 12230; (North Sydney) 12229; (Petit Rocher spur) 12759 (vii); (Pictou) 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii); (rolling stock) 5549 (iii), 12257; (St. Cyrille, diversion) 12756; (St. John, accommodation) 12257 (vii); (St. Rosalie, improvements) 5558 (iii); (Ste. Rosalie) 12259; (Sackville) 12236 (vii); (salaries) 10127 (v); (Springhill junction) 12233 (vii); (stationery) 10181 (v); (Stellarton) 12230; (surveys, branch lines) 12764; (Sydney Mines) 12229; (Sydney Mines, diversion) 12759; (Truro) 12231 (vii); (Windsor branch) 10145 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; (extra clerks) 10342; (inspections, &c.) 10341; (litigation) 10357; (statistical branch) 10328; (unprovided items) 10328 (vi).

Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claim) 12762 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362; (maintenance, &c.) 10385 (vi); (Quebec Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 6400 (iv).

Telephone Wires, Application to cross R. Tracks (Ans.) 690 (i).

*See* 'Ry. Tracks,' &c.

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5387 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

*See* 'G.T.P.,' &c.

Transportation: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Trent Canal, Bradford Canal, Building of (remarks) 13476 (vii).

——— Cameron Lake, Water Level, &c. (Ans.) 9772 (v).

——— Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1735 (i).

——— Holland River Extension (remarks) 11940 (vi).

——— Tributaries, Completion of Works, &c. (Ans.) 1115 (i).

——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

——— Surveys, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6988 (iv).

Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

Tusket Wedge, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Valleyfield Floods, Damages, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7808, 7996 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Sloan) in Com., 4545 (iii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Welland Canal, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

——— Resignation of John E. Scott (Ans.) 6059 (iii).

White Horse Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade (Ans.) 10736 (v).

Wilberforce Dam, Obstruction to Traffic, &c. Cor., Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Copies, 2989 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Williams, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).

Yukon Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commission *re* (Ans.) 894 (i).

GRANT, Mr. G. D., *Ontario, N.*

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 74) 1°*, 1584 (i); on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

GREENWAY, Mr. T., *Lisgar.*

Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7880 (iv).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1355 (i).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *Wellington, S.*

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. (B. 141) 1°*, 6054 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv).

Budget, The, 6011 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Power, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7608 (iv).

Commercial Travellers, Provincial Tax, Agreement *re* Abolition, &c. (Ques.) 5794 (iii).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 104) 1°*, 3653 (ii).

Eastern Trust Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 3653 (ii).

Foresters Subsidiary High Court, &c. (B. 62) 1°*, 1283 (i); in Com., 5174 (iii).

Hamilton Electric Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3697 (ii).

——— on Mr. Speaker's Ruling, *re* Ref. back to Committee, 3362 (ii).

Northern Bank and Crown Bank (B. 156) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3339 (ii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 1°*, 350 (i).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry (prop. res.) 2856 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G., *Lanark, S.*

Address, The, 548 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3864 (ii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2816 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co's B. 214 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13285 (vii).

C.P.R. Plaster Rock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation *re* Depts., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 6153 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5643 (iii).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8899 (v).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1175 (i).

——— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1778 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11882 (vi).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 758 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6774 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5484 (iii).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

Fort William Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6224 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1240 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3632, 3803 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Surveys, Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2238 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

G.T.P. Ry., Branch Line Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8746, 9462 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12717 (vii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12249 (vii).

——— Montreal Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

——— Port Arthur Branch, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3748 (ii), 4228 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6431 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13128 (vii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10128 (v).

——— Rolling Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Transportation, &c. (reply) to Annual Statement, 4448 (iii).

Interprovincial Bridge Co., N.B., Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 8481 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11245 (vi).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12802 (vii).

Man. Voters' Lists, Affidavits quoted, Ruling *re* Laying on Table, 7948 (iv).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13418 (vii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6228 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3270 (ii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2744 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, ref. to in Debate on Address, 548 (i).

Quebec Bridge Report, Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6227 (iv).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13292 (vii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii); in Com., 4980 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10664 (vi).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., 3011 (ii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7723 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4579 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5450 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Cornwall (gate lifter) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).
Canals—Generally (extra remuneration) 5697 (iii); (surveys, &c.) 10340 (vi).
Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672 (iii); (walls) 12226 (vii); (slope walls) 5663 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Soulanges (Manning & Macdonald's claims) 5668 (iii).
Canals—Trent (improvements) 12227; (Lindsay lock) 12227 (vii).
Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12196 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5673 (iii); (surveys) 12207 (vii).
Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 617 (i).
Justice (salaries) 5505 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1452 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10381; (inspection) 10392 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridges) 12259 (vii); (collection of revenue) 5693 (iii); (double tracking) 12237; (facilities, &c.) 12259 (vii); (Halifax, accommodation) 5548 (iii), 12228 (vii); (locomotives) 10149 (v); (Moncton car shops) 12253; (North Sydney) 12229 (vii); (Pictou) 5559 (iii), 12230 (vii); (rolling stock) 5549, 5550 (iii), 12257; (St. John, accommodation) 12258 (vii); (St. Rosalie) 5558 (iii); (Sackville) 12236 (vii); (salaries) 10128; (supplies) 10202 (v); (Truro) 12231 (vii).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 10386 (vi).

Temiskaming Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 13305 (vii).

Tenders, *re* Opening of, Ques. of Priv., 2738 (ii).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2339 (ii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

HALL, Mr. R. R., *Peterborough, W.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 9 (i).

Dominion Lumbering and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 172) 1°*, 9021 (v).

——— Pet. (presented) 1731 (i).

Petition (M.) to Present, 1731 (i).

HARTY, Mr. W., *Kingston.*

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clark) in Com., 3731 (ii).

Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Railway Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11091 (vi).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 5763 (iii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4398, 4517 (iii).
*See* 'National,' &c.

Binder Twine Bounty, Amount paid from 1903 to 1907, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 191 (i).

Bronte Harbour Dues for Wharfage, Amount collected (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6166, 6174, 6195 (iii); in Com., 6411 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) in Com., 13507 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2767 (ii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5119 (iii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c. (remarks) 9734 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, and Customs Tariff, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10488 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13022; on M. for 3°, 13229; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11194 (vi).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 613 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4545 (iii).

——— B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13268; in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5920 (iii).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase of, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7665 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7797 (iv).

Fort William Ry. Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3584 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10557, 10568 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12557 (vii).

'Grafter,' Use of, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 10994 (vi).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2236 (ii).

G.T.P., Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141 (iv), 8751 (v).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 95 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3194, 3621, 3712, 3735, (ii), 4226; on M. for 3°, 4542 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10499 (vi).

Immigration Bonuses, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1323 (i).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13137 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10528 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3035 (ii).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C.P.R. Extension (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7661 (iv).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13504 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses, &c. (remarks) 797 (i).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4698 (iii).

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry Co.'s B. 74 (Mr. Grant) on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and the U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).

Postal Rate Reduction, &c. (remarks) 3159 (ii).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv); in Com., 10704 (vi).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7667 (iv).

Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Funds B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagant Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7145 (iv).

——— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 4939 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3913 (ii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10669 (vi).

Railways and Municipal Agreements, Penalties *re* Violations (remarks) 6987 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7676, 7723 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4235, 4546 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2934 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2777 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 41 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6183 (iii).

Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Supply, Estimates, Total Appropriations, 5919 (iii).

Supply (seed grain) B. 96 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 2782 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10398; (exhibitions) 10572 (vi); (seeds) 12891 (vii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9748 (v); Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 613; Sec. of State (salaries) 612 (i).

Excise (distilleries) 814; (tobacco stamps) 816 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4207 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1896 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 10293 (v); (customs) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii); (seed grain) 2777 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5764 (iii); (wrecks) 3197 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5526; (maintenance) 5514 (iii).

Public Works (ass't. dep. min.) 5699 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10864; (Ladysmith) 10867; (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10870; (Victoria, immigration) 10876 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10887 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, military) 10973 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) customs) 7143; (Halifax, immigration) 7143; (Halifax, miltary) 7143 (iv); (Parrsborough) 13327 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7498; (Guelph, armoury) 7680; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7694; (Hamilton, post office) 7696; (North Bay) 7714; (Owen Sound) 7818; (Sarnia) 7829; (Simcoe) 7830; (Welland) 7831 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents, &c.) 10983, 10994 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte, dredging) 5708 (iii); (Bronte) 12091 (vii); (Tiffin, dredging) 5712 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11080; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11108 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 12728 (vii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Tobacco, Canadian, Protection to, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 914 (i).

Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908 (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Vancouver Bank incorp B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).

Winnipeg Bank incorp. B. 19 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2787 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Alberta.*

Blairmore Townsite (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12741 (vii).

Blunden, Fred. W., Imprisonment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vii).

——— on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3475 (ii).

Buffalo Herd, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10103 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10547 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367 (vi).

Coal and Govt. Lands, Acres in Possession of Govt. (Ques.) 843 (i).

Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta, &c. (Ques.) 1685 (i).

Cowly and Highwood, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Customs Officers at Windsor, Age, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 12655 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11915 (vi).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 761 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11136; in Com.,11164, 11169, 11410, 11504 (vi); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12397 (vii).

Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta, &c. (Ques.) 3433 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Fishery Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c. (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Fishing Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13214 (vii).

Grazing Leases, Irrevocable for 21 years, Application for, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Homesteaders for Sections 16, 15, 27, &c., Issue of Patents, &c. (Ques.) 7503 (iv).

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Applications, &c. *re* Coal Mining Lands, (M. for copies*) 698 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6386 (iv).

Immigration Expenditure from March, 1907, 1908 (Ques.) 5080 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4674 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2141 (ii).

Lands applied for by Mr. Aylwin under Irrigation Regulations (Ques.) 7209 (iv).

Land Patents, S.E. ¼ Sec. 2, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2171 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 2169 (ii).

Lewis, N.W.M. Policeman, Murder of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8867 (v).

Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 430 (i).

Macleod Post Office, Report re Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12565, 13223 (vii).

Newspapers in Alberta, Amounts paid to by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Piegan Reserve, Cattle Shipping, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3402 (ii).

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8470 (v).

Section 14, South-east Quarter, Application for, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 5476 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1360 (i).

Seed Grain Supply Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2782 (ii).

Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 7729 (iv).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3810 (ii), 12596; in Com., 12620; in Com., 13048 (vii).

S.A. Volunteers, Land Grants (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Squatters' Claims in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10617 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 632 (i).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10044; (coal lands) 10072; (forest rangers) 10049; (salaries) 10044 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9881; (agents, U.S.) 9967; (deportations) 9884 (v).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12753 (vii).

Interior — Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5758 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5743 (iii).

N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8867 (v).

Post Office (inspectors) 9109 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10874 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (experimental farm, repairs, &c.) 10907; (quarantine stations) 11008 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Knowlton) 7292 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask., &c. (Edmonton) 8580; (Humboldt) 8587 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Old Man's River) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11076 (vi).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2373 (ii).

White Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 10736 (vi).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6183 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J., *Kings (P.E.I.)*

Address, The, 380 (i)

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

Budget, The, 6097 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1709 (i).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name of I.C.R., &c. (prop. res.) 6243, 6284 (iv).

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2449 (ii).

Labour Organizations *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald,' Ques. of Priv., 8289 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12826 (vii).

Nipissing Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 170) 1°°, 8694 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3258 (ii).

—— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12635 (vii).

—— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2747 (ii).

P.E.I., Ice-Breaker, Contract for Construction, &c. (Ques.) 365, 1734 (i); 5796 (iii); 8444 (v).

—— Telegraphic Communication, Com. from Commercial Cable Co. *re* (remarks) 8515 (v).

—— Winter Comunication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4628 (iii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7752 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3762 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2943, 2953; (wrecks) 3191 (ii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2212 (ii).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*

Advertisements in Montreal 'Star' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7479 (iv).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4030 (ii).

Balsam Lake and Gull River Ret., Incomplete, &c. (remarks) 6059 (iii).

Balsam Lake Section, Trent Canal, Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10308(vi). *See* 'Trent,' &c.

Battlefields of Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 3902 (ii); in Com., 4399, 4417, 4527 (iii).

'Bessie Butler,' Str., Dimensions, &c., Use of by R. C. Clergy (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Board of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, Protection *re* (prop. res.) 2992 (ii).

—— Transfer of Power Plant, &c. (Ques.) 1114 (i).

Booms in International Streams, Regulation B. 105 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 1°, 3655 (ii).

Canadian Naturalization and British Rights, on M. for Sup., 12084 (vii). *See* 'Naturalization.'

C.P.R. Papineauville Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Canadian Patriotic Funds B. 216 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 13320 (vii).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2769 (ii).
Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10745 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11317; in Com., 11544, 11639 (vi).
Civil Service Commission Report, Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7579, 7596 (iv)
Cornwall Canal, Breakage, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 13085 (vii).
Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup., (remarks) 10136 (v).
Debates, Official (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10247 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11808, 11837 (vi); 12955 (vii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B.181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127; in Com., 11170, 11950; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11978 (vi).
Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1111 (i).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13281 (vii).
Fishing Licenses in B.C., Grants to Japanese (Ques.) 7445 (iv).
Fruit Inspection, Apples, &c., Complaints *re*, 2757 (ii).
G.T.R., Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12078 (vii).
G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6657 (iv).
——— (remarks) 6850 (iv).
G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12680 (vii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10396 (vi).
G.T.P., Supplies, Transportation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10378 (vi)
——— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1448 (i).
Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6653 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6706 (iv).
Immigration Regulations *re* British Subjects, Deportation, &c. (Ques.) 9772 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Indian Dept., Extravagent Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11045 (vi).
I.C.R., Accidents, Letter *re* (read) 6986 (iv);
——— Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10218 (v).
——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4422 (iii).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1601 (i).
Labour unemployed, Protection to (Ques.) 10735 (vi).
Lancaster, Cadet, R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct, &c., on M. for Sup, 1019 (i).
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Accident at Rockliffe Range (Ques.) 10014 (v).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 606 (i).
Lumber Duties from U.S., on M. for Sup., 9504 (v).
Lumber Industry, Duty, &c. (remarks) 10259 (v).
Militia Rations, Cost per Day (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13505 (vii).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com.,11992 (vi).
*See* 'Canadian Naturalization.'
Newmarket Canal, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. for Sup., 10403 (vi).
Peace River Timber Limits, Cor., &c., *re* Granting (M. for copies) 3851 (ii).
Peace River Valley and Land Co., Cancelling of Grant (remarks) 11018 (vi).
——— Homesteads leased, sold, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2769 (ii), 6010 (iii).
Peace River Valley Lands, Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c. (Ques.) 1111 (i).
Postal Service in the House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, Ques. of Order, 12629 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, in Com. on B. 215 (remarks) 13485 (vii).
Prince Rupert Customs Collector, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald (Ques.) 6401 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4953 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Militia (remarks) 8696 (v).
——— City Corps., &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Quebec Tercentenary, Transportation of Volunteers (remarks) 8377, 8384 (v).
Ques. of Priv. *re* Doukhobors, &c., 7321 (iv).
Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3413 (ii).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re* (Ques.) 8610 (v).
Religious Fanatics (remarks) 12161 (vii).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re* (Ques.) 11494 (vi).
——— Contract for Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vii).
——— Deficiency in Manufacture, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9028 (v).
——— Par in Ottawa Citizen, *re* Accident at Rockliffe Ranges (Ques.) 10515 (vi).
———Ques. of Priv. *re* Mr. Bergeron's denial of Stmnt., 9330 (v)
——— Tests, &c. (remarks) 8169 (iv).
See 'Lee-Enfield,' &c.
R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1019 (i).
School Statutes *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6864 (iv).
Seed Grain for Settlers in N.W., Extension, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2903, 2935 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn.,1360 (i).
Seed Grain for Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2775 (ii).
Shipping Rings, Combinations, &c. (remarks) 5919 (iii).
S. A. Contingent, Medals for 3rd Contingent (Ques) 1110 (i).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) on prop. Res., 3759 (ii); in Com. on Res, 12596 (vii).
S. A. War, Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c. (Ques.) 1110 (i).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).
Stewart, James, Inspecting Auditor, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10152 (v).
Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10399 (vi).
Canals—Cornwall (repairs to bank) 12768 (vii).
Canals—Generally (statistical branch) 10319 (vi).
Canals—Trent (damages) 12768 (vii); (repairs, &c.) 10305 (vi).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12219 (vii).
Customs—Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577 (v).
Excise (methylated spirits) 823 (i).
Geological Survey (oil borings) 13162 (vii).
Indians—N.B. (schools) 13170; Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12751 (vii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4030 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 10293 (v); (customs dues) 12156; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (provisions, &c.) 12152; (R. M. College) 12152 (vii).
Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13156; (Civil Service Commission) 13168; (cotton strikers) 13158; (Olympic Games) 13167; (Oriental immigration) 13156 (vii); (seed grain) 2775 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7495 (iv); (Kingston, magazine) 10907; (Kingston) 10913 (vi); (London, military) 7707; (Markham) 7709; (North Bay) 7712 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1459 (i); (ventilation) 11010 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10885 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11210; (Porter's Lake) 11263; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hood) 11270; (Yarmouth) 11291 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 12090; (Belle River) 12090; (Blanche River) 12090; (Chute à Blondeau) 12092; (Colborne) 12095; (Collingwood) 12096; (Winnipeg River) 12138 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11093; (engineering branch) 11095; (unprovided items) 11119 (vi).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11071 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (operating) 13178; (Yukon) 13179 (vii).
Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10384; (inspection) 10390 (vi).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Petit Rocher spur) 12760; (Sydney Mines diversion) 12759 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (Que. Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Tobacco Prohibition, &c., Ques. of Order *re* Resolution from Moral Reform Associations, 11302 (vi).
Trent Canal, Cameron Lake Water Level, Purchase of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 9772 (v).
——— Extension to Gull River, Reps., Plans, Surveys, &c. (M. for copies) 2991 (ii).
*See* 'Balsam,' 'Bobcaygeon,' 'Newmarket.'
——— Tributary Works, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 1115 (i).
——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1114 (i).
Wilberforce Dam., Obstruction to Traffic, &c., Cor., Plans, &c. (M. for copies) 2988 (ii)

HUNT, Mr. A. B., *Compton.*

Pulp Wood Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4818 (iii).

JACKSON, Mr. S. J., *Selkirk.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8242 (iv); in Com., 13007 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11173, 11442, 11526, 11954 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act, Man. Voters' Lists, Polling Divisions made by Judges (remarks) 13139 (vii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10819 (vi).

Grazing Lease of H. Riviere, Location, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6386 (iv).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11035 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12583 (vii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Ques. of Priv., 10793 (vi).

Ques. of Privilege, Letter from Mr. Cyr (read) 8460 (v).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1365 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents) 9881 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8526; (Selkirk) 8548; Sask. (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8602 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12767 (vii).

JACKSON, Mr. W., *Elgin, W.*

Address, The, 412 (i).

Budget, The, 5959 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vii).

Cattle sold at Central Experimental Farm, Sale of (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for seeds, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

——— Sale of Cattle, &c. (Mr. for ret.*) 2795 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6900 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amount of Expenditure for Cleaning, &c. (Ques.) 8888 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

JACKSON, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Vehicle Traffic (Ques.) 10739 (vi).

St. Lawrence River Route, Wrecks and Collisions (Ques.) 10739 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10576 (vi); (live stock) 12899 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4086 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1077 (i); (naval schools) 3224; (wrecks) 3205 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Yarmouth) 7181 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8594 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Stanley) 12136 (vii).

'Vigilant' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision (Ques.) 682 (i).

JOHNSTON, Mr. A., *Cape Breton, South.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13056 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5254 (iii).

Committee Meeting, Rep. *re,* on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) Ques. of Order, 2383 (ii).

Co-Operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Debates, Official (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10248 (v).

Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Govt. Employees, Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 615 (i).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9129 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6651 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1337 (i).

I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4487 (iii).

Keewatin Diocese Synod incorp. (B. 179) 1°*, 9330 (v).

Kun, Agnes Ballum, Release of from Gaol (remarks) 9335 (v).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal (B. 185) 1°*, 10008; M. for 2°, 10122 (v).

JOHNSTON, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries, Purchase of Supplies for 1892-1896 (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

Metal Shingle and Siding Co.'s Patent (B. 210) 1° m., 12649 (vii).

Obstruction to Supply, Ques. of Order, 10024 (v).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2429 (ii).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7667 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3128, 3139 (ii).

——— 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 9890 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4949 (iii).

Public Works, &c., in N. S., Irrelevancy of Debate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7129 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) on order for 2° (remarks) 5211 (iii).

Sessional Papers and Returns: Number ordered, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).

——— Number presented, &c. (Ques.) 2592 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7748 (iv).

Supplies purchased for Govt., &c., Ques. of Order, *re* Investigation by Pub. Accounts Com., 5830 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5667 (iii).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9253 (v).

House of Commons (contingencies) 10502 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4759 (iii).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1906 (i).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1053 (i); (ice-breakers) 2958 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Digby) 11226 (vi); Ont. (Stanley Island pier) 5720 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Campbellton) 12258 (vii); (supplies) 10201 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods (B. 178) 1°*, 9330 (v); on M. for 2°, 13509 (vii).

KEMP, Mr. A. E., *Toronto, East.*

Address, The, 434 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12460 (vii).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9738 (v).

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of B. E. Walker (read) 6008 (iii).

KEMP, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12877 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6889 (iv).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9735 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12932; on M. for 3°, 13230 (vii).

Election Corruption, Charges of Hon. Mr. Pugsley, ref. to in debate on Address, 435 (i).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12554 (vii).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

——— Winnipeg and Moncton Route, Miles Located, &c. (Ques.) 2386 (ii).

I.C.R., &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4422 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11247 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12567 (vii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9487 (v).

Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13418 (vii).

Port Colborne Elevator and Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12218 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between U. S and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3893 (ii).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3346 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3906, 3922 (ii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4665 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (constrution) 12226; (Port Colborne) 12212; (surveys) 12209 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9738; (salaries) 9699 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773 (iii); (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (cotton strikers) 13162 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt steamers) 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2962; (life-saving stations) 2972 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (new deptl. building) 5701; (post office) 5705; (rents, &c.) 5706 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii); (Montreal,

KEMP, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

postal station B) 7419; (Montreal, post office) 7411; (Montreal, warehouse) 7424; (Point St. Charles) 7419; (St. John's, military) 7440 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 5702; Ont. (Stanley Island pier) 5721 (iii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10146 (v).

Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday (remarks) 13085 (vii).

Toronto Harbour, (western entrance) Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 10014 (v).

KENNEDY, Mr. J. B., *New Westminster.*

B. C. Fishing Licenses to Packer's Association, Issue of (Ques.) 8173 (iv).

Customs Defalcations in B. C., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10485 (vi).

——— Ques. of Priv., 9459 (v).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Speakers (remarks) 13537 (vii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1725 (i).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11031 (vi).

Japanese Immigration, &c., Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2144 (ii).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 748 (i).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9501 (v).

Obstructions *re* Supplies, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9943 (v).

Ry. Act, 1903 (fires, &c.) Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 350; 2° m., 938 (i).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Assiniboia, West.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11549 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11132; in Com., 11413, 11958 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10826 (vi).

G.T.P., Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8128 (iv), 9382 (v).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. for Sup., 6291 (iv).

Lumber Duties from U. S., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 9510 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7654 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 9068 (v).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1368 (i).

Seed Wheat in N. W., Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P., Ques. of Priv., 1438 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12595 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9700 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10976 (vi); Sask. (Humboldt) 8596 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).

Yeomans, Indian Agent, Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9668 (v).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*

Address, The, 459 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4713 (iii).

Autonomy Act Validity, Return, Inquiry for, 5727 (iii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12740 (vii).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

Buchanan Townsite, Applications *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10079 (v).

Budget, The, 5605 (iii).

Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4769 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry., Erwood and Pas Mission Branch, Rep. of Engineer (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 13309 (vii).

——— Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Mission (remarks) 13475 (vii).

C.P.R. Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 5049 (iii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6882 (iv).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10550 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367 (vi).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Coal Lands, Timber, &c., Dates of Regulation, O.Cs., &c. (Ques.) 12656 (vii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Coal Mines Royalty, Sums received by Govt. (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

——— (remarks) 10916 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1637 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1839 (i).

Documents, Original, *re* Timber Berths (M. for papers, &c.) 2855 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8150 (iv), 11791; in Com., (amt.) 11898 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127; in Com., 11158, 11168 11415, 11505, 11942; on M. for 3° (amt.) 11976 (vi), 12395; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 65) 12395; on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 754 (i).

Dom. Lands, Area disposed of by Govt. (Ques.) 3431 (ii).

——— Sales of during 1907 (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).

——— Return, Inquiry for, 5727 (iii).

——— Total Area disposed of from 1896 to 1905, &c. (M. for ret.) 3852 (ii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10816 (vi).

Doukhobor Prisoners at Fort William, Pardon by Justice Dept. (remarks) 6847 (iv).

——— Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept. (Ques.) 6983 (iv).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Tel. *re* Conduct, &c. (remarks) 7621 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, 6752 (iv).

Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of (Ques.) 694 (i).

Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3651 (ii).

Grain Commission's Rep., Inquiry for, 2381 (ii), 4224, 4316 (iii).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13208 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9469 (v).

Harbottle, N. F., Emplymt. in Excise Dept., &c. (Ques.) 7730 (iv).

Homestead Cancellations, Unfair Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10100 (v).

Homestead Entries, Declarations, &c., by R. Cruickshank, of N. W. (M. for copies*) 698 (i).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Homestead Entry for S. W. ¼ Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties performed, &c. (Ques.) 2167 (ii).

Homestead Entries N. E. ¼ Sec. 28, Permissions *re* Grants (Ques.) 1941 (i).

Homestead Entries in N. W. Quarter Section 35, &c. (Ques.) 4762 (iii).

Homestead Entry by Mr. Tanguay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Homesteads, Sale of in Township 13, Range 13 (Ques.) 7206 (iv).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6368 (iv).

Indian Lands, Sale of, Ret., Inquiry for, 4495 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 962 (i).

Land Patents, Entry of Dates, Applications, Inspections, &c., of ¼ section 16, &c. (Ques.) 3432 (ii).

Land Patents, Sections 36, &c., Issue of (Ques.) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N. W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

Lands in Sections 2, 10, 14, 22 and 24, Disposal of (Ques.) 5083 (iii).

Land Titles Act Assurance B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 8481 (v).

Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c. (Ques.) 9475 (v).

Lumber manufactured in N. W., Royalties, &c. (Ques.) 3835 (ii).

McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent at Edmonton (Ques.) 6981 (iv).

Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry (Ques.) 6401 (iv).

Mail Matter lost in C.P.R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re* (remarks) 9281, 9723 (v).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12559, 13221 (vii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6890 (iv).

Moberly, Mr. H. J., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3848 (ii).

Moose Mountain Buffalo Herd (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9493; (amt.) 9494 (v).

Muskoday Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Sale (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Peace River Colonization and Land Development Co., Surveys, Reps., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10001 (v).

'Phoenix' Saskatoon, Number ordered, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 6920 (iv).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10713 (vi).

Postal Arrangements between Can. and U. S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3166 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. and SS. Co., Last Deficit, &c. (Ques.) 6459 (iv).

Quarter Sections 35, 31, 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c. (Ques.) 8176 (iv).

Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3410 (ii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3401 (ii).

Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 5209 (iii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4664 (iii).

Samovici, A., and H. Bolacan, Applications for Cancellation of Homestead Rights, &c. (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

Saskatchewan Act, May 23rd, 1906, Constitutionality of, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 3435 (ii).

———.Report *re* (Ques.) 6400 (iv).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 4761 (iii).

*See* 'Timber,' &c.

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8472 (v).

Scrip and Money received by Govt. *re* Lands, Mines, &c. (M. for ret.) 3852 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 3431 (ii).

School, Timber and Coal Lands in Man., &c. Average Price, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Payment, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2896; Neg (Y. 58; N. 98) 2937 (ii).

Seed Grain, Distribution to Settlers in N. W. (Ques.) 692 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1352 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2772 (ii).

Six Nation Indians, Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 6242 (iv).

——— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c. (Ques.) 6239 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3790, 3831 (ii); in Com. (amt.) 12621; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9764 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10041; (homesteads) 10082; (salaries) 10041 (v).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Survey (specimens) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (agents) 9858; (deportations) 9882; (Doukhobors) 9956; (hospitals) 9983; (relief to settlers) 9983 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12733 (vii).

Inspection of Staples (inspectors) 12264 (vii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2772 (ii).

N. W. M. Police (pay of force) 8869 (v).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5527 (iii).

Post Office (inspection) 9114 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally Experimental Farms (repairs, &c.) 10906 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8531 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10957 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10976 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston) 10910 (vi); (North Bay) 7715 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta (Edmonton) 8579; (Battleford) 8577; (Estevan) 8581; (Humboldt) 8582; (Regina) 8602 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (Lesser Slave) 5719 (iii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 12764; I.C.R. (surveys, branch lines) 12764 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1220-1272, on Order for Ret. (amt.) 849 (i).

Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c. (Ques.) 181 (i).

Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present (Ques.) 359 (i).

Timber Licenses and Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c. (Ques.) 181 (i).

——— (M.) for Com. of Investigation, 2260, 2269; Amt. Neg. (Y. 55; N. 111) 2736 (ii).

Timber Sales, &c., on Amt. to Com. of Sup., 8769; (amt.) 8778; Amt. neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 8833 (v).

Vacant Land Reservation, Instructions to Agents *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1935 (i).

Wheat Feed Shipments, Special Arrangements with Ry. Cos. (Ques.) 893 (i).

Wheat Transportation, Financial Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 1938 (i).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10531 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8484 (v).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*

Address, The, 292 (i).

Apple and Fruit Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 353 (i).

Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1508 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6177, 6197 (iii).

Canada-Germany Trade Relations (remarks) 13081 (vii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*

Cattle exported to U. S. during 1900-7, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1507 (i).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11252 (vi).

Cold Storage Cos., Grants to (Ques.) 1937 (i).

Dauphin Public Building, Valuation of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13039 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13265 (vii).

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).

Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Packing of Apples (remarks) 2760 (ii).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 669 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11249 (vi).

Meat and Canned Food Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 352 (i).

Militia Stores and Arms, Care of for Rural Battalions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).

Port Maitland, Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender (Ques.) 690 (i).

——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector (Ques.) 6919 (iv).

——— Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 1294 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10714 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, &c. (remarks) 8862 (v).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10676 (vi).

St. John Cold Storage Co., Names of Stockholders, &c. (Ques.) 1938 (i).

Seed Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 353 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 677 (i).

Canals, 10319 (vi); Welland (Port Maitland) 5676 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 5735; (stores, care of) 5736 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Ladysmith) 10867; (Vernon) 10870 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8522 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Leamington) 7815; (Owen Sound) 7822; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Welland) 7832 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 11275; (Pugwash wharf) 11281 (vi).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*

Welland Canal, Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation (M. for copy*) 852 (i).

——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c. (Ques.) 174 (i).

——— Resignation of John R. Scott (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2189 (ii).

Wilson Cordage Co., Charges against A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 657 (i).

Woollen Industry, Deputations *re* (remarks) 13082 (vii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*

Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 362 (i).

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4865 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2816 (ii).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3473 (ii).

Campaign Literature, franking by Depts., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Fielding) on M. to place on Order Paper (remarks) 13494 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6875 (iv).

Cannon, Catherine Ann Relief B. 175, on M. (Mr. Galliher) to remit Fees, 13510 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).

Cooper & White, Payments *re* Rental for Govt. Lands, Welland (Ques.) 3841 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12204 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1814 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 11726; in Com. (amt.) 11816; (amt.) 11841 (vi), 12967 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11177 (vi).

Electrical and Gas Power Licenses granted under Statute, c. 16, &c. (Ques.) 360 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trades Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3532 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3801 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. McCool) for Plans, &c., 5239 (iii).

——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Scheme (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10313 (vi).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8746, 9382 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup. 12707 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12318 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2246 (ii); in Com., 12076 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3718 (ii).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12400 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12566 (vii).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 90 (i); 2° m., 3014; in Com., 3034 (ii).

——— on Order for 2° (remarks) 570 (i).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13501 (vii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9367 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3057 (ii).

Niagara Lands, Purchase for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).

Niagara Military Camp, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 5002 (iii).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9906 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10854 (vi).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).

Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* improvements (Ques.) 4403 (iii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 91; 2° m., 570; in Com., 583 (i); (amt.) on Senate Amts., 12191, Neg. (Y. 42; N. 85) 12192 (vii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3353 (ii).

———(compensation) Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 5247 (iii).

Railway Commission (ass't chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3909 (ii); in Com., 4967 (iii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10645; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11607; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 11624; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10784, 11595 (vi).

——— (Ry. Commission) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10784, 11595 (vi).

Ry. Act (mortgages) Chap. 38, B. 204 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 12550 (vii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12601 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Generally (repairs) 10309; (statistical branch) 10319 (vi).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (Port Colborne) 12221; (surveys) 12208 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9753 (v).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9540; Miscellaneous (legal expenses) 9578; Outside Service (salaries) 9439 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4050, 4103 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Colborne) 12096; (Collingwood) 12096; (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii).

Railways — Miscellaneous (inspections) 10342 (vi).

Timber Marking Act Amt. (B. 193) in Com., 12408 (vii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13509 (vii).

Waterways Commission *re* International Boundary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9753 (v).

Welland Canal, Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

——— Deepening, Estimated Cost (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).

——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2190 (ii).

LANCTOT, Mr. R., *Laprairie-Napierville.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 17 (i).

Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 12653 (vii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of (Ques.) 516 (i).

——— O.C. *re* (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3373 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay Patrol) 4027 (ii).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provinces (Ques.) 7990 (iv).

——— Number under Control of Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 3897 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4029 (ii).

LAURIER, Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Prime Minister) G.C.M.G., *Quebec East.*

Address, The, (M.) *re* Precedence, 8 (i).

Address, The 40 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 544 (i).

——— (M.) to present, 554 (i).

Adjournment for Christmas: (M.) 754 (i).

*See* 'Business,' &c.

Advertisements for Tenders of Public Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4706 (iii).

All-Red Line (prop. res.) 12414, Agreed to (Y. 109; N. 47) 12501 (vii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12495 (ii).

All-Red Route, Authority *re* Negotiations, &c. (statement) 366 (i).

——— Canadian Representatives in England, &c. (Ans.) 353 (i).

——— Irish Route, Opposition by Govt. (Ans.) 10254 (v).

——— Letter to Mr. Sifton (remarks) 948 (i).

——— Purposes of Mr. White's Presence in London (remarks) 608 (i).

——— Mr. White's Duties in England (Ans). 694 (i).

——— Resolutions (remarks) 12162 (vii).

——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude (remarks) 947 (i).

——— Tenders, Proposals, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 6460 (iv).

Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of (remarks) 8440 (v).

Anglo-American Treaties, Cor. &c. (remarks) 9715 (v).

——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 7447 (iv), 8516 (v).

——— on Inquiry for Cor., 10120 (v).

——— Submitted to Can. Govt. (remarks) 6926 (iv).

——— Tel. from Mr. Bryce *re* (remarks) 6985 (iv).

Anglo-Japanese Treaty Cor, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 599 (i).

*See* 'Japanese.'

'Arctic' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).

Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 4221, 4314 (iii).

Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Bate & Co., and W. C. Edwards & Co., Payments to (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada (B. 111) prop. Res., 3579, 3901; 1° m., 3902 (ii); 2° m., 4376; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; 3° m., 4530, 4534, Agreed to (Y. 90; N. 11) 4535 (iii).

Battlefields Commission (lands) Amt. B. 219 1° m., 13495; in Com., 13501 (vii).

Beauharnois Canal Water Power, New Lease (remarks) 947 (i).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., and G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2820 (ii).

Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 4583 (iii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, &c. (remarks) 241 (i).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3471 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5949

Bounties paid by Govt. since 1896 (remarks) 895 (i).

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c (Ans.) 4583 (iii).

Brier Island Fog Alarm, Contract *re* Installation (Ans.) 9474 (v).

Business of the House (M.) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii), 9480 (v), 11232 (vi).

——— Public Bills, &c. (remarks) 2982 (ii)

*See* 'Govt. Business,' &c.

Cabinet Appointments, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 44 (i).

Campaign Funds, Charges and Investigation *re* (remarks) in debate on Address 65 (i).

Canada-Australian SS. Subvention, Discontinuance of (Ans.) 941 (i).

——— Yearly Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 1289 (i).

Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty (Ans.) 12391 (vii.)

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6418 (iv).

Canada and U. S. Treaties, on Inquiry (Mr R. L. Borden) 7835 (iv).

*See* 'Anglo-American,' &c.

Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by Customs Officer of U. S. (remarks) 11122 (vi).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12849 (vii).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. (remarks) 6060 (iii).

——— Conditions *re* Investigation of Marine Dept., 6143 (iii).

——— Cor. *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. Laid on Table, 6464 (iv).

*See* 'Civil Service,' &c., 'Marine and Fisheries.'

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*
Cattle Embargo by G. B., Cable *re* Removal (remarks) 13228 (vii).
'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes (remarks) 9127, 9343, 9460 (v).
Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. of (Ans.) 8894, 9266 (v).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax (Ans.) 514 (i).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on M. to resume adjn. debate, (remarks) 5246, 5251 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11562 (vi).
Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigation *re* Depts., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 6148 (iii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).
——— Marine, Deptl. Dismissals (announcement 6003 (iii).
——— Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to Adjn. House, 5887 (iii).
——— Report, (remarks) on Presentation, 5633 (iii).
——— Translation of (remarks) 11312 (vi).
Civil Service List (presented) 93 (i).
Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9200 (v).
Cold Storage, Papers on, Inquiry for, 3690 (ii).
*See* 'N.B. Cold Storage, &c.
Colonial Conference (remarks) in debate on Address 41 (i).
*See* 'Travelling,' &c.
Commercial Travellers Tax, Condition *re* Abolition of (Ans.) 5794 (iii).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 6 (i).
——— (M.) to conc. in Rep., 90 (i).
——— Organization of (remarks) 505 (i).
——— (M.) to add Names, 1207 (i), 3315 (ii).
Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).
Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on Order for 2°, 583 (i); (M.) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 28 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 940 (i).
Criminal Code Amendments, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 9283 (v).
Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 2786 (ii).
Debates of the House, Average Price per Column (Ans.) 3479 (ii).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 7834 (iv).
——— (remarks) 12505 (vii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*
Debates of the House, 4th Rep. (translaters) on M. to ref. back to Com. (remarks) 8900, 9710, 9889, 10119, 10242 (v).
Debates, Official, French Edition, Delays in Printing (Ans.) 2978 (ii).
——— Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3491 (ii).
——— French Supt. of Printing (Ans.) 2978 (ii), 12411 (vii).
Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N.W.M. Police Force (Ans.) 6001 (iii).
Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1137 (i).
——— Instruction *re* Laying on Table (remarks) 7810 (iv).
——— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1623 (i).
——— Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1775 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1845 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table, 1927 (i).
——— on Notice being called, 2794 (ii).
*See* 'Public Documents,' 'Timber,' &c.
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 5247 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8296 (v); in Com., 11807 (vi), 12922; on M. for 3°, 13231 (vii).
Dom. Election Bill, 1903, Preparation of (remarks) &c., 8393 (v).
Dom. Elections Act, and Govt. Measures, Proceeding with (remarks) 7721 (iv).
Dom. Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) on Senate Amts., 12773 (vii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11977 (vi).
Doukhobors, Prisoners at Fort William (remarks) 6848 (iv).
Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws (remarks) 7620 (iv).
Dredging Companies, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).
——— O.Cs. *re* Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6747 (iv).
Dredging in Quebec Harbours in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3240 (ii).
Drury, R. L., Apptmt. as Japanese Agent (remarks) 4769 (iii).
Dunsmuir, Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) 1738 (i).
——— Tel. of Sec. of State (read) 1859 (i).
*See* 'Immigration,' &c.
Easter Adjournment (M.) 6464 (iv).
Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to (Ans.) 3239 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13276 (vii).

Elder-Dempster SS. Subsidy to S. Africa (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Empire Day and Ascension Day, Adjnmt. (M.) 8894 (v).

Employees of Parlt. and Printing Bureau, Names, Salaries, Religions, &c. (remarks) 5206 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5485

Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 5249 (iii).

Fisheries Negotiations, &c., between U. S. and Canada (remarks) 2023 (ii).

Fisheries Treaty Boundaries with U.S., Information *re* (remarks) 6632, 6740, 6844 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal (remarks) 8295 (v).

Franco-Canadian Treaty (remarks) in debate on Address, 43 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty Bill (remarks) *re* 3°, 3754 (ii).

*See* 'Canada and France,' &c.

French Translation of Govt. Documents, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3181 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 4230 (iii).

Govt. Business, (announcement) 7834 (iv).

——— Introduction of Bills (remarks) 10258 (v).

——— Legislation (remarks) 10303, 10511, 11123, 11826 (vi).

——— Stmnt. *re* Legislation, 12049, 12163 (vii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (M.) 6287 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Interference in Elections (remarks) 11903 (vi).

Govt. Ownership of Rys., &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 51 (i).

Grain Commission, Number of Members, &c. (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

Grain Commissioner's Report (Ans.) 180 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, 609 (i), 2381 (ii).

Grain Inspection, Total Expenditure and Receipts in 1906 (Ans.) 4586 (iii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9465 (v).

G.T.P. Ry., Eastern Division, Recent Estimate of Cost (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, Amt. to M. to ref. to Special Com., 7320 (iv).

——— Charges *re* Classification (remarks) 6844, 6925 (iv).

——— Statement from Mr. Parent (remarks) 6985, 7097 (iv).

——— (M.) to ref. to Com., 7213 (iv).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Location, Conference in Montreal, Par. in Toronto 'World' (remarks) 7809 (iv).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2224 (ii); in Com., 12071 (vii).

G.B. and U.S. Treaties, Papers laid on Table, 8694 (v).

*See* 'Anglo-American,' &c.

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R. (Ans.) 184 (i).

Halifax Garrison, Disbandment of (remarks) 1208 (i).

Halifax Platform, *re* Conservative Speeches (remarks) in debate on Address, 47 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3695 (ii), 4226 (iii).

Hansard, Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

Hillsborough Bridge Claims, on Inquiry for Ret., 3691 (ii).

Hindus, Immigrants and Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5489 (iii).

Hodgins, Major, Retirement of (remarks) 366 (i).

*See* 'G.T.P.,' &c.

House of Commons Act Amt. B. 66 (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for 2°, 5226 (iii).

House of Commons, Allottment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5729 (iii).

——— Employees, Apptmts. and Recommendations, &c. (Ans.) 3899 (ii).

——— Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 588 (i).

House of Commons and Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities (Ans.) 4760 (iii).

Hudson Bay Co., Lord Selkirk's Estate, Original Land Registers, &c. (Ans.) 4403 (iii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii); in Com., 6432 (iv).

Immigration Act, B.C., known as Natal Act, Disallowance of (Ans.) 567 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7077 (iv).

——— on Notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 6289 iv).

——— Par. in 'Canadian Gazette' (remarks) 7454 (iv).

Immigrants, Fraudulent Circular issued, &c. (remarks) 607 (i).

Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations (Ans.) 1939 (i).

Indian Lands, Sale in Algoma, Tel. from Mr. Sifton (read) 13416 (vii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*
Indian Lands (remarks) 13532 (vii).
Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6479 (iv).
Insurance, Supt. of, Salary (prop. res.) 12162 (vii).
I.C.R., Claims for Damages by A. W. Belyea (Ans.) 9472 (v).
——— Freight Rate *re* Fredericton, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Cor., 2562 (ii).
——— Moncton Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1509 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 7 (i).
International Boundary Line, Representation *re* Placing of Buildings (Ans.) 356 (i).
——— Correction of Answer, 519 (i).
Italy, Commercial Treaty with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10596 (vi).
Japanese Immigration, Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission (remarks) 1208 (i).
——— (remarks) 1424 (i).
Japanese Immigration into B.C. (remarks) on debate on Address, 58 (i).
——— Debate in Japanese Diet, *re* (remarks) 4738 (iii).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 947 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2090 (ii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs., Cor., Papers, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Ret., 864 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1929 (i).
*See* 'Anglo-Japanese,' &c., 'Dunsmuir.'
Kun, Agnes Ballum, Release of, from Gaol (remarks) 9335 (v).
Labour Rep. (presented) 841 (i).
Library of Parlt., Com. (M.) 312 (i).
Literary Aid Fund, Establishment of, by Govt. (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of (remarks) 230 (i).
Lumber Duty, &c. (remarks) 10259 (v).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Inland Rev. Dept. at Toronto and Sub-Postal Stations (Ques.) 5798 (iii).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Toronto Globe' *re* (remarks) 6986 (iv).
Major's Hill Park and G.T.R. Hotel (remarks) 1425 (i).
*See* 'G.T.R.,' &c.
Manitoba Boundaries (prop. res.) 12776 (vii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Consent of Legislature, &c. (remarks) 936 (i).
——— Bill *re* Extension (remarks) 1741 (i).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 2882 (ii), 7506 (iv), 11706 (vi).
Marier, J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission (Ans.) 2162 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, &c., ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4006 (ii).
——— Dep. Minister, Resignation of (remarks) 7996 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appointment of Ass't. Judge (remarks) 11312 (vi).
——— Delay in Investigation, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8453 (v).
——— Delay *re*, on M. for Sup., 9731 (v).
——— Evidence transmitted day by day to House (remarks) 8293 (v).
——— Evidence, Distribution of (remarks) 10789 (vi).
——— Issue of Judge Cassels' Commission (remarks) 6466 (iv).
——— Postponement of by Judge Cassels (remarks) 8385 (v).
Marine Deptl. Officials, Suspension, &c. (remarks) 6003 (iii).
Members appointed to Offices, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 46 (i).
Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3240 (ii).
Midland 'Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertising (Ans.) 3235 (ii).
Montreal Directory in Library of House, (Ans.) 4764 (iii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse, on Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).
Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditures *re* for the last fifty years (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3441, (amt.) 3442, Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii).
——— Claim of Govt. *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
Morning Sittings (M.) 9477; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 9495 (v).
Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°*, 5256 (iii); in Com., 11990 (vi).
Naval Defences, Imperial, Contributions by Canada (Ans.) 1118 (i).
N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9415 (v).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3019, 3075 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3675 (ii).
Newspaper Advertising, Amounts paid, &c. (remarks) 509 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, pro forma, 3 (i).
Obstruction Tactics *re* Dom. Elections Bill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).
Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10035 (v).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Office Specialty Co., and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Payments to (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Old Age Pensions (M.) for Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2423 (ii).

Ontario, Northern Division of Prov. (remarks) 8294 (v).

Order Paper, French and English Editions (remarks) 6852 (iv).

——— Printing in French (remarks) 5407 (iii).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals released since 1896, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2853 (ii).

Peace Interparliamentary Union, Meeting at Ottawa (remarks) 13581 (vii).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3971 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty Bill (prop. res.) 12162 (vii).

Pinette Harbour Dredging, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 9474 (v).

Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy, &c. (Ans.) 352 (i).

Postmasters, Rural, Salary Increases, &c. (Ans.) 183 (i).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 93 (i).

Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).

P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2742 (ii).

——— Mail Service, on M. (Mr. Martin) for Cor., &c., 1206 (i).

P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-Establishing of (Ans.) 8383 (v).

P.E.I., Queen's County, Complaints *re* Mail Service (Ans.) 355 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4650 (iii).

Printing and Lithographing outside of Canada, Amounts expended (Ans.) 1732, 1931 (i).

Printing, Supt. of, Apptmt. of a Frenchman (Ans.) 2978 (ii), 12411 (vii).

Printing of Parlt., Joint Com. (M.) 312 (i).

Private Bills Com., Extension of Time (M.) 891 (i).

Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and House of Commons (remarks) 10123 (v).

Provincial Subsidies, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 61 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3075 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents (remarks) 1384 (i).

Public Accounts Rep. and Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (M.) to ref. to Public Accounts Committee, 311 (i).

Public Bills and Orders, Priority of Procedure (remarks) 2940 (ii).

Public Documents, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1426 (i).

——— Production in Committees, 1428 (i).
*See* 'Documents.'

Quebec Bridge, Change of Plans *re* Height (Ans.) 5203 (iii).

——— Change of Site, &c. (remarks) 7931

Quebec Bridge Co., Govt. Grants, Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 2557 (ii).

——— Ref. to, in debate on Address, 544 (i).

Quebec Bridge Rep., Ques. of Order, 13403 (vii).

——— (remarks) 3901 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy, Apptmt. of Committee, 8440 (v).

Quebec Judges, Apptmt. of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Army and Navy Veterans (remarks) 7448 (iv).

——— Legal Holidays (Ans.) 7934 (iv).

——— Transportation of Volunteers remarks) 8378 (v).

Quebec Tercentenary, and Visit of Prince of Wales, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5210 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary: *See* 'Battlefields.'

Questions, Precedence of (Ans.) 350 (i).

Railway Act (water mains, &c.) Amt. B. 43 (Mr. Barr) on M. for 2°, 5225 (iii).

——— B. 85 (Mr. A. Lavergne) on M. for 2°, 5243 (iii).

——— (passenger tickets) Amt. B. 90 (Mr. J. D. Reid) on M. for 2°, 5245 (iii).

——— (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10644; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. for 3°, 11605 (vi).

——— (working hours) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. R. Smith)—(remarks) 10121 (v).

Ry. Subsidies (remarks) 12504 (vii).

——— on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for 569, 1739 (i), 2024 (ii), 6010 (iii).
*See* 'Sessional.'

Rolla L. Crain, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 3239 (ii).

Ross Rifle, Report from Public Accounts (remarks) 5914 (iii).

——— Target Practice, Suspension by N. W. M. Police (Ans.) 3818 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to amend, 2986 (ii).

Russian Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re* (Ans.) 2391 (ii).

St. Boniface Public Building, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 4246 (iii).

Ste. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay unpaid, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., 3012

St. Louis, H., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to (Ans.) 2977 (ii).

Saturday Sittings (M.) 11501 (vi).

School Statutes *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6866 (iv).

Seed Grain Distribution, Extension *re* (remarks) 5408 (iii).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1567 (i).

Sessional Returns, Number presented, &c. (Ans.) 2592 (ii).

Shipping Cos., Pacific Coast, Amount of Subsidies (Ans.) 6920 (iv).

Souris Ry. Wharf, P.E.I., Contract for (Ans.) 2386 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res., 3757 (ii).

S. A. School Teachers, Recognition by Govt. (Ans.) 2791 (ii).

South Huron Elections Expenses, Payment by Ret. Officer (Ans.) 11935 (vi).

Speech from Throne, Reply from Gov. Gen. (presented) 1584 (i).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8846 (v).

Stanstead By-election Papers, Destruction of (remarks) 8087 (iv).

——— Ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections (M.) 8887 (v).

Sub-Target Machines, on submitting Papers to Pub. Accts. Com. (remarks) 946 (i).

Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3286 (ii).

Superannuation and Retirement Acts, Payments under (Ans.) 7989 (iv).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5816 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10594 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Privy Council (salaries, &c.) 611 (i).

N. W. M. Police (compensations) 8870; (pay of force) 8863; (pensions) 8870; (salaries, &c.) 8863 (v).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10364 (vi).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Telegraph and Telephone Bill, and Man. Boundaries (remarks) 3043 (ii).

Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday (remarks) 13085 (vii).

Timber Berths, Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Ret. (amt.) 2856 (ii).

——— Returns, on Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 921; Ques. of Order, 921 (i).

Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5199 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3993 (ii).

Treaty Negotiations between Canada and U. S., &c. (remarks) 937 (i).

*See* 'Anglo-American.'

Trent Canal Extension, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2992 (ii).

Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c. (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to Senate (Ans.) 7936 (iv).

U. S. Training Ships passing through St. Lawrence Canals, Number, &c. (Ans.) 5789 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5338 (iii).

——— Inquiry as to Armaments, &c. (Ans.) 7502 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Wednesday Evening Sittings (M.) 9480 (v), 11232 (vi).

Winnipeg Bank Co.'s incorp. B. 19 (Mr. Henderson) in Com., 2788 (ii).

Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of (remarks) 7452 (iv).

Woollen Industry Relief, Legislation (remarks) 12772 (vii).

——— Memorandum from Mfg. Ass'n. read 13518-19 (vii).

——— Specific Duties (remarks) 6988 (iv).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9648 (v).

——— Finance Ret., on Inqiury for, 6464

——— Moral Reform, Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, on Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 10689 (vii).

——— (remarks) 10303 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law, Instructions to N. W. M. P. (remarks) 565 (i).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A., *Montmagny.*

Address, The, 476 (i).

Battlefields of Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); in Com., 4410, 4499; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4533 (iii).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Belgian Syndicate, Commission *re* Investigation (Ques.) 842 (i).

Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).

Cimon, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence (Ques.) 2545 (ii).

——— Payments *re* Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

——— Residence in District, &c. (Ques.) 2218 (ii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5900 (iii).

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. B. 161 (Mr. Beauparlant) on M. for 1°, 7319 (iv).

Customs Dues on French Books, Reduction *re* French Treaty (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3487 (ii).

——— Delays in Printing (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

——— French Supt. of Printing, &c. (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1827 (i).

French Language, Par. in 'La Presse,' Ques. of Priv., 8291 (v).

——— Pet. *re* (read) 8886 (v).

——— Ques. of Privilege *re* Par. in 'Le Soleil,' 1209 (i).

——— Use of on Railway Crossings, &c. (B. 85) 1° m., 2021 (ii).

Halifax Garrison, Replace by Imp. Troops (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3716 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6718 (iv).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1303 (i).

Immigration Premiums, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1287 (i).

I.C.R., Notices printed in French, &c. (Ques.) 7936 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2137 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1603 (i).

Japanese Syndicate *re* Purchasing of Land in Alberta (Ques.) 2162 (ii).

Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmnt. on Commissions (Ques.) 357 (i).

Justice, Administration of, in Quebec, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 842 (i).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1026 (i).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Interruption of Services, &c. (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

Marier, J. E., Emplymt. on G. T. P. Commission (Ques.) 2162 (ii).

Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4070 (ii).

Order Paper, Printing in French (remarks) 5407 (iii).

Postage Stamps, Designs for Quebec Tercentenary, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 7934 (iv).

——— New Series, Issue of (Ques.) 6397 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3095 (ii).

Quebec Superior Court, Apptmt. of Additional Judge (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary, Legal Holidays (Ques.) 7934 (iv).

——— Par. in 'Le Canada,' Ques. of Priv., 4669 (iii).

——— Postage Stamps, Printing in French and English (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

——— Postage Stamps (remarks) 8895 (v).

——— Rep. of Commission (remarks) 7449 (iv).

——— Visit of Prince of Wales, Par. in Halifax 'Chronicle,' Ques. of Priv., 5209 (iii).

Ques. of Privilege, Par. in 'La Presse' *re* Vote on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 2022 (ii).

——— Voting of French Members (remarks) 7993 (iv).

Railway Act (dual language) Amt. (B. 85) 1° m., 2021 (ii); 2° m., 5242 (iii).

——— (scheduled time) Amt. (B. 106) 1° m., 3655 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3914 (ii).

Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion (Ques.) 357 (i).

R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1026 (i).

Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau, Ques. of Priv., 7094 (iv).

School Acts, Saskatchewan, Disallowance of (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

——— Notice of Discussion, 6647 (iv).

——— (M.) to adjn., 6854 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3758 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4131 (ii).

Tercentenary at Quebec, Apptmt. of French Canadians as Commissioners, Ques. of Priv., 4770 (iii).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to Senate (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

LAVERGNE, Mr. L., *Drummond & Arthabaska.*

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10494 (vi).

'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privileges *re* (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Construction of, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3269 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Railways—I.C.R. (St. Cyrille diversion) 12756 (vii).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*

Presbyterian College Board (B. 154) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii); (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3189 (ii).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A., *Prince (P.E.I.)*

Adjournment of the House (M.) 4495 (iii).

Alberton Fire, Damage Claims, Inquiry for Ret., 1209 (i).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13053, 13055 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13494 (vii).

Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c. (Ques.) 681 (i).

Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders re Construction, &c. (Ques.) 513 (i).

Charlottetown, Pipe Line to Tank, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 5655 (iii).

Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract (Ques.) 4831 (iii).

Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907 (Ques.) 1733 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon anl Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13276 (vii).

Estimates, Discussion on Resolutions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1726 (i).

Fisheries Jurisdiction between Dom. and Provs., Instructions to Agent (Ques.) 3429 (ii).

——— Conference *re* (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6261 (iv).

Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 8382 (v).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Higgin's Shore, P.E.I., Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 694 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge Construction, Land Purchases, &c., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1686 (i).

——— Return, Inquiry for, 6160 (iii).

Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

Ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 10254 (v).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2444 (ii).

——— Motor Cars, Tests *re* Operation, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i).

Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 8444 (v).

Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Pet. *re* Issue of Licenses (Ques.) 2388 (ii).

Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts (Ques.) 10256 (v).

Mail Service between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9502 (v).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2430 (ii).

Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3892 (ii).

P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c. (Ques.) 359 (i).

P.E.I. Life-saving Stations, Establishment of (Ques.) 681 (i).

P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-establishment of (Ques.) 8383 (v).

P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1686 (i).

——— (M. for ret.) 2171 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 8696, 9893 (v).

——— (remarks) 11679 (vi).

P.E.I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet *re* Construction (Ques.) 6642 (iv).

——— Branch Lines, Cor., &c., *re* Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3254 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13490 (vii).

P.E.I. Ry., Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 8383 (v).

——— Station Agents, Salaries, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

——— Tenders *re* News Agency (Ques.) 8444 (v).

P.E.I. Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4606 (iii).

——— Rep. *re*, Inquiry for, 9893 (v).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer (Ques.) 2546 (ii).
——— Discussion, &c, 4496 (iii).
——— Ice-breaker Str., Rep. *re* Plans, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).
*See* 'Ice-breaker.'
P.E.I. Winter Service, Str. 'Stanley,' Route, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).
——— Withdrawal of Steamer, &c. (remarks) 1208 (i).
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Changes (Ques.) 1940 (i).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3920 (ii); in Com., 4975 (iii).
Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9821 (v).
Returns, Detention of by Members, Ques. of Priv., 5048 (iii).
Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I. (remarks) 3690, 3752 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3777 (ii); in Com., 13047 (vii).
'Stanley,' Str., Passenger Accommodation (Ques.) 687 (i).
Summerside Harbour and Str. 'Stanley' (remarks) 6160 (iii)
SUPPLY—
Marine (ice-breakers) 1899 (i).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2944, 2949 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, P. O.) 8576 (v); Ottawa (Mint) 1459 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Buctouche) 11679 (vi).
Tignish Breakwater Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3229 (ii).
Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 682 (i).
——— Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Tobacco Infractions of Inland Revenue Act. in P.E.I., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 9526 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General and Min. of Labour) Gaspe.

Alien Labour Regulations, Pet. *re* from Sault Ste Marie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12159 (vii).
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid to (Ans.) 12653 (vii).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Charges *re* Customs, Montreal (Ans.) 1347 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 134) 2° m., 5763 (iii).
Australian Representative from Canada in 1901, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2168 (ii).
Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 1291 (i).
Bonn P. O., Application *re* Mail Service (Ans.) 10516 (vi).
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Charges *re* Political Activity (Ans.) 6642 (iv).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 6404 (iv).
Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connections (remarks) 1436 (i).
Canadian Newspapers, Refund *re* American Surtax (Ans.) 5203 (iii).
C.P.R., Papineauville Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).
Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12489 (vii).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster (Ans.) 5654 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11403, 11636 (vi), 12179 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) *re* Distribution to Press, 5723 (iii).
Conciliation Boards, Applications *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) 2° m., 4547; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4566 (iii).
Cotton Strikers, Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Criminal Code (ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13317 (vii).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8897 (v).
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Denis des Saintes, Charges *re* (Ans.) 9474 (v).
Desaulniers, Mr. Gonzalve, Emplymt. as Translator, &c. (Ans.) 1121 (i).
Digby to Westport, Mail Contractor, Name, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iv).
Dom. Coal Co.'s Labour Dispute, Settlement Tel. (read) 4995 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11914 (vi), 13043 (vii).
Drop Letter One-cent Rate (remarks) 3159 (ii).
Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton Mail Contract, Renewal of (Ans.) 5257 (iii).
Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails (Ans.) 7731 (iv).
French Translation of Govt. Documents, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3183 (ii).
Glencoe Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3846 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 10733 (vi).
Harlaka Ry. Connections (remarks) 1437 (i).
Hindoo Immigrants, and Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).
House of Commons Post Office, Delays in Mails (remarks) 11939; (stmnt.) 12044 (vi).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906-8 (Ans.) 11704 (vi).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6444 (iv).
Immigration Agents in France (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9848 (v).
Japanese in B.C., Ques. of Priv. and Political Pamphlets, 12659 (vii).
Japanese Colony in the West, C.P.R. Application *re* (Ans.) 7197 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Rep. of Mr. King laid on Table, 1550 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2144 (ii).
——— Result of Mission (statement) 1585 (i).
Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 5201 (iii).
Labour Gazette, Cost of Printing, &c. (Ans.) 6407 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Japanese Investigation) Rep. (presented) 1583 (i).
'Lady Evelyn,' Date and Place of Wintering, &c. (Ans.) 7937 (iv).
Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privileges to (Ans.) 6058 (iii).
Letter Carriers, Hours of Service, Pay, &c. (Ans.) 7728 (iv).
Literature distributed through Mail (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9096 (v).
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 2980 (ii).
Mackinnon Post Office, Application *re* Establishment (Ans.) 10517 (vi).
Mail from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived, &c. (Ans.) 12653 (vii).
Mail Contract between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I. (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Mail Contract at Rimouski, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda' (Ans.) 5799 (iii), 8176 (iv).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing of, Inspection *re* (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Mail Matter delayed by C.P.R. Accident (remarks) 9724 (v).
——— (remarks) 9281 (v).
Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2215 (ii).
Mail Service to Atlantic Steamers, Cost per Annum (Ans.) 5656 (iii).
Mail Service in B.C. (remarks) 3754 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Mail Steamer, Purchase of (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Mail Service, Soulanges county, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 9278 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers, via Coteau Landing (Ans.) 9277 (v).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda,' &c. (Ans.) 5799 (iii), 8176 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12830 (vii).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence (Ans.) 7269 (iv).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 9275 (v).
Montreal P. O. Building Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8608 (v).
Montreal Post Office Defalcations, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 7198 (iv).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3446 (ii).
N. B. Election, Patronage of Federal Govt., &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3046 (ii).
Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery, &c. (Ans.) 11298 (vi).
——— Postal Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 6460 (iv).
Nicolet Post Office, Completion, Postmaster's Name, &c. (Ans.) 11499 (vi).
North Grove Post Office Ret., on Inquiry for, 5491 (iii).
Old Age Pensions Com., Progress *re* (remarks) 7722 (iv), 12660 (vii).
Opium Prohibition (B. 205) prop. Res., 12503; in Com. on Res., 12550; 2° m., 12851; on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).
Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8606 (v).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train (remarks) 1425 (i).
Port au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 11300 (vi).
Postage Stamps, New Series issued *re* Quebec Tercentenary (Ans.) 6398 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* (Ans.) 7934 (iv).
——— Special Issue (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangements of (remarks) 3040 (ii).
——— (statement) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3159 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3886 (ii).
Postal Notes Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 9279 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation (Ans.) 8175 (iv).

Postal Rates on Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re* (Ans.) 3484 (ii).

—— Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5201 (iii).

Postal Revenue, One Cent Rate (Ans.) 8381 (v).

Postal Service, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7263 (iv).

Postal Service Improvements (Ans.) 8891 (v).

—— Ret., on Inquiry for, 4832 (iii).

Postmasters' Assessments, Amounts collected, &c. (Ans.) 6459 (iv).

Post Office Act (P. O. supt., &c.) Amt. (B. 162) 1° m., 7931 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10703 (vi); on Senate Amts., 12393 (vii).

Post Offices built since 1904, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4761 (iii).

Post Office Irregularities in Western Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).

Post Office Returns, Number, &c. (Ans.) 6405 (iv).

Post Offices, Ret., on Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry. Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9094 (v).

Printing, Postal Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).

Quebec Religious Feuds, Letter of Rev. Mr. Dumesnil to Papal Ablegate, signed 'P. M. G., Ques. of Priv., 11501 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Postage Stamps, &c. (Ans.) 7935 (iv), 8895 (v), 12414 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5491 (iii).

Ricard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Riviere du Loup Postmaster, Resignation and Salary (Ans.) 6399 (iv).

Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

Ryan, Mr. G. M., Apptmt. of a Successor (Ans.) 7504 (iv).

St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. *re* Postmaster, Pet., &c. (Ans.) 5797 (iii).

St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office Savings Bank, Recommendation *re* (Ans.) 4828 (iii).

St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster (Ans.) 5795 (iii).

St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

St. Peter's Bay Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1687 (i).

St. Peters Post Office, on Inquiry for Ret., 2787 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Sandy Cove Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 8891 (v).

Scotch Hill East, Post Office, Establishment of (Ans.) 2793 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).

Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes, &c. (Ans.) 4766 (iii).

Southvale, N.S., Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 4829 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10599 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (salaries) 12159 (vii); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8872; (salaries) 8872 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9848 (v).

Labour Dept. ('Gazette') 12261 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (cotton strikers) 13156 (vii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (Oriental immigration) 13156 (vii); (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii).

Post Office (contingencies) 5562; (Durston, R., promotion) 5561 (iii); (extra assistance) 9112; (inspectors) 9092 (v), 13155 (vii); (mail service) 5561 (iii); (North Bay inspectors) 13152 (vii); (outside service) 9092; (stamps, &c.) 9111; (uniforms, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7459; (Hamilton, post office) 7697 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Levis) 7298; (Montreal, barracks) 7408; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7427 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5705 (iii); Montreal post office) 7411; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Montreal station B) 7419; (Quebec drill hall) 7431; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12129 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10371 (vi).

Tenders, Advertisements *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7477 (iv).

Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 2594 (ii).

Town Site, Erection of Public Buildings (Ans.) 1348 (i).

Trent Canal, Clearing of Logs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10310 (vi).

Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith and Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2887 (ii).

—— Salary, &c. (Ans.) 2794 (ii).

Yukon Mail Service, Complaints *re*, 2022 (ii).

—— Service during Winter (remarks) 5137 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *Simcoe, S.*

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, &c., on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4708 (iii).

Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c. (Ques.) 3037 (ii).

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379 (iii).

Battlefields of Canada (B. 111) in Com. on Res., 3901 (ii); in Com., 4507; on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2818

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671 (iv).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6522 (iv).

Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission (Ques.) 5474 (iii).

Campaign Literature sent from Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10346 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res.. 6164. 6215 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12874 (vii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12848 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6875 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12882 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11361; on M. for 1°, 10729; in Com., 11394, 11553, 11659 (vi), 12183 (vii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9203 (v).

Criminal Code (ry. act.) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13318 (vii).

Devil's Elbow, Canal Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals,, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1155 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1776 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11869 (vi), 13020 (vii).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 9333 (v).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6750 (iv).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4678 (iii); in Com., 6912 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13263 (vii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4545, 4577 (iii).

Foreign Purchases, Customs Collection *re* (Ques.) 5475 (iii).

Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3615 (ii).

Fritz Cirkel, Mining Engineer, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7202 (iv).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief B. 129 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3622. 3794 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5497 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6270 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141, 7667, 8125 (iv), 8609, 8741, 9377 (v).

G.T.P., Classification of District 'B' and 'F,' Inspections *re* (Ques.) 12051 (vii).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12675 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12271; (amt.) Minority Rep.. 12291. (Neg. (Y. 53; N. 98) 12388 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2233 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

Grazing and Irrigation Lands, Reserved by Govt. (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

Grazing Lands Reservations, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

Grazing Ranches, Names and Addresses of Lessees in Township 12 to 19 (Ques.) 7210 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3226, (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., &c., 3228, in Com., 3692; on M. for 3°, 4540 (iii).

——— on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).

High Commissioner's Office, Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 10737 (vi).

Holliday, Mr. P., Payments of additional Living Allowance (Ques.) 5475 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10497 (vi).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6446 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re* (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

——— Inquiry for, 8607, 8696, 9890 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Immigration, O.C. *re* B.C. (remarks) 8171 (iv), 11018 (vi).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7029 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6902 (iv).
I.C.R. Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4492 (iii).
Japanese Immigration, Restriction *re* B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1752 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, &c., on (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).
Judges' Salaries, Application *re* Payments (remarks) 11018 (vi).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).
Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526; in Com., 10527 (vi).
Lockerby & McCombe, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues (Ques.) 11935 (vi).
Lyall & Sons, Storage of Refuse on Harbour Property (Ques.) 11936 (vi).
McInnes, Hon. W. B., Employment in the Yukon, Total Amount paid to, &c. (Ques.) 5794 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12801 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Brodeur) to Com. of Sup., 7342 (iv).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emolument, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).
Mining Regulations, published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette' (M. for copy*) 5801 (iii).
Ministers of Crown and Govt. Contracts and Subsidies (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9415 (v).
National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501 (vii).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11997 (vi).
N.B. Cold Storage Co and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9398; (amt.) 9415 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter *re* (Ques.) 2392 (ii).
Obstruction to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9935 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10020 (v).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4108 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. Fisher) *re* Montreal Liquor Licenses, 4065 (ii).
Pacific Coast Insurance B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182 (iii), 6230 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv).
Presbyterian College Board, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7669 (iv).
Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).
Quebec Harbour Improvements, Specification, &c., Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c. (M. for copies*) 5802 (iii).
Quebec and New Brunswick B. 128 (M.) Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).
Quebec Tercentenary, Rural Corps, Letter from Mr. G. W. Stoddart (read) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3412 (ii).
———(demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean on M. for 2°, 3369 (ii).
——— (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3905 (ii); in Com., 4964 (iii).
——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 10625; in Com., 10639 (vi).
Ross Rifle Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham (remarks) 3903 (ii).
——— Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c. (Ques.) 4404 (iii).
Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7677 (iv).
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4546, 4580 (iii).
Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).
Seed Grain Distribution, O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6634 (iv).
——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 6981 (iv).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5409, 5519; (amt.) 5445 (iii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3767 (ii).
Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2785 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Canals (repairs) 10306 (vi); Trent (construction) 12225 (vii); (surveys) 10339 (vi).
Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9257 (v).
Excise—(travelling expenses, &c.) 814 (i).
House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).
Immigration (agents) 9854 (v).
Justice (salaries) 5505 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (pensions) 13324 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol, 3996 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 10292 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 13339 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph) 13331; (Markham) 13331; (Walkerville) 13333 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Barracks) 7409 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Richelieu) 12039 (vi).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 11103 (vi).
Railways (extra clerks) 10346; G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10380; (inspection) 10390 (vi).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12766 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10129 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10357 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.,) 10388 (vi); (Quebec Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1413, 1414 and 1415, Applications, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 2398 (ii).

——— Inquiry for, 4833 (iii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3996 (ii).

Trent Canal, Bradford, Building of (remarks) 13476 (vii).

——— Engineer's Rep., Inquiry for, 6925 (iv).

——— Newmarket, Extension to Devil's Elbow (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).

——— Holland River Extension (remarks) 11939 (vi).

——— Surveys, Inquiry for 6988 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) on Order for 2°, 779 (i); in Com., 4581 (iii).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 77 (Mr. Sloan) on Senate Amts., 6190 (iii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6187 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10275 (v).

Winding-Up Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6523 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith, and Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2889 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10531 (vi).

Yukon, Judges Salaries (remarks) 11123 (vi).

——— Official Administrators, Charges against *re* Settlement of Estates, &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Yukon Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c. (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 4588, 4589 (iii).

——— Public Administrators, Charges against, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

LEONARD, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Bridge Subsidies to Rys. (amt.) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 13310 (vii).

Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster (Ques.) 5653 (iii).

Chambly Common, Area, Rental &c. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).

Lobster Fishery Overseers in Lunenburg, &c., Names, &c. (Ques.) 2793 (ii).

Montreal Directory in Library of House (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3442 (ii).

Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 5654 (iii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Holidays for Officers (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

——— Officials interfering in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).

——— Votes of Officers in Municipal Affairs (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4029 (ii).
Penitentiaries— (binder twine) 5522, 5530; St. Vincent de Paul (meat contracts) 5519; (officials) 5538 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *Huron, W.*

Address, The, 242 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Distribution to Press (remarks) 5723 (iii).

Criminal Code Amendments, Placing on Govt. Orders (remarks) 9281 (v).

Criminal Code (offensive weapons) Amt. (B. 78) 1° m., 1668 (i).

——— (assaults) Amt. (B. 79) 1° m., 1670 (i).

——— (hunting) Amt. (B. 93) 1° m., 2590 (ii).

——— (motors) Amt. (B. 140) 1° m., 5993 (iii).

Immigration Act (concealed weapons) Amt. (B. 65) 1° m., 1284 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12789 (vii).

Pulp Wood, Export Duty on (prop. res.) 4774 (iii).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3923

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1530 (i).

Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7449 (iv).

LOGAN, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12480 (vii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4386 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3512 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 1992 (i).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2460 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4460 (iii).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3066 (ii).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2417 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Pugwash wharf) 11280 (vi); Railways—I.C.R. (train service) 10165 (v).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Budget, The 6553 (iv).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6169 (iii).

Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Cigarettes, Sale and Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5253 (iii).

France and Canada SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6195 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7230 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4863 (iii).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6522 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12648; in Com., 13056 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5895 (iii).

Conciliation Boards, Application *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations Act, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1160 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13012 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3626 (ii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6256 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9467 (v).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12723 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12340 (vii).

——— counsel fees, payment of (M.) 13578 (vii).

I.C.R., Employees and Municipal Elections, on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4479 (iii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11222 (vi).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12827 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel, for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7381 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9489 (v).

Phoenix Assurance Co.'s (B. 167) 1°*, 8603 (v).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2745 (ii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4647 (iii).

Railway Act (liability) Amt. (B. 27) 1° m., 430 (i); on Order for 2°, 5211; in Com., 5246 (iii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3783 (ii); in Com., 12602 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4138 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (icebreakers) 2966 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston military buildings) 10909 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Caribou Island) 11225; (Round Hill) 11286 (vi).

Railways — I. C. R. (Campbellton) 12258; (double tracking) 12250; (Moncton, additional line) 12760; (Moncton, car shops) 12250 (vii); (rolling stock) 5558 (iii).

Railways—Railway Commission (Quebec Bridge) 12770 (vii).

Sutherland Rifle Sight Co., Patent Relief (B. 63) 1°*, 1283 (i).

MACDONALD, E. M.—*Con.*

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2712 (ii).

Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8778 (v).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *Toronto, S.*

Canada-Australian SS. Subvention, Continuance of (Ques.) 941 (i).

Canadian Naval Stations, Maintenance of, Arrangement with G. B. (Ques.) 1117 (i).

Canadians entering U.S., Deportation of Macedonians, &c. (remarks) 2738 (ii).

——— Letter form Messrs. Allen, Cassels & Defries (read) 2739 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt. (B. 28) 1° m., 508; 2° m., 939 (i).

Cosgrave, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation (Ques.) 5797 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. (B. 29) 1° m., 508 (i); 2° m., 5247 (iii).

Dom. Notes Outstanding, Total Amount 1907, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).

Dredging Contract, Basis of Payments, &c. (Ques.) 9710 (v).

Drop Letter, One-cent Rate (remarks) 3158 (ii).

Electrical Power exported at Niagara Falls, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*). 2397 (ii).

Fisheries Protection, Amounts expended since 1885, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).

Foss, C. O., Apptmt. on G.T.P. Engineering Staff, &c. (Ques.) 358 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3500 (ii).

Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 353 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ques.) 10731 (vi).

G.T.P., Apptmt. of Engineer at Kenora (Ques.) 895 (i).

——— Changes in Engineering Staff (Ques.) 509, 681 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

——— Resignation of Major Hodgins, Appointment of Successor (Ques.) 358 (i).

G.T. Ry., Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 556 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3194, 3700 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4358 (iii).

Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 1128 (i).

Immigrants, Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto, Tel. (read) &c. 185 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Questions, 242 (i).

Immigration Act, B.C., known as Natal Act, Disallowance of (Ques.) 567 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Insurance Bill, Introduction of (Ques.) 9272 (v).

Insurance Commission, Exhibits of Commercial Travellers' Mutual Benefit Society, Originals, asked for, 7988 (iv).

Insurance Companies' Deposits, -Total Amount, Securities, &c. (Ques.) 241 (i).

Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7 (Ques.) 897 (i).

Letter Carriers, Hours of Service, Pay, &c. (Ques.) 7728 (iv).

Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept. (Ques.) 5797 (iii).

Militia—Board of Officers, Rep. *re* Pay and Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 2165 (ii).

Militia Permanent Corps, Commission *re* Pay, &c. (Ques.) 1292 (i).

Naval Defence, Imperial, Contributions by Canada, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).

Naval Instructions, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c. (Ques.) 1119 (i).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4996 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and the U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3166 (ii).

Printing and Lithographing, Expenditure by Govt. outside of Canada (Ques.) 1506, 1732, 1931 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 2397 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8851 (v).

Railway Commission (Ass't Chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3928 (ii); in Com., 4985 (iii).

Railway Commission, Total Expenditure in Counsel Fees, &c. (Ques.) 10256 (v).

Returns, Inquiry for, 569 (i), 2885 (ii).

Smith, Wm. R., Patent Relief (B. 198) 1°*, 12393 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3820 (ii).

Standard Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 132) 1°*, 5337 (iii).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 41) 1°*, 754 (i); in Com., 6183 (iii).

Sugar Manufacture, Regulation *re* Saccharine Standards (Ques.) 351 (i).

SUPPLY—

Militia (annual drill) 5745 (iii).

Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Term of Settlement, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4774 (iii).

Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans by Militia Dept. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

Toronto Harbour, Murray & Cleveland's Contract *re*, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Toronto Harbour (eastern gap) Amount of Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 354 (i).

——— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, Changes, &c. (Ques.) 1507 (i).

Toronto Harbour (western gap) Construction of Entrance, &c. (Ques.) 354, 518 (i), 4587 (iii).

——— Delay in Contract (remarks) 5915 (iii).

Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 2594 (ii).

Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 95) 1° m., 2974 (ii).

Woollen Industry, Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c. (Ques.) 7504 (iv).

Yukon Gold Co., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c. (Ques.) 7725 (iv).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8486 (v).

MACLAREN, Mr. A. F., *Perth, N.*

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11255 (vi).

Goderich Military Camp, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R. (Ques.) 184 (i).

International Tunnel, Windsor, Customs Duty *re* Construction Material, &c. (Ques.) 3840 (ii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11080 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K., *Lunenburg.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12870, 13052 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) 5648 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1718 (i).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3021; in Com., 3035 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9363 (v).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3113 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order, 3083 (ii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge Commission, Rep., Evidence, &c. (M.) to ref. to Special Committee, 10401 (vi).

——— Rep. of Sel. Com. (M.) to conc., 13353; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 13373 (vii).

Rules of the House, Amendments to (prop. Res.) 2984 (ii).

Shipping Act Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 313 (i).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7754 (iv).

Supplies purchased by Govt., &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5834 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (dredging) 13341 (vii); (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *Huron S.*

Budget Speech by Fin. Min., Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11871 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *York (O.) S.*

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10935, 10941 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); in Com., 4504; on M. for 3°, 4532 (iii).

Belleville and Hastings Ry., Cor. with G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2808 (ii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Connections (remarks) 433 (i).

Buildings, Administrative, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Business of the House, Precedence on Tuesday (remarks) 2982 (ii).

——— Public Bills, &c. (remarks) *re* Procedure, 2786 (ii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12845; in Com., 12849 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10718, 10729; in Com., 11635 (vi).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Criminal Code (trade restraint) Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2976 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126; in Com., 11170 (vi).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1692 (i).

Foresters' Subsidiary High Court B. 62 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5175 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).
G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3726 (ii).
——— on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. to Com., 3362 (ii).
Hindus in B.C., Protest *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).
House of Commons Chamber, Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10979 (vi).
I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4484 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12787 (vii).
Marconi System, Regulation of Rates, &c. (Ques.) 174 (i).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3031 (ii).
Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C.P. Ry., Extension, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7657 (iv).
Public Bills and Orders, Precedence of (remarks) 2939, 3405 (ii).
Ry. Act (demurrage, &c.) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 93; on Order for 2° (remarks) 938 (i); 2° m., 3320 (ii).
——— (tel. cos.) Amt. (B. 11) 1° m., 231 (i).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3904 (ii).
Ry. Act (ry. comn.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10783; (amt.) 11602; on M. for 3°, 11613; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11619; on Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11633 (vi).
Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2903 (ii).
Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 8185 (iv).
Standard Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 71) 1°*, 1424 (i).
Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3282 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents, &c.) 9851 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 10291 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2965 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi); Ont. (Guelph, armoury) 7678 (iv).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., 907 (i).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade (remarks) 3901 (ii).
Toronto Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13417

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Water Carriage of Goods Bill (remarks) 13415 (vii).

MACPHERSON, Mr. R. G., *Vancouver City.*
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12472 (vii).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5380 (iii).
Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9741 (v).
British Columbia Chartered Bank incorp. (B. 59) 1°*, 1283 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10745 (vi).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax (Ques.) 513 (i).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5132 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11384 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13032 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.'s (B. 101) 1°*, 3477 (ii); in Com., 6180 (iii), 6223 (iv).
G.T.P., Supplies to Prince Rupert via Seattle (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10376 (vi).
Hindus, Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 5337 (iii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).
Indian Dept., Extravagent Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11031, 11062 (vi).
Indian Lands, B.C. Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 627 (i).
Japanese entering B.C., Passports, &c. (Ques.) 4243 (iii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 719 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2087 (ii).
——— on Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605 (i).
Japanese Immigration Restriction and B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1760 (i).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3018 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894, 7231; on M. for 3°, 7219 (iv).
Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 754 (i); in Com., 6182 (iii), 6227 (iv).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4983 (iii).

MACPHERSON, Mr. R. G.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9086 (v).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 627 (i); Interior (astronomical surveys) 9741 (v).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3187 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10865; (Quesnel) 10868; (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10871 (vi); N.S. (Antigonish) 7121 (iv).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10703 (vi).

Vancouver Bank incorp. (B. 32) 1°*, 606 (i); in Com., 4580 (iii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 5255; in Com., 6183 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9662 (v).

McCARTHY, Mr. L. G., *Simcoe, N.*

Canada Shipping Act (marine engineers) Amt. (B. 17) 2° m., 3414 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11360; in Com., 11382 (vi).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1143 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12986 (vii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10762 (vi).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief B. 139 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 6190 (iii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Birnie and Noble (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 987 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12405 (vii).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3017 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3012 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 17) 1° m., 349 (i).

SUPPLY—

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2947, 2949 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10379 (vi).

Supreme Court Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5497 (iii).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Buffalo imported from Montana for Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments *re* (Ques.) 847 (i).

Buffalo Herds for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

Buildings in Man. and N.W., Amounts paid by Govt., &c. (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Calgary Town Sites (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9775 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546 (vi).

'Coquitlam,' Str., Seizure of, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11133; in Com., 11159, 11177, 11426, 11524, 11957; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 11975 (vi).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Game Preserve, Alberta, Buffalo imported from Montana, Payments *re* (Ques.) 847 (i).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6326 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6443 (iv).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 955 (i).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).

Irrigation in West, Investigations *re* Measurements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9989 (v).

Japanese Immigration, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).

Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B.C., Number, &c. (Ques.) 692 (i).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 10527 (vi).

Life-Boats in B. C., Purchase of, from U. S. (Ques.) 683 (i).

McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 688 (i).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4981 (iii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4666 (iii).

Russian Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 683 (i), 2391 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1376 (i).

S. A. Veterans, Land Grants to, &c. (Ques.) 563 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12605 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10049; (surveys) 9989 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9967; (Doukhobors) 9956 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12750 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5756 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10979 (vi).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Timber Berths in Man. and N. W. Ters., under Licenses, Applicants' Names, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2347 (ii).

Wireless Tel. Station on Pacific Coast, Erection of (Ques.) 683 (i).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *Northumberland, W. (O.)*

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Budget, The, 6073 (iii).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 14) 1°*, 350 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary Postage Stamps, Issue of Denominations (Ques.) 12414 (vii).

McCOOL, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*

Copper Cliff Postmaster and Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11916 (vi).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, on M. for Sup., 7805 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11914 (vi), 12973 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3626 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Reports, &c. (M.) for Copies, 1941 (i).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5438 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7811 (iv); Ottawa (Museum) 1503 (i).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatchewan.*

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11463, 11948 (vi).

Doukhobors, Manner of Living (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6323 (iv).

Keewatin Diocese incorp. (B. 179) 1°*, 9889 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7658 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 153) 1°*, 6525; in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8560, 8610, 9068, 9166 (v).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2924 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1363 (i).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (general expenses) 5752 (iii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 652, &c., Applications, &c., &c., (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

—— Nos. 645, &c., Original Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

McINTYRE, Mr. G. H., *Perth, S.*

Address, The, 455 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5130 (iii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5482 (iii).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13094 (vii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6842, 6928 (iv).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1024 (i).

Patent Medicine B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12623 (vii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4970 (iii).

Rules of the House, Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2986 (ii).

Senate Reform (prop. res.) 1513 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12607 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1458 (i).

Wheat Transportation in N. W., Financial Aid by Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2211 (ii).

McINTYRE, Mr. W., *Strathcona.*

Address, The, 445 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 81) 1°*, 1732 (i); in Com., 4231 (iii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 891 (i).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2585 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11171, 11420, 11502 (vi).

Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4577 (iii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6436 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6735, 6956 (iv).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11034 (vi).

Inspection and Sale Act (oats) Amt. (B. 114) 1° m., 4312 (iii).

McINTYRE, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7262 (iv).

Ruthenian Catholic Mission, &c., incorp. (B.69) 1°*, 1424 (i).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1°*, 1424 (i); in Com., 4231, 4546, 4579 (iii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1358 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3760 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5528 (iii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2327 (ii).

McKENZIE, Mr. P. H., *Bruce, S.*

Agriculture Com.'s Rep. (M.) to conc., 12409 (vii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) 191 (i).

Budget, The, 6573 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12883 (vii).

G.T. Ry. and C.P.R., Connection at Wingham (remarks) 191 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Address, The, 420 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).

Bear River Station Dwelling, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9473 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6204 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12648 (vii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12842 (vii).

Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7246 (iv).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 517 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11984 (vi).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso, &c. (Ques.) 5651 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).

Draper, Mr., and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Offices (Ques.) 687 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8503 (v).

Fishing Licenses, River John, Inquiry for Ret., 10511 (vi).

Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor, &c. (Ques.) 3427 (ii).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6252 (iv).

Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10490 (vi).

——— Post Office, Delays in Mails (remarks) 11939 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act, Violations, Inquiry for Ret., 4964 (iii).

I.C. Ry. Rates, Increase in Winter to P. E. I. (Ques.) 5995 (iii).

Legal Agents for Govt. in P. E. I., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Lobster Fisheries, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N. S. *re* Regulations (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

Lobster Fishing in Lunenburg, &c., N.S., Reps. *re* Undersized Fish (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

Lobster Hatchery, License to E. H. McLennan and G. A. Redmond, Pets., Cor. &c. (M. for ret.*) 2983 (ii).

Louisburg, Harbour, N.S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906, &c. (Ques.) 7503 (iv).

——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 3428 (ii).

——— Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c. (Ques.) 4401 (iii).

McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I., Post Office (M. for cor.*) 5087 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12813 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4002 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7333 (iv).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6892 (iv).

Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S., &c. (Ques.) 5650 (iii).

'Montague,' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 182 (i).

Naval Schools, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9221 (v).

Pinette Harbour Dredging, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 9474 (v).

Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 3898 (ii).

Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 10254 (v).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Port Hood Harbour Works, Closing of Northern Entrance (Ques.) 10255 (v).

P.E.I., Lighthouse Supplies, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 358 (i).

——— Souris Breakwater, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1685 (i).

——— Subsidy, Deduction *re* Hillsborough Bridge (Ques.) 5079 (iii).

——— Terms of Union with Dom., Nonfulfilment of, &c., Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 5801 (iii).

——— Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4620 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry., Bear River Station Master's Dwelling, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1737 (i).

——— Branch Lines, Construction re, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3261 (ii).

——— Construction of Freight Sheds, &c., Specifiations, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 5086 (iii).

——— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12631 (vii).

——— Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).

——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 850 (i).

——— (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10715 (vi).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9806 (v).

Scotch Hill East Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 2793 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. for Sup., 7732 (iv).

Souris Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Souris Ry. Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 2386 (ii).

——— Permission to Build, &c. (Ques.) 7728 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3767, 3825 (ii); in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9770 (v).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9221, 9237 (v).

House of Commons (accommodation) 10490 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (wireless stations) 5045 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5768 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2947, 2949; (obstructions) 3212; (winter mail service) 3216; (wrecks) 3195 (ii).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 9092 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Experimental Farms (repairs, &c.) 10905 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8572 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, militia clothes) 10908 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 12027 (vi).

Public Works—Marine (ship channel) 5038 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (claims dept.) 10177 (v) P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claims) 12763 (vii).

Tobacco, Customs Seizure at Charlottetown, Penalties *re*, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).

Tobacco Infractions of Inland Rev. Act in P.E.I., on M. for Sup., 9514 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).

Tobacco Manufacturers in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines and Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 363 (i).

Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c. (Ques.) 9476 (v).

Travelling Expenses of R. A. Wiallard *re* Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3987 (ii).

Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 5471 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6136 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c. (M.) 10259 (v).

——— Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 5996 (iii).

McLEAN, Mr. P. D., *Centre York.*

Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).

McLENNAN, Mr. A., *Inverness.*

Ancoin *vs.* The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N.S. (M. for cor.*) 558 (i).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2589 (ii).

Dog Fish Reduction Works at Canso, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 5790 (iii).

Inverness County and Increased Ry. Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9546 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Inverness) 7173 (iv); (Lake Ainslie) 11228; (Margaree) 11229; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268 (vi).

McLENNAN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton, additional line) 12761; (stations) 12233 (vii).

MARCIL, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*

Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co. of N. B. (B. 76) 1°*, 1584 (i).

MAJOR, Mr. C. B., *Labelle.*

C.P.R., Papineauville to Little Nation River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *Elgin, E.*

Aylmer, Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1506 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6206 (iii).

Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment (Ques.) 351 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1242 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3604 (ii).

Fraser, A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Apple Packing, &c. (remarks) 2766 (ii).

Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 516 (i).

Govt. Securities *re* Dom. Notes, &c. (Ques.) 6235 (iv).

Immigration Agents in East Elgin, Number employed (Ques.) 692 (i).

Meat and Canned Foods B. 149, in Com., 7227; on M. for 3°, 7215 (iv).

Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Port Burwell Harbour, Contracts, Payments, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3924 (ii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).

Salvation Army Immigrants, Stmnt. of Genl. Booth (Ques.) 2390 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Meats and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5750 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10894 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7493; (Leamington) 7815; (St. Mary's) 7828; (Owen Sound) 7824 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (improvements, &c.) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of, &c. (remarks) 8439 (v).

Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 685 (i).

Budget, The, 6113 (iii).

Charlottetown Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Sailing Vessels (M. for copy*) 6240 (iv).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5099 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10723; in Com., 11559 (vi).

Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c. (Ques.) 515 (i).

Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. of Board of Trade, P.E.I. (Ques.) 5470 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13273 (vii).

Express Charges in Mar. Provinces, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 518 (i).

Fisheries Dispute between Dom. and Mar. Provs., Jurisdiction *re* (Ques.) 2395 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10563 (vi).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6250 (v).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1342 (i).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2450 (ii).

——— Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10157 (v).

Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Lobster Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I. (M. for cor.) 5475 (iii).

Lobster Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road P. O. (M. for cor.*) 5087 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12798 (vii).

Murray Harbour Branch Ry. Improved Service, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 6239 (iv).

——— Inquiry for, 10123 (v).

Peat for Fuel, Deposits in Canada, Industry, &c. (Ques.) 515 (i).

Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging (Ques.) 685 (i).

Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 4588 (iii).

Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c. (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3895 (ii).

P.E.I. Fishing Bounties, Stmnt. of Payments (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service (Ques.) 355 (i).

——— Steam Communication between P.E.I. and C. B. (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 12754, 13353 (vii).

——— Tunnel, Information *re* (Ques.) 562 (i).

P.E.I., Winter Communication, Freight carried, Freight Rates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 936 (i).

——— (Ques.) 843 (i).

P.E.I., Winter Communication, Mail Service, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1203 (i).

——— Tunnel Construction, Tels., Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 4589 (iii).

——— Withdrawal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

——— (remarks) 1207 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1109 (i).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Cor., &c., *re* Construction (M. for copies) 3242, 3272 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Claims of Mr. James Maher, &c. (Ques.) 3834 (ii).

——— Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

——— Freight Rates, Delegates from P.E.I., Reps. *re* (M. for copies*)6240 (iv).

——— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 12408; on M. for 2°, 12628; in Com., 12631 (vii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2745 (ii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Mr. Haney's Claim, Progress *re* (remarks) 7100 (iv).

——— Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9094 (v).

——— Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure and Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 848 (i).

———Time-Table, Protest *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour (Ques.) 568 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11630 (vi).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3926 (ii); in Com., 4978 (iii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9811 (v).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5491 (iii), 7722 (iv).

MARTIN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Returns, Unopposed (remarks) 5914 (iii).

St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1686 (i).

St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Charges against Mrs. Finlay, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1687 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2786 (ii).

Seed Grain, Distribution *re*, Purchases in P.E.I. (remarks) 3157 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7738 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3812 (ii); in Com., 12610 (vii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12754 (vii).
Militia (annual drill) 5736 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1085 (i); (obstructions) 3213; (winter mail service) 3218 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 13339 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (New London) 11292; N.S. (Port Hood) 11276; P.E.I. (repairs) 11292; (Rustico) 11293 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10157 (v).

Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5564 (iii).

Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route (Ques.) 11297 (vi).

Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).

West India Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations (remarks) 1860 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal (St. Mary's).*

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6728 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6511 (iv).

Monteal Excise Officers, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4911 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13393 (vii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 100) 1° m., 3316 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (provisional allowances) 817 (i).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*

G.T.P., Madawaska Right of Way (remarks) 12661 (vii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7176 (iv).

MICHAUD, Mr. P.—*Con.*

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3068 (ii).

Quebec and New Brunsick Ry. Co.'s (B. 128) 1°*, 5255; in Com., 6181 (iii), 6225 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *Grey, S.*

Address, The, 148 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3860 (ii).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Budget, The, 5567 (iii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res (Mr. Blain) 5104 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 11707; in Com., 11844 (vi), 12944 (vii).

Fruit Inspection *re* Apple Packing, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 2764 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).

Indian Department, Extravagent Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11068 (vi).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 7261 (iv).

Presbyterian Widows' and Orphans' Fund B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2789 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3102 (ii).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H McIntyre) 1533 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12620 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12749 (vii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4058 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Owen Sound) 7817; P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7185 (iv).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2359 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10693 (vi); on Sen. Amts., 13045 (vii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., on M. Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2194 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 6232 (iv).

Address, The, 535 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3875 (ii).

——— All-Red Line, Irish Route, Opposition by Govt. (Ques.) 10253 (v).

——— Letter to Mr. Sifton from Prime Minister (remarks) 948 (i).

——— Negotiations, Canadian Representatives in England, &c. (Ques.) 353 (i).

——— Tenders, Proposals, &c., Cor. *re* (Ques.) 6460 (iv).

Anglo-American Treaty, Submitted to Can. Govt. (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative (Ques.) 8611 (v).

——— Purchase of Goods, &c. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

——— Total Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor. Rep., &c. (M. for copies) 594 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4395 (iii).

Becancour, Blanche. &c., Dredging at during 1907, &c. (Ques.) 3040 (ii).

Bonus System, *re* Immigration (notice of motion) 6288 (iv).

Bridge Subsidies to Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13311 (vii).

B.C. Appeal Court B. 165 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 8466 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6169, 6174, 6192 (iii), 6409 (iv).

Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12868 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5125 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10724; in Com., 11573 (vi).

Clarke City, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 2394 (ii).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

Co-operative Societies (B. 5) 1° m., 92; on Order for 2°, 583 (i).; on M. for 2°, 4558; in Com., 4564 (iii).

——— (M.) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii).

Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to (Ques.) 9277 (v).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2544 (ii).

Cumberland Railway and Coal Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 891; 2°*, 1109 (i).

Debates, Official, 4th Rep. (translators) Notice to ref. back to Debates Com., 9709 (v).

——— M. to ref back to Com., 10225; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 94) 10252 (v).

——— (remarks) 9889, 10119 (v).

Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, Contractor, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 5464 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8116, 8138 (iv).

Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3896 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

Dredging in Quebec Prov., Claims pending, &c. (Ques.) 7200 (iv).

Dredging in Vaudreuil Co., Supt.'s Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10763 (vi).

Fisheries Treaties, Boundaries with U. S. (remarks) 6632 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1397 (i); on M. for 2°, 2221 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4317 (iii).

Frano-Canadian Trade Treaty, Consideration of Proposed Convention, (M.) for Sel. Com., 923 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 12651 (vii).

——— Shipments from Canada, &c. (Ques.) 4763 (iii).

*See* 'Can. and France,' &c.

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3423 (ii).

Govt. Vessels, Pay of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 10736 (vi).

Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students (prop. res.) 3288 (ii).

G.T.P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

G.T.P., Winnipeg to Moncton, Number of Miles completed, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 6643 (iv).

House of Commons, Rules for Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr, Wright) 592 (i).

Hudson, Dredging,, Total Expenditure, 1907 (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8 (Ques.) 11703 (vi).

Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906-07 (Ques.) 11704 (vi).



MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Immigrants landed in Canada to June, 1907, Number deported, &c. (Ques.) 3839 (ii).

Immigrants reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c. (Ques.) 6921 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B.135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5658 (iii); in Com., 6436 (iv).

Immigration Agents in France, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9840 (v).

——— (notice of motion) 4769 (iii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of *re* Agents, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6663; Amt. neg. (Y. 42; N. 95) 7092 (iv).

Immigration Frauds at Halifax, Par. in Press (remarks) 4834 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6491, 6514 (iv).

I.C.R., Amqui Station, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 10012 (v).

——— Vote *re* Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 12774 (vii).

Italy, Commercial Treaty with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10593 (vi).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for copies of O.Cs., &c., 872 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Recent Entries into B. C. (remarks) 3751 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605 (i).

——— from U. S., Deportation, &c. (remarks) 3900 (ii).

Lachine Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).

La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt. (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

Lac Saumon Station, I.C.R., Amount expended (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet. *re* Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).

——— (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Lighthouses in Nicolet River and Fort St. Francois, &c. (Ques.) 3837 (ii).

Loans, Temporary, by Govt., Names of Lenders, Rates of Interest, &c. (M. for ret.*) 554 (i).

——— (Ques.) 314 (i).

Mail Service, Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Renewal of Contract (Ques.) 5257

Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c. (Ques.) 9277 (v).

Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 9277 (v).

Marine, Deptl. Officials, Suspension of *re* C. S. Report (remarks) 6004 (iii).

——— Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3988 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Montreal Turnpike Roads, Claim of Govt., &c. (prop. res.) 3465 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c. (prop. res.) 3436; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3452 (ii).

——— Amounts collected and expended, &c. (M. for ret.) 1688 (i).

——— Payment of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 1931 (i), 2979 (ii).

——— Rep. of Auditor General (M. for copy*) 2983 (ii).

Nicolet County, Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet Post Office, Contract, Tender, Extras, &c. (Ques.) 3838 (ii).

Nicolet River Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3840 (ii).

Nicolet River Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, *re* answering questions by Govt., 234 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).

Pointe Aux Trembles Wharf, Date of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9267 (v).

——— Number of Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).

——— Tender of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c. (Ques.) 8838 (v).

Quebec Bridge Commission, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to ref. Rep., Evidence, &c., to Special Com., 10401 (vi).

——— Rep. of Sel. Com., on M. (Mr. Maclean) to conc. (amt.) 13363; Amt. neg. (Y. 52; N. 103) 13414 (vii).

Quebec Bridge Commission's Report, Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 8608 (v), 10302 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Co., Govt. Grants, Investigation *re* (M.) for Sel. Com., 2547 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Co., ref. to in debate on Address, 535 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Construction Materials, Customs Duties collected (Ques.) 5200, 5793 (iii).

Ques. of Priv., Par. in 'Le Soleil,' 7994 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, 10688; (amt) 11603, neg. (Y. 36; N. 89) 11608 (vi).

Ry. Act (working hours) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. R. Smith)—(remarks) 10120 (v).

Railway Commissioners' Board, Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8513 (v).

Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5658 (iii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 10013 (v).

St. Gabriel de Brandon, Post Office Savings Bank, Opening, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

St. Francois Port Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 3423 (ii).

Ste. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Total Amount of Pay unpaid, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5541 (iii).

Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of six Offices, &c. (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* Charges, &c. (Ques.) 9278 (v).

Seven Islands, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 2394 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Commissioner Boyer, (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

——— Electric Power, Contract with Govt., &. (Ques.) 10011 (v).

——— Expenditure *re* Investigation by Messrs. Sauve and Boyer (Ques.) 10513 (vi).

——— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer, Inquiry for, 9890 (v).

——— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3805 (ii).

Suburban Mail Delivery (prop. res.) 3276 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10585 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13175 (vii).

Canals—Soulanges (investigation) 10304 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9698 (v).

Immigration (agents, G.B.) 9840 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3988 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2943 (ii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8877 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12128 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11081 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works (prop. res.) 3288 (ii).

Temporary Govt. Loans, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 233 (i).

Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 566 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., *re*

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Amt. to Inland Revenue Act, 904; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 921 (i).
Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of (prop. res.) 3299 (ii).
Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).
Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6123 (iii).
Wharfage Dues in Soulanges County, Amounts received, &c. (Ques.) 9276 (v).
Wheat, frozen, Shipments from Man., &c., on M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn., 826 (i).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution at Thetford Mines (remarks) 9894 (v).

MORIN, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*

Bic Wharf, Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 9713 (v).
Brockville-Ottawa Ry Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 189 (i).
Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 2162 (ii).
Debates, French Edition, Delay, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10505 (vi).
Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 8613 (v).
G.T.P., Contracts, Safeguard Clause, &c. (M. for copies*) 2398 (ii).
——— Medical Officer Parent, Payments to (Ques.) 8618 (v).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10493 (vi).
I.C.R., Connection with Quebec Central at Levis (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).
——— Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections (remarks) 189, 434, 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
——— Riviere du Loup Station Master, &c. (Ques.) 7445 (iv).
Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Pulp Wood Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4813 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Disaster, Lifting of Ruins (remarks) 10303 (vi).
Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Riviere du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 6462 (iv).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. Johns, Tenders *re* Supplies (Ques.) 5788 (iii).
Saguenay Dredging, Purchase of Coal *re*, &c. (Ques.) 8380 (v).
——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Employment of (Ques.) 8381 (v).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5414; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5448 (iii).



MORIN, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents) 9875 (v).
Marine—(ice-breakers) 1913 (i).
Miscellaneous (charwomen) 10508 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (obstructions) 3213; (tidal service) 3216 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings — Ottawa (Museum) 1495 (i).
Public Works—Que. (Montreal post office) 7413; (Quebec, citadel) 7430; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (Levis) 7295 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (train service) 10179 (v).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *Hastings, E.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12476 (vii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4505 (iii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Cor. with G.T.Ry. Co. (M. for copies) 2796 (ii).
Crown Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 180) 1°*, 9330 (v).
Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1190 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1658 (i).
——— on M. for Sup., 1830; (amt.) 1839; neg. (Y. 50: N. 95) 1882 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11803 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6753 (iv).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13271 (vii).
Govt. Employees at Ottawa, Number of Permanent and Temporary, &c. (M. for ret.*) 558 (i).
G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12323 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Sup., 1030 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4182 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7371 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron (remarks) 6926 (iv).
——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10743 (vi).
Militia and Marine Stationery Supplies, Purchases *re* Book-keeping (Ques.) 6233 (iv).
Niagara Camp, Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 2163 (ii).
P.E.I.Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2750 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (Ry. Commission) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°,4659 (iii); in Com., 10647; on M. for 3° (amt.) 10777; on M. for 3°, 11598; Amt. neg. (Y. 36; N. 77) 11600 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Extravagance of Militia Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 8994 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5854 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4182 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1923 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8526; Ont. (Glencoe) 7490 (iv).

Watson, Mr. G. H., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds (remarks) 6848 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank (Minister of the Interior) *Edmonton.*

Adams Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5798 (iii).

Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c. (Ans.) 3037 (ii).

Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman (Ans.) 1937 (i).

Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amounts, Price, &c. (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9740 (v).

Boyle Concession, Memorial of Dawson Legislature (Ans.) 509, 562, 681 (i).

Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

Buchanan Townsite, Homestead Entry of Mr. Ramsland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10083 (v).

Buffalo Herd located at Elk Park (Ans.) 5208 (iii).

Buffalo Herd for Moose Mountain Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).

Buffalo Herd for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).

Buffalo imported for Game Preserve in Alberta, Payments *re* (Ans.) 847.

Buffalo purchased for Parks, Authority for Expenditure (Ans.) 896 (i).

Buffalo purchased for Elk Park, Name of Purchaser (Ans.) 5795 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Calgary Town Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9776 (v).

Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4769 (iii).

Canadian repatriated from U.S. (Ans.) 685 (i).

Chambly Common, Area, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 5652 (iii).

Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 513 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 184) 1°*, 10008 (v); 2° m., and in Com., 10545, 10744, 11020 (vi).

Clearwater Lake, Half Breeds' Location, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

——— Squatters' Claims (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).

Clement, W. H. P., Legal Adviser in Yukon, &c. (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ans.) 5469, 5790 (iii).

Coal and Govt. Lands in Possession of Govt., &c. (Ans.) 843 (i).

Coal Lands, Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c. (Ans.) 9278 (v).

——— Royalty Dues, &c., Sale or Lease of (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt. (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

——— Leases, Applicants *re* (Ans.) 2395 (ii).

——— Leased by Govt., Original Grantees, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).

——— Purchase Price on Sections 16, 20 and 21, &c. (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

——— Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, Payments *re* (Ans.) 10512 (vi).

——— Timber, &c., Dates of Regulations, O.Cs., &c. (Ans.) 12656 (vii).

Coal Mining Cos. in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt. (Ans.) 10258 (v).

Coal Mine Royalties, Sums received in Alberta (Ans.) 12391 (vii).

Colonization Lands, Alienations, on Inquiry for Ret., 4317 (iii).

Colonization Societies in Quebec, Amounts paid (Ans.) 684 (i).

Congdon, Mr. F. T., Stmnt. *re* Estates administered (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10111 (v).

——— Investigation *re* Trusts and Estates (Ans.) 12050, 12413 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13420, 13518 (vii).

Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 565 (i).

*See* 'Yukon.'

Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

——— (remarks) 10916 (vi).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Cypress Hills Reservation, Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9992 (v).

—— Reserve, Preservation of, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1133 (i).

—— Examination of, by Members (remarks) 3853 (ii).

—— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1636 (i).

Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds (Ans.) 5655 (iii).

*See* 'Halifax.'

Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent of Chief *re* Sale of Timber (Ans.) 8175 (iv).

—— Commission to Mr. Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

—— Name of Agent (Ans.) 5084 (iii).

—— Negotiations *re* Surrender (Ans.) 3849 (ii).

—— Protest *re* Sale of Timber (remarks) 10918 (vi).

—— Sale, Notice in Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 7501 (iv).

—— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender (Ans.) 10512 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8659 (v).

Dom. Lands Survey (B. 9) 1° m., 231; 2°, and in Com., 754, 948 (i); on Senate Amts., 3755 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 9333 (v); 2° m., 11125; in Com., 11158, 11165, 11408, 11502, 11940; 3° m., 11970 (vi); on Mr. Lake's Amt., 12394; on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).

Dom. Lands, Areas disposed of (Ans.) 3431 (ii).

—— Disposed of from 1896 to 1905, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Ret., 3852 (ii).

Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 8183 (iv).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10806 (vi).

Doukhobors, Bonuses *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).

—— Condition of, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2219 (ii).

—— Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5017 (iii).

—— Manner of Living (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

—— at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) 7630 (iv).

Doyle, Mr. P., Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 6923 (iv).

Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of (Ans.) 694 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).

Fence Post Fees on Permits, &c. (Ans.) 10258 (v).

Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 3433 (ii).

Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re* (Ans.) 5475 (iii).

French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).

French Immigrants, Number and Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Gaetz Brothers, Payments to (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council (Ans.) 11938 (vi).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. (B. 203) 1°*, 12594; in Com., 13048, 13208 (vii).

Grazing Lands leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co., Number of Acres (Ans.) 13062 (vii).

Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Woods, Fleck and Finnie (Ans.) 238 (i).

—— Irrevocable for 21 Years, Applications for, &c. (Ans.) 1512 (i).

Grazing and Irrigation Lands reserved by Govt. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

Grazing Lease of H. Riviere, Location, &c. (Ans.) 13060 (vii).

Grazing Ranches, Names of Lessees, &c. (Ans.) 7211 (iv).

Griffith Island, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).

Halifax Frauds, Rep. of Mr. Robertson (remarks) 9127 (v).

—— Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein (remarks) 8605 (v).

*See* 'Dodds.'

Hindus Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 5337 (iii).

*See* 'Immigration,' 'Japanese,' &c.

Hintz, Fred., Homestead Location, &c. (Ans.) 3235 (ii), 6238 (iv).

Holliday, Mr. P., Additional Living Allowance (Ans.) 5475 (iii).

Homestead Application of Mr. John C. Haddock (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11200 (vi).

Homestead Cancellations, Unfair Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10090, 10101 (v).

Homestead Entries, Granted for Quarters 10-17-17 W. of 4th Meridian (Ans.) 9773 (v).

Homestead Entry for S.W. Quarter-Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties performed, &c. (Ans.) 2167 (ii).

Homestead Entries in Quarter-Section No. 35, History of (Ans.) 4762 (iii).

Homestead Entries on Quarter Section 16, &c., Applications, Inspections, &c. (Ans.) 3432 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Homestead Entries, N.E. Quarter-Section 28, Permission *re* Grants (Ans.) 1941 (i).
Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 6921 (iv).
Homesteaders on Sections 15, 16 and 27, Issue of Patents, &c. (Ans.) 7503 (iv).
Homesteading in Section 18, Extension of Time Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 8382 (v).
Homestead Sale of Township 13 (Ans.) 7206 (iv).
Hough, Campbell and Ferguson, Sales of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).
Hough, Mr. J. S., and Hough, Campbell and Ferguson (Ans.) 568 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6394 (iv).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5729 (iii).
Immigration Act Amt. (B. 135) 1° m., 5657 (iii); in Com., 6429 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re* (Ans.) 7500 (iv).
——— O.C. *re* B.C. (remarks) 8171 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 8608, 9891 (v).
Immigration Agents in East Elgin, Number, &c. (Ans.) 693 (i).
——— G.B., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2169 (ii).
——— Italy, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4584 (iii).
——— Names of those paid Commissions in Europe, &c. (Ans.) 3845 (ii).
——— N.B., Apptmt. (Ans.) 843 (i).
——— Number of Special Agents, Addresses, &c. (Ans.) 180 (i).
——— Special Prizes, &c. (Ans.) 3484 (ii).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of, to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1311 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6697 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1298 (i).
Immigration, Central Board, London, Moneys paid to, &c. (Ans.) 2545 (ii).
Immigration, Co-operation with Govt. of N. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
Immigration, Expenditure *re* Maintenance of Immigrants (Ans.) 5084 (iii).
Immigration, Expenditure for March, 1907-8 (Ans.) 5081 (iii).
Immigration Forms, Number received by Farmers, Agents, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).
Immigration Frauds at Halifax, Investigation *re* (statement) 4963 (iii).
——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 5567 (iii).
——— Restitution *re* (remarks) 5659 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Immigration Frauds at Halifax (remarks) 4835, 5567, 5659 (iii), 6465 (iv).
*See* 'Halifax.'
Immigration from U. S., Total Expenditure (Ans.) 5082 (iii).
Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c., Disposal of (Ans.) 6403 (iv).
Immigration Officers, Waugh and Perrin, Payments to (Ans.) 514 (i).
Immigration Premiums, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Immigration Regulations *re* British Subjects, Deportations, &c. (Ans.) 9773 (v).
Immigration Regulations, O.C. *re* (remarks) 11019 (vi).
Immigration Relief to Gimli Galicians, Rep. of Mr. Walker (read) in Com. of Sup., 9979 (v).
Immigration Returns, on Inquiry for, 1108 (i).
Immigrant Bonuses, Increase to Agents, &c. (Ans.) 3429 (ii).
Immigrants, Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto (remarks) 186, 242 (i).
Immigrants cared for in Toulon Sheds, 1906-7 (Ans.) 892 (i).
Immigrants at Chatham, Complaints *re* Deportation (Ans.) 6922 (iv).
Immigrants deported from Chatham, Names and Causes, &c. (Ans.) 5796 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation (Ans.) 5080 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).
Immigrants stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of (Ans.) 567 (i).
Immigrant Detention Hospital, Amount expended (Ans.) 5082 (iii).
Immigrants entering Canada, Number, Bonuses paid on, &c. (Ans.) 5256 (iii).
——— Deportations, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i).
Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt. (Ans.) 5082 (iii).
——— Restriction of (remarks) 5491 (iii).
Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Agents (Ans.) 6923 (iv).
Immigrant Inspection of Ships, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1289 (i).
Immigrants reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c. (Ans.) 6921 (iv).
Immigrants landed in Canada to June, 1907, Number deported, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).
Immigrant Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies (Ans.) 5468 (iii).
Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Indian Department, Extravagant Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11045 (vi).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Indian Lands, Acres sold, Total Receipts, &c., since 1896 (Ans.) 4586 (iii).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13122 (vii).

——— Withdrawal from Sale, &c. (Ans.) 2396 (ii).

Indian Lands and Islands owned, sold, &c., by Indians (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Indian Lands, B.C., and Provincial Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 628 (i).

Indian Lands at New Westminster, B.C., Disposal of, &c. (Ans.) 3037, 3839 (ii).

Indian Lands, Sale of, on Inquiry for Ret., 4495 (iii).

Indians in Man. and Sask., Investigation by Mrs. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 6919 (iv).

Indian Schools, Rep. of Dr. Bryce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).

Irrigation (B. 10) 1°*, 231; 2° m., 766; in Com., 767, 953 (i); (M.) to withdraw, 2974 (ii).

——— (B. 99) 1° m., 3315 (ii); in Com., 4671 (iii).

Irrigation in Western Provs., Investigations *re* Measurements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9990 (v).

Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B. C., Number, &c. (Ans.) 692 (i).

Japanese entering B. C., Passports, &c. (Ans.) 4243 (iii).

Japanese Immigrants entering from U.S. into Canada, Deportation, &c. (remarks) 3900 (ii).

Japanese Syndicate purchasing Land in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 2162 (ii).

Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights, &c. (Ans.) 3036 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt. (Ans.) 5082 (iii).

Lands applied for by Mr. Alwyn under Irrigation Regulations (Ans.) 7209 (iv).

Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Area reserved on July 1st, 1896 (Ans.) 13512 (vii).

Land Grants to Rys., Selections, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 4766 (iii), 6920 (iv).

Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantee, &c. (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Land Patent issued for E. ½ S.E. ¼ Section 2, Name, &c. (Ans.) 2169 (ii).

Land Patents for Section 8, Twp. 53, Present Owner, Occupation, &c. (Ans.) 3430 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Land Patents for Sections 10 and 17, Applicants for (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Land Patents, Section 36, &c., Issue of (Ans.) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N. W., Purchasers' Names, Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 3835 (ii).

Lands, Section 2, 10, 14, &c., Disposal of (Ans.) 5083 (iii).

Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-6 (Ans.) 8614 (v).

Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 113) 1° m., 4221 (iii); in Com., 6517 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund (B. 168) prop. Res., 7094 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8480 (v); 2° m., 10525; in Com., 10526 (vi).

Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Coloniztion Purposes, &c. (Ans.) 2393 (ii).

La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Assistance *re* (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re* (Ans.) 8444 (v).

Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c. (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Lumber manufactured in N. W., Royalties, &c. (Ans.) 3835 (ii).

McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants (Ans.) 8617 (v).

McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 688 (i).

McInnes, Hon. W. B., Emplymt. in the Yukon, &c. (Ans.) 5794 (iii).

McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent, Edmonton (Ans.) 6981 (iv).

McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry (Ans.) 6401 (iv).

Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of moneys of Mr. Walter Dick (Ans.) 11937 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 188) 1°*, 10717 (iv); in Com., 12559, 13215 (vii).

Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres (Ans.) 1289 (i).

Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1349 (i).

Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Ret., on Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).

Mining Rights on Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfers, &c. (Ans.) 3238 (ii).

Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co. (Ans.) 5257 (iii).

Muskoday Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Sale (Ans.) 5083 (iii).

Newspapers, Payments to (Ans.) 1512 (i).

Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Patents to (Ans.) 8182 (iv).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid, Claims, &c. (Ans.) 167 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses paid by Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 773 (i).
——— Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter, &c. (Ans.) 2392 (ii).
Northwest Gold Dredging Co., Assignment of, &c. (Ans.) 11703 (vi).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12731 (vii).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B. C., Sale to (Ans.) 6002 (iii).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10408 (vi).
——— Surveys of Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Peace River Exploratory Surveys, Rep. (presented) 3834 (ii).
Peace River Timber Limits, Granting of Leases, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 3851 (ii).
Peace River Land Co., Cancellation of Grant (remarks) 11018 (vi).
——— Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c. (Ans.) 1111 (i).
'Phœnix,' Saskatoon, Number ordered, paid, &c. (Ans.) 6920 (iv).
Piegan Reserve, Cattle Shipments, Weighing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 360 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents, on Inquiry for, 4495 (iii).
Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Quarter Sections, 35, 31 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c. (Ans.) 8176 (iv).
Railway Land Grants in Man., Alberta, Sask., Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 6920 (iv).
Rama Indians Fund, Payments *re* (Ans.) 8611 (v).
Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 5209 (iii).
*See* 'Buchanan,' &c.
Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Receipts, Number, &c. (Ans.) 5258 (iii).
——— Sub-Land Agency, Closing of (Ans.) 4830 (iii).
Rattenbury & Co., Purchasers of Seed Oats, Assignment, &c. (Ans.) 12392 (vii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2309, 2384, 3318 (ii).
——— Questions, &c., ordered by the House, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4243 (iii).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications *re* Homesteads (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9994 (v).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Entry for Homesteaders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7654
——— Squatters' Rights, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended to Date (Ans.) 4763 (iii).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion in Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Rocky Mountain Park, Revenue, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
St. Peter's Reserve, Extinguishment of Title, Issue of Patents (Ans.) 1933 (i).
——— Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers (Ans.) 2217 (ii).
——— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors (Ans.) 7990 (iv).
Salvation Army Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
——— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth (Ans.) 2391 (ii).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale &c. (Ans.) 4761 (iii).
——— (stmnt.) 10402 (vi).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 9280 (v).
——— Sale of Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) 9127 (v).
School Lands Exchange (B. 163) 1° m., 8086 (iv); 2° m., 8467; in Com., 8478 (v).
School Timber and Coal Lands, Average Price, &c. (Ans) 3431 (ii).
Scrip and Money received by Govt. *re* Lands, &c., on M. (Mr. Lake) for Cor., 3852 (ii).
Scrip received on Account of Lands, Mines, &c. (Ans.) 3431 (ii).
Section 32, Report *re* (Ans.) 8383 (v).
Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1377 (i).
——— Apptmt. of Mr. R. A. E. Leech (remarks) 3041 (ii).
——— Duties assigned to Mr. Leech (remarks) 3158 (ii).
——— Distribution of (Ans.) 692 (i).
——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 6981 (iv).
——— O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6634 (iv)
——— in N. W., Extension of time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2901 (ii).
——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10121 (v).
——— Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 277[illegible] (ii).
Seed Grain Distribution, Purchases from P.E.I. (remarks) 3158, 3752 (ii), 12392 (vii).
——— Corrected answer, 13066 (vii).
Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 8185 (iv).
Selkirk, Lord, Land Register, State Papers and Register 'B,' Custody of, &c. (Ans.) 1685 (i).
Six Nations Indians, Refusal *re* Inspection of Memorials, &c. (Ans.) 6239 (iv).
Smith, O. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).
S. A. Veterans, Land Grants to, &c. (Ans.) 563 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

S. A. Volunteers Land Grant Bounty (B. 109) Res. prop., 3316, 3756 (ii); 11938 (vi); in Com. on Res., 3823 (ii) 12595; in Com., 13047; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands (Ans.) 7729 (iv).

Squatters on Turtle Mountain Forest Reserves (remarks) 4741 (iii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2784 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623 (i); Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries) 616 (i), 9693 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10044; (forest rangers) 10049; (forest reserves) 10060; (homesteads) 10083; (salaries) 10038; (surveys) 9987 (v).

Immigration (agents, G. B.) 9840: (agents in U. S.) 9965; (deportations) 9882 (v); (general expenses) 5753 (iii); (hospitals) 9983; (literature) 9949; (relief to settlers) 9983 (v); (U. S. labourers) 13169 (vii).

Indians—B. C. (land sales) 12752 (vii).

Indians — Generally (destitute) 5762; (printing, &c.) 5762 (iii).

Indians—N. B. (salaries) 12736, 13170; (schools) 13170 (vii).

Indians—N.W.T. (Sioux) 5762 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2777 (ii).

N.W. Ter. (Govt. salaries) 10117; (school grants) 10117 (v).

Public Works—Telegraphs (towers) 13178 (vii).

Yukon—(Govt. salaries) 10107 (v).

Surveys of Public Lands: *See* 'Dom. Lands.'

Swamps Lands in Man. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10106 (v).

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt. (Ans.) 693 (i).

——— Sale (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).

——— Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).

Tanguay, Mr., Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10090 (v).

Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon (Ans.) 1126 (i).

Timber Berth, East Saskatchewan, Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ans.) 3839 (ii).

Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W. T., Retention by Original Grantees (Ans.) 2546 (ii).

Timber Berth, No. 1100, Area, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).

——— No. 1168, Area, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).

——— Nos. 1220, &c., on Order for Ret. (remarks) 849 (i).

Timber Cutting by Sawmill Owners, Applications, &. (Ans.) 2168 (ii).

Timber Lands, Sales to Messrs. Rutherford, &c. (Ans.) 1294 (i).

Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c. (Ans.) 181 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present (Ans.) 359 (i).

Timber Licenses granted under Mackenzie Govt. (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

Timber Licenses issued in Man. and N.W.T. during 1896-7 (Ans.) 2396 (ii).

Timber Licenses and Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c. (Ans.) 182, 691, 1127 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2486 (ii).

——— Grants to Messrs. McLeod, Lundy, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii).

Timber Permits to Sawmill Owners, O.C. *re* (Ans.) 179 (i), 11496 (vi).

Torrens Land Title Fund, Information *re* (remarks) 10916 (vi).

Turtle Mountain Reserve, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4741 (iii), 7649 (iv).

Vacant Land Reservations, Instructions to Agents *re* (Ans.) 1935 (i).

Water Power Sales or Leases in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 8378 (v).

Waugh, James, Immigration Agent, Refund to Govt. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).

Whitehorse Town Site, Portions sold and retained (Ans.) 11496 (vi).

Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 568 (i).

Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c. (Ans.) 1127 (i).

Yukon Act Amt. (B. 169) 1° m., 8604 (v); 2° m., 10528; in Com., 10529; on Senate Amts., 11634 (vi).

Yukon, Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).

——— Finnie-Perron Case, Investigation *re* (remarks) 4316 (iii).

——— Gold Co., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c. (Ans.) 7726 (iv).

——— Liquor Permits, Agents, &c., Corrected Answer, 5048 (iii).

——— Lithgow, Girouard and Congdon, Messrs., Apptmt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 5999 (iii).

*See* 'Congdon,' &c.

——— Officials, Re-arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

——— Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c. (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

——— Placer Mining Act Amt. (B. 150) 1°*, 6221 (iv); 2° m., 8481; in Com., 8483 (v), 10518 (vi).

——— Whiskey Permit Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1127 (i).

——— Wiley *vs.* Congdon, Amt. *re* Return (remarks) 1691 (i).

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *Toronto W.*

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1800 (i).
Dry Docks, Construction, B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4687 (iii).
Goodwin Car Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 60) 1°*, 1283 (i).
I.C.R. Audit System (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 10214 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 91 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11238 (vi).
Montague Moore and T. J. Haskett Patent Relief (B. 61) 1°*, 1283 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4908 (iii).
Seed Grain for Northest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1362 (i).

SUPPLY—
Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10209 (v).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *Northumberland, E., Ont.*

Brighton Wharf, Rep. of Mr. Sing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
——— Repairs *re* (remarks) 5913 (iii).
Cambellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12889 (vii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11820 (vi).
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13469 (vii).
Fruit Inspection, *re* Apple Packing, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2761 (ii).
House of Commons Clerks, Changes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
——— Recommendations *re* Apptmts., &c. (Ques.) 3899 (ii).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1611.
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7248 (iv).
Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3930 (ii).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10640 (vi).
Shipping Rings, Combination *re* (remarks) 5915 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227; (construction) 12226 (vii).
Justice—Supreme Court (registrar's uniform) 5507 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4087 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5735 (iii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5533 (iii).

OWEN, Mr. C. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10879; (Victoria Immigration) 10879 (vi).
Public Works — Buildings — Ont. (Owen Sound) 7823; (St. Mary's) 7827 (iv).
Public Works — Buildings — Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Brighton) 12133 (vii).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11078 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10697 (vi).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2507 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-opening of (remarks) 609 (i).
Woolen Industry, Specific Duty (remarks) 6988 (iv).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Address, The, 505 (i).
Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).
Canadians repatriated from U. S. (Ques.) 684 (i).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3490 (ii).
Experimental Farm in Quebec District, Establishment of (Ques.) 2593 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3545 (ii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ques.) 177 (i).
Immigrants, Number settled in Canada in 1905-6-7, &c. (M. for ret.*) 697 (i).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6945 (iv).
I.C.R., Cold Storage Cars for Dairy Produce, Number, &c. (Ques.) 1688 (i).
'Montcalm,' Str., Services as an Ice-breaker, in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Quebec Colonization Societies, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 684 (i).
Quebec Port Improvements, Expenditure, since Confederation (M. for ret.*) 697 (i).
——— Sums expended for Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).

SUPPLY—
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4038, 4172 (ii); Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2941 (ii).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *Lambton W.*
Budget, The, 5364 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12859 (vii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1424 (i); on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5910 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11834 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett)—(remarks) 6749 (iv).
Erie, London & Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 1108 (i).
'Golspie,' Str., Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3020 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4137 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2955; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12106 (vii); (Tiffin) 5711 (iii).

PARENT, Mr. G., *Montmorency.*
Quebec Bridge Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13411 (vii).

PARMELEE, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*
Printing of Parliament, 5th Rep. of Com. (peresented) 10915 (vi).

PATERSON, Hon. W. (Minister of Customs) *Brant.*
Absinthe and Brandy imported, Total Amount, &c. (Ans.) 689 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, (Ans.) 1112 (i).
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c. (Ans.) 3485 (ii).
Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U. S. and other Countries (Ans.) 1511 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., Payments *re* Supplies (remarks) 4163 (ii).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1506 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Customs Ports opened, &c. (Ans.) 5208 (iii).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Can. (Ans.) 6232 (iv).
Budget. The, 5296 (iii).
Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 2163 (ii).
Butter Imports, Quantity, and Countries of Origin (Ans.) 1116 (i).
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Cattle, Exports and Imports from Canada to G. B. (Ans.) 6460 (iv).
Cattle exported to U. S. during Years 1900-07, Value &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).
Cattle Registered, Importations from U. S. (Ans.) 6238 (iv).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10746 (iv).
Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9139 (v).
Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships (Ans.) 6237 (iv).
Coasting Trade, O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c. (Ans.) 4586 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 194) Res. prop., 11233, in Com. on Res., 11312, 1°*, of B., 11315; in Com., 11980 (vi).
Customs Brokers, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Customs Defalcations in Huntingdon, B.C., Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9442 (v).
Customs Dept., Criticism by Civil Service Rep., 10448 (vi).
Customs Dept., Criticism, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10448 (vi).
Customs Duties on Militia Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Supply (remarks) 10133 (v).
Customs and Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1 to 15, 1908 (Ans.) 10791 (vi).
Customs Frauds in Montreal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).
Customs Inspectors, and Rep. of Civil Service Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9555 (v).
Customs Officers at Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, &c., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6980 (iv).
Customs Officers at Windsor, Age and Salary (Ans.) 12656 (vii).
Customs Outside Service, Ports, &c., 9220 (v).
Cotton, Raw, Imported from U. S. during 1905-7, &c. (Ans.) 1511 (i).
Customs, Receipts and Expenditures for 1907-8 (Ans.) 12655 (vii).
Customs Statistics, Duplicating with Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Detroit River Tunnel, Materials entered free of Duty (Ans.) 10254 (v).
—— Material imported, &c. (Ans.) 4583 (iii).
—— Duties on Construction Materials (Ans.) 1117 (i), 3841 (ii).
—— (statement) 13524 (vii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. at Windsor Customs (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12951 (vii).

Dredging Companies, Insinuations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties, &c. (Ans.) 13061 (vii).

Fire Extinguishers File, Cor., &c., quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7792 (iv).

Fish Exportations from Man., to March, 1907, Value, &c. (Ans.) 4240 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1257 (i); on M. for 1°, 3507, 3567; in Com. 3588 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products, &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 852 (i).

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations (Ans.) 5200 (iii).

——— Dismissal from Customs Service (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

*See* 'Customs Defalcations.'

French Books, Reduction of Customs *re* French Treaty (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 689 (i).

Glucose, Quantity imported from G. B. (Ans.) 6980 (iv).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2249 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4226 (iii).

Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c. (Ans.) 8177 (iv).

Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Horses and Cattle imported from U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of (Ans.) 6001 (iii).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8 (Ans.) 11703 (vi).

Imports and Exports, Sept. 30 and Oct. 30th, 1907 (Ans.) 350 (i).

——— Values from June to Dec., 1907 (Ans). 1113 (i).

Imports from France for last five years, &c. (Ans.) 1124 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Value, &c., for 1897-8 (Ans.) 13063 (vii).

Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7 (Ans.) 898 (i).

Literature distributed through Customs and Mails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9104 (v).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).

Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 8442 (v).

Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S. (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4067 (ii).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9220 (v).

Opium, Amount of Duty received, Pet. from B. C. *re* Prohibition (Ans.) 8614 (v).

Pacaud, Benj., Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor (Ans.) 5200 (iii).

Pepin, J. E., Emplymt. at Customs Office in Windsor (Ans.) 7202 (iv).

Pork, Fresh, Imported for Home Consumption (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Port, South Bar, C. B., Number of Vessels entered for Customs, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).

Posters, Prohibition *re* Indecent Ones, Tariff *re* (Ans.) 6462 (iv).

Prince Rupert Customs Collector, Transfer of Mr. McDonald (Ans.) 6402 (iv).

Pulp Wood exported to U. S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1511 (i).

Quebec Bridge Material, Total Amount of Customs Duties *re* (Ans.) 5200, 5793 (iii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4977 (iii).

Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils imported from G. B. in 1904-5-6-7 (Ans.) 1506 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Port, Quantity of Farm Produce entered, &c. (Ans.) 898 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2932 (ii).

Sugar Imports for 1898, Total Amount (Ans.) 13065 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 637 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9536; Miscellaneous (Guarantee Cos.) 9577; (cruisers) 9578; (legal expenses) 9578; (printing, &c.) 9577; Outside Service (salaries) 9226, 9442 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2964 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8530 (v); Ont. (Brantford) 7465 (iv).

Trade and Nav. Returns (presented) 7 (i).

Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties (Ans.) 8616 (v).

Venoit, Mr. P. G., Complaints *re* Interference in Politics (Ans.) 6406, 7730 (iv).

Wallace, Michael J., Employment in Customs at Windsor (Ans.) 7500 (iv).

Wheat Transportation from N.W. and Financial Aid, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2196 (ii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada (Ans.) 5201 (iii).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*

Address, The, 449 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3873 (ii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12866 (vii).

Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c. (Ques.) 8174 (iv).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Inquiry for, 90 (i).

Coal Lands, Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, &c., Payments *re* (Ques.) 10512 (vi).

Corry Building, Total Rental by Govt., Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 11938 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1818 (i).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent from Chief *re* Sale of Timber (Ques.) 8175 (iv).

——— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c. (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

——— Sale of Timber, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender (Ques.) 10512 (vi).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2256 (ii); in Com., 12073 (vii).

Mining Rights in Sections 17, 20, 21, &c., Applications, Leases, &c. (M. for copies*) 3851 (ii).

Mining Rights on Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfer, &c. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).

Postal Stamps, Special Issue (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).

Public Works Dept. Expenditures, on M. for Sup., 4868; (amt.) 4886; Neg. (Y.43; N. 99) 4959 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10637 (vi).

Saguenay Boom and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid Govt. *re* (Ques.) 183 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4140 (ii).

Post Office (inspection) 9115; (mail service) 9119 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military) 10971 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N. W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10978 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11010 (vi); (mint) 1453 (i); (rents, &c.) 10999; (telephones) 11012 (vi).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Timber Licenses in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Renewals, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

Timber Limits, Leasing, Alienation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2310 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c. (explanation) *re* Mr. McDonald's letter, 2679 (ii).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12874 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10559 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Annapolis) 11211; (Round Hill) 11283 (vi).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *Hastings, W.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4851 (iii).

Belleville City, Flood Investigation by Govt. (remarks) 3319 (ii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4744 (iii).

Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c. (Ques.) 1509 (i).

——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley (Ques.) 1737 (i).

Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c. (Ques.) 6237 (iv).

——— Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2983 (ii).

——— Delay, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

——— Total Revenue, for 1903-7, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2592 (ii).

Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 5211 (iii).

Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage, &c. (remarks) 7933 (iv).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 7669 (iv), 8552, 8609, 9066 (v).

——— on Order being called for 2°, 681 (i).

Bell Rapids P. O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8883 (v).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connection (remarks) 1437 (i).

Buell, W. S., Emplymt. *re* Telephone Commission (Ques.) 10011 (v).

Commissions appointed between 1896 and 1908, Costs, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

——— Ret., Inquiry for, 6288, 7447 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11892 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act Prosecutions, Violation *re* Apples, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).

Hintz, Fred., Location of Homestead (Ques.) 3235 (ii), 6238 (iv).

PORTER, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*

Homestead Entries, Records of Payments, of Scale by Peter Luenson to F. Heintz, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1294 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (milk) Amt. (B. 64) 1° m., 1283 (i); on Order for 2°, 5226 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4673 (iii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Sup., 1031 (i).

Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred. Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt. (Ques.) 9272 (v).

——— Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9372, 9390 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4701 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8862 (v).

Section 32, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 8383 (v).

SUPPLY—

Post Office (clerical assistance) 8883 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8525 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10967 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 7455 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11078 (vi).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11072 (vi).

Trent Valley Canal Contracts, Deposits, &c. (Ques.) 1734 (i).

POWER, Mr. W., *Quebec, W.*

Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.'s (B. 73) 1°*, 1584 (i).

PRINGLE, Mr. R. A., *Stormont.*

Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).

Bank Act Amendment (prop. res.) 4248 (iii).

Banking Systems, Par. in 'Financial Post,' Ques. of Priv., 4770 (iii).

——— Ques. of Privilege *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).

*See* 'Wheat.'

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. E. B. Walker, Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Civil Service Bill, Physical Fitness (remarks) 11017 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with Mfg. Cos. *re* Water Power (remarks) 13084 (vii).

——— Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 12201 (vii).

——— Opening (remarks) 12660 (vii).

——— Payment of Dues on Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).

PRINGLE, Mr. R. A.—*Con.*

Deep Waterways Commission, Damming St. Lawrence River at Long Sault (remarks) 13146 (vii).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s (B. 127) in Com., 6183 (iii), 6231 (iv); on Senate Amts., 12772 (vii).

——— (B. 211) M. to suspend Rule, 12836 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13270 (vii).

London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Co.'s incorp. (B. 129) 1°*, 5255 (iii).

'Montcalm,' Str., Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1899 (i).

Old Age Pension Scheme (M.) for Sel. Com., 2398 (ii).

——— Progress *re* (remarks) 12660 (vii).

——— (remarks) 7722 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Marine—(ice-breakers) 1899 (i).

Wheat Transportation from West, Financial Aid *re* (Ques.) 173 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2204 (ii).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Chute à Blondeau) 12094 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W. (Minister of Public Works) *St. John City and County.*

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6232 (iv).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4723 (iii).

Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 615 (i).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Anse. St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Architects on Public Works, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 2392, 3040 (ii).

Bell Memorial Association (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11207 (vi).

Bell River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 685 (i).

Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c. (Ans.) 1509 (i).

——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley (Ans.) 1738 (i).

Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c. (Ans.) 4830 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8557, 9067 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Bic Wharf, Materials supplied, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 9713 (v).
Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5943 (iii).
Booms in International Streams, Regulation (B. 105) 1° m., 3654 (ii).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs to (remarks) 5913 (iii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iv).
Buildings, Administrative, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).
Buildings, Construction of, Papers laid on Table, 12771 (vii).
Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman (Ans.) 4404 (iii).
Campbellton Wharf, Contract *re* Piling (Ans.) 8612 (v).
Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).
C.P.R., Plaster Rock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Canadian Timber used in Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 10517 (vi).
Cement Testing Laboratory, Cost. &c. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 11250 (vi).
—— Purposes of Vote (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).
'Challenge,' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed (Ans.) 12651 (vii).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 686 (i).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection (Ans.) 5202 (iii).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 7937 (iv).
Chicoutimi Boom and Pulp Co.'s Payments, &c. (Ans.) 8175 (iv).
Chicoutimi Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iv).
Chicoutimi Public Expenditure, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Taylor) 13204 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5895 (iii).
Clarke City, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ans.) 2394 (ii).
Clerk of Works *re* Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 695 (i).
Clinton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 4832 (iii).
Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 8380 (v).
Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 359 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Colchester Point, Pier, Essex County, Amt. expended (Ans.) 12652 (vii).
Corry Building, Total Annual Rental, Taxes, &c. (Ans.) 11938 (vi).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to (Ans.) 9277 (v).
Côté, Boivin & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 12650 (vii).
Dauphin Public Building, Valuation of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Deep Waterways Commission, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) *re* Progress (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c. (Ans.) 1736 (i).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 5465 (iii).
Documents, Production of Originals, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1426 (i).
—— Production in Committees, 1428 (i).
—— Taken from Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 2308 (ii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club (Ans.) 13060 (vii).
Dredges, registered in Canada (Ans.) 11497 (vi).
Dredging at Becancour, Blanche, &c., during 1907 (Ans.) 2392, 3040 (ii).
Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co. (Ans.) 8839 (v).
Dredging at Port Arthur and Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8618 (v).
Dredging Contract, O.C. *re*, on Inquiry for, 6927 (iv).
Dredging Contracts at Midland, &c., Advertisements for Tenders (remarks) 7195 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments (Ans) 9711 (v).
—— O.C. *re* (remarks) 6853 (iv).
—— O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6745-6816 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co. (Ans.) 1737 (i).
Dredging Contracts (remarks) 7105 (iv).
—— Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6633 (iv).
—— Tenders *re* (remarks) 9773 (v).
Dredging in Ont. and Que., for 1907-8, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 10008 (v).
Dredging in Quebec Prov., Claims Pending, &c. (Ans.) 7200 (iv).
Dredging Instructions to Inspectors, Circular (read) in Com. of Sup., 12043 (vi).
Dredging Tenders, on Inquiry for Ret., 8696 (v).
Dredging Work at Nicolet River, &c. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).
Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Drill Halls, Ret., on Inquiry for, 4834, 5659 (iii), 6222 (iv).
Eclipse Co. of Ottawa, Payments to (Ans.) 6461 (iv).
—— Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13279
Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 7200 (iv).
Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvements (Ans.) 6399 (iv).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days working (Ans.) 7199 (iv).
Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, &c. (Ans.) 1510 (i).
—— Explanation *re* Purchases, 5658 (iii).
—— Ret., on Inquiry for, 4833 (iii).
—— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7643 (iv).
Floods at Chatham and Belleville (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4745 (iii).
Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 8613 (v).
Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12652 (vii).
Garthby, Govt. Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c. (Ans.) 3844 (ii).
Gatineau Point Bridge, Amount contributed by Govt. (Ans.) 355 (i).
Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 654 (i).
Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Report *re* Estimated Cost (remarks) 12053 (vii).
—— Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Final Report, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).
—— on Inquiry for, 1740 (i).
—— Papers laid on Table, 8378 (v).
—— Rep. of Surveys, on Inquiry for (Mr. White) 11827 (vi).
Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3423 (ii).
Govt. Employees, and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10989 (vi).
Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate *re* (Ans.) 8891 (v).
—— Ret., Delays, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).
Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing (Ans.) 6463 (iv).
Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 8382 (v).
Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 13059 (vii).
G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale (B. 89) M. for Com. on Res., 2221; 1°*, 2260 (ii); in Com., 12060 (vii).
*See* 'Major's Hill Park.'

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8130, 8745, 9462 (iv).
—— Ques. of Order *re* 'Imputing Motives,' 8134 (iv).
G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).
Gravenhurst Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Hackett Dock, Purchase of (Ans.) 7730 (iv).
Halifax Customs House, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 7212 (iv).
Higgin's Shore Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 695 (i).
Hillsborough Bridge Return, on Inquiry for, 6160 (iii).
Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10498 (vi).
—— Allotment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5729 (iii).
—— Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10978 (vi), 13340 (vii).
*See* 'Postal,' 'Restaurent.'
Howard's Cape, Wharf, Pet. *re* Investigation (Ans.) 11702 (vi).
Hudson, Dredging, 1907, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4587 (iii).
Hunter, Mr. J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1459 (i), 5698 (iii).
Indian Lands, B.C., Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 631 (i).
Inspectors of Public Works, Apptmts. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iii).
Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond (Ans.) 5792 (iii).
Inverness Public Building, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5998 (iii).
I.C.R., Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13489 (vii).
—— Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3233 (ii).
—— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4451 (iii).
Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co., N.B., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).
Jesus River, Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan (Ans.) 6980 (iv).
Juvenile Delinquents, B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12406 (vii).
'King Edward,' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour (Ans.) 13063 (vii).
Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).
Lachine Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12098 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of (Ans.) 8176 (iv).

Lafferty, Thos., Payment for Removal of Snags in St. John River (Ans.) 8379 (v).

Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12139 (vii).

Lake Megantic, Public Works, Total Cost to date, &c. (Ans.) 11299 (vi).

Leonardville Wharf, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re* (Ans.) 9472 (v).

'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ans.) 7198 (iv).

Major's Hill Park and G.T.Ry. Co.'s Hotel, Sale (B. 89) prop. Res., 1584 (i).
*See* 'G.T.R.'

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12799 (vii).

Matchedash Bay, Dredging done at Fesserton, &c. (Ans.) 566 (i).

Medicine Hat, Building, Contract *re* Heating System (Ans.) 10791 (vi).

Midland and Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3428 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* Dredging, 1907 (Ans.) 8181 (iv).

Midland Harbour, Tenders for Dredging (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Milford Haven Wharf, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 13060 (vii).

'Montague,' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 182 (i), 8172 (iv).

Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 1288 (i).

Montmorency Falls, Walls, Length, &c. (Ans.) 12410 (vii).

Montreal 'Gazette,' Building, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 3900 (ii).

Montreal Harbour and St. Lawrence River, Dredging and Elevator Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

Montreal Post Office Addition, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 6922 (iv).

Monuments to McGee and Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).

N. B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9376 (v).

N. B. Inland Water Wharfs, Construction Policy (Ans.) 5465 (iii).

N. B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3663 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7134 (iv).

Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditures from 1896-1908 (Ans.) 12775 (vii).

——— Dredging, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4588 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Nicolet Post Office, Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3838 (ii).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

——— Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

Notre Dame du Portage Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 6400 (iv).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7725 (iv).

Office Specialty Co., Quantity of Goods supplied Govt. (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

Ont. and Quebec Dredging, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 9276 (v).

Order, Ques. of, Withdrawal of word 'grafter,' 10994 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging (Ans.) 11496 (vi).

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. at Nicolet Post Office (Ans.) 11702 (vi).

Ottawa Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Contract *re* Extension (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

——— Inspector, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

——— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Petawawa Dock, Tenders *re* Improvements (Ans.) 685 (i).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Return (remarks) 7108 (iv).

——— Incomplete Return (remarks) 5725 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

——— Papers laid on Table, 10402 (vi).

——— Statement as to Missing Letters (remarks) 9716 (v).

Pictou Post Office, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost (Ans.) 10518 (vi).

Pinette Harbour, Pets. *re* Dredging (Ans.) 685 (i).

Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 3898 (ii).

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau (Ans.) 8839 (v).

——— Date of Contract (Ans.) 9268 (v).

——— Tenders, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1734 (i)

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Number of Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2394 (ii).
Port Arthur Dredging, Contracts, Securities, &c. (Ans.) 697 (i).
Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2389 (ii).
Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements (Ans.) 4403 (iii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10513 (vi).
Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Port Hood Harbours, Closing of Northern Entrance (Ans.) 10255 (v).
Port St. Francois Wharf, Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3424 (ii).
Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i).
Port Vernon Bridge, Completion of Works, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4404 (iii).
Postal Service in House of Com. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7669 (iv).
P.E.I., Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1686 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Ret., 2172 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 8696, 9893 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
P.E.I., Souris Breakwater, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1685 (i).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7192 (iv).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Public Works Dept., New Apptmts. (Ans.) 13061 (vii).
——— Employees at Hamilton, Delay in Pay (remarks) 10016, 10119 (v).
——— Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) 5661 (iii).
——— Ret., on Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).
Quebec County, Govt. Expenditures, on M. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4896 (iii).
Quebec County, Govt. Expenditures, on M. (Mr. Robitaille) for Ret., 3853 (ii).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).
Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).
Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10649 (vi).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4588 (iii).
——— correcting answer, 5658 (iii).
Red Head Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Reinhardt, Paul, Emplymt. in Provincial Elections, Hull (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10988 (vi).
Representation from the Mar. Provs., Ques. of Priv., 9892 (v).
Restaurant of House of Com. and Senate, Joint Com. (M.) 13224 (vii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2385, 3581 (ii).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary as Port Physician (Ans.) 6000 (iii), 6232 (iv).
Richibucto Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5467 (iii).
Rimouski Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of 'Lady Evelyn' (Ans.) 7727 (iv).
Rimouski Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10013 (v).
Rivard, Mr. S., Apptmt. as Supt. of Nicolet Post Office (Ans.) 11702 (vi).
Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 686 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3689 (ii).
Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds (Ans.) 6399 (iv).
——— Wharf, Total Amount of Dredging (Ans.) 6462 (iv).
Ruscomb River Works, Estimate of Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1122 (i).
St. Andrews Rapids Improvement Co., Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co. (Ans.) 238 (i).
St. Anicet Wharf, Expenditure by Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).
St. Boniface Public Building, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 5999 (iii).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Removal of Rock, &c. (Ans.) 6918 (iv).
——— Richmond Pier, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 6641, 6919 (iv).
St. Fulgence Pier, Signatures on Pay List, &c. (Ans.) 1116 (i).
St. John, N.B., Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co. (Ans.) 11700 (vi).
St. John Port, Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 11497 (vi).
St. John River, Snags, Removal of, Tender *re* (Ans.) 3478 (ii).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Payments to *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 8890 (v).
St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 896, 1121 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Lake Manitoba (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
St. Mary's Post Office, Total Cost (Ans.) 11019 (vi).
——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03 (Ans.) 11937 (vi).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Saguenay and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid for Use of Boom, &c. (Ans.) 183 (i).

Saguenay Dredging, Purchase of Coal, &c. (Ans.) 8380 (v).

——'Storm King,' Tug, Emplymt. of (Ans.) 8381 (v).

*See* 'Chicoutimi.'

Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c. (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8563, 9068 (v).

Scotch Town Wharf, Application (Ans.) 7202 (iv).

Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5425, 5520 (iii).

'Sir Wilfrid Laurier,' Dredge, Completion, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5207 (iii).

Skinner's Cove, Boat Channel, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10012 (v).

Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 567, 891 (i).

Souris Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 1939 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12599 (vii).

Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended (Ans.) 4764 (iii).

'Speedy,' Str., Purchase, Commission, &c. (Ans.) 565 (i), 3844 (ii).

Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, (Ans.) 2392 (ii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5564, 5787 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 638 (i), 12917 (vii).

Indians—N. B. (salaries) 12737; (schools) 13172 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5766 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13153 (vii).

Public Works—(Ass't. Dep. Minister) 5698 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 13338 (vii); (Cranbrook) 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii); (Cumberland) 10864 (vi); (Fernie) 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi); (Grand Forks) 13338; (Greenwood) 13338 (vii); (Ladysmith) 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii); (Quesnel) 10867 (vi); (Revelstoke) 13339 (vii); (Vancouver) 10868 (v), 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii); (Victoria) 10883; (Victoria, immigration) 10874; (William's Head) 10883 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886; (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (experimental farms, repairs) 10904 (vi), 13339 (vii); (furniture) 11007; (immigration, repairs) 11008; (post office fittings) 11007; (quarantine stations) 11008; (rents, &c.) 10981; List read, 10998; (repairs) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8517 (v), 10953, 10974; (Dauphin) 8519 (v); (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); Emerson) 8534 (v), 13335 (vii); (Neepawa) 8536 (v), 13336; (Portage la Prairie) 13336 (vii); (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Souris) 13336; (Winnipeg) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10955 (vi); (Winnipeg immigration) 8573 (v); (Winnipeg military) 10969 (vi); (Winnipeg P. O.) 8575; (Winnipeg warehouse) 8566 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (Fredericton) 13328; (Grand Falls) 13328; (Hillsborough) 13328; (Moncton) 13328 (vii); (quarantine, steam sterilizer) 7187; (quarantine, water service) 7186; (St. John) 7186 (iv), 13329 (vii); (St. John, military) 7186 (iv); (St. John, quarantine station) 5703 (iii); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 7187 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 7110; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax, customs) 7144; (Halifax, immigration) 7143; (Halifax, military) 7143; (Halifax, quarantine) 7171; (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Lunenburg) 13326; (Parrsboro) 13327 (vii); (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv); (Wolfville) 13327 (vii); (Yarmouth) 7180 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Arnprior) 7454; (Belleville) 7678; (Belleville armoury) 7455; (Brantford) 7455; (Dom. renewals) 7467; (Glencoe) 7473 (iv), 13331; (Guelph) 13331 (vii); (Guelph, armoury) 7678; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7692; (Hamilton, post office) 7696 (iv); (Harriston) 13331 (vii); (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, hospital) 7702 (iv); (Kingston, magazine) 10907; (Kingston, militia stores) 10907 (vi); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7702 (iv), 10907 (vi); (Leamington) 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331; (Listowel) 13331 (vii); (London, magazine) 7705; (London, military) 7706; (Markham) 7709 (iv), 13331; (Mitchell) 13332; (Mount Forest) 13331; (Niagara) 13332 (vii); (North Bay) 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii); (Owen Sound) 7817 (iv); (Park Hill) 13332 (vii); (Peterborough) 13332 (vii); (Port Arthur) 7825 (iv), 13332 (vii); (Renfrew) 7825 (iv); (St. Mary's) 7826 (iv); (Sarnia) 7829 (iv), 13333; (Seaforth) 13332 (vii); (Simcoe) 7830 (iv), 13333; (Sudbury) 13333 (vii); (Tilsonburg) 13333 (vii); (Uxbridge) 13333 (vii); (Walkerville) 13333 (vii); (Waterloo) 13333 (vii); (Welland) 7830 (iv); (Whitby) 7833 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 5700 (iii); (deptl. buildings) 1505 (i), (eastern block) 1504 (i); (elevator attendants) 11011 (vi); (grounds) 11012 (vi); (heating, &c.) 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii); (House of Commons, addition) 1486 (i); (improvements, &c.) 5707 (iii); (lighting) 11011 (vi); (Major's Hill park) 11015 (vi); (mint) 1451, 1474 (i);

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(museum) 1489 (i), 13477 (vii); (new deptl. building) 5701 (iii); (observatory) 1450, 1485 (i); (post office) 5705 (iii); (printing bureau, motors) 7817 (iv); (rents, &c.) 5706 (iii); (repairs, furniture, &c.) 10981 (vi); (Rideau Hall) 11005 (vi); (skylights) 7816 (iv); (telephones) 11012 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7183 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaskaville) 13329 (vii); (Chicoutimi) 7279 (iv); (Cookshire) 7281 (iv); (Dominion, renewals) 7286 (iv); (Dundee) 7286 (iv); (Farnham) 7287 (iv); (Grand Mere) 13329 (vii); (Grosse Isle) 7289, 7290 (iv); (Joliette) 13329 (vii); (Knowlton) 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Lachute) 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Lake Megantic) 7294 (iv); (Levis) 7294 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Longueuil) 7304 (iv); (Magog) 7306 (iv); 13329 (vii); (Marieville) 7306 (iv); (Megantic) 13330 (vii); (Montreal, barracks) 7407 (iv); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7423 (iv); (Montreal, military) 7418 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5703 (iii); (Montreal, postal station) 7418 (iv); (Montreal, post office) 7410 (iv); (Montreal, station C) 7419 (iv); (Nicolet) 7428 (iv); (Plessisville) 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii); (Point St. Charles) 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii); (Quebec Citadel) 7430 (iv); (Que. Dominion arsenal) 7435 (iv); (Quebec, drill hall) 7431 (iv); (Quebec, hospital) 7433 (iv); (Quebec, immigrants) 7432 (iv); (Quebec, warehouse) 7432 (iv); (Roberval) 13330 (vii); (St. Henri) 7439 (iv); (St. Hyacinthe) 7440 (iv); (St. John's, military) 7440 (iv); (St. John's, post office) 7444 (iv); (St. Rochs) 7438 (iv); (St. Therese) 13330 (vii); (Shawenegan) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 7439 (iv); (Three Rivers) 13330 (vii); (Westmount) 13331 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 8576 (v); (Calgary) 8578 (v); (Edmonton) 5706 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii); (Estevan) 8581 (v), 13336 (vii); (Humboldt) 8582 (v); (Lethbridge) 13336 (vii); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v), 13337 (vii); (Medicine Hat) 8601 (v); (Moose Jaw) 13336 (vii); (Prince Albert) 13337 (vii); (Prince Albert, penitentiary) 8601 (v); (Regina) 8602 (v); (Saskatoon) 8602 (v), 13337 (i); (Strathcona) 13338 (vii); (Wetaskiwin) 13338 (vii); (Yorkton) 8603 )v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 10883 (vi); (Dawson) 13339 (vii); (maintenance) 11005 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson river) 13352 (vii); Mar. Provs. (new plant) 12143 (vii); Ont. and Que. (generally) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Spillumcheen) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11694, 12032 (vi); (graving docks) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Grand Marais) 12140 (vii); (Lake Dauphin) 12141 (vii); (St. Andrew's rapids) 5701 (iii), 12145 (v); Winnipegosis Lake) 12141 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 12028 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver) 13344 (vii); (Buctouche) 11679 (vi); (Campbellton) 13344 (vii); (Campbellton wharf) 11685 (vi); (Caraquet) 11685 (vi); (Dorchester) 13344 (vii); (Dover wharf) 11692 (vi); (Harvey) 13344 (vii); (Leonardsville) 13344 (vii); (Lorneville) 13344 (vii); (Lower Newcastle) 11696 (vi); (Madawaska) 11696 (vi), 13344; (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (Moncton) 11696 (vi); (New Mills) 13345 (vii); (Richibucto) 11698 (vi); (St. Andrews) 12011 (vi); (St. John) 11698 (vi); (St. John, harbour) 12011 (vi); (St. John, improvements) 5708 (iii); (St. John, surveys) 13346 (vii); (St. John, tidal waters) 12000 (vi); (St. John, wharfs) 13345 (vii); (Shippegan) 12027 (vi); (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11207 (vi); (Baddeck) 11219 (vi); (Barachois) 11224 (vi); (Bay St. Lawrence) 11224 (vi); (Big Lorraine) 11224 (vi); (Breton Cove) 11224 (vi); (Cape St. Mary) 11224 (vi); (Caribou Island causeway) 11224 (vi); (Charlos cove) 11225 (vi); (Church Point) 11225 (vi); (Cow Bay) 11225 (vi); (Digby) 11226 (vi); (dredging) 13340 (vii); (Glace Bay) 11228 (vi); (Hall's Harbour) 11228 (vi); (McPherson's cove) 11229 (vi); (Margaree) 11229 (vi); (Middle River) 11230 (vi); (New Glasgow) 11257 (vi); (Oyster Pond) 11258 (vi); (Parker's Cove) 11258 (vi); (Parrsborough) 11259 (vi); (Poirierville pier) 11260 (v); (Porter's Lake) 11260 (vi); (Port Hastings) 11265 (vi); (Port Hilford) 11267 (vi); (Port Hood) 11268 (vi); (Port Joli West) 11279 (vi); (Port Royal) 11278 (vi); (Portuguese cove) 11279 (vi); (Pugwash wharf) 11280 (vi); (Round Hill) 11282 (vi); (Skinner's cove) 11290 (vi); (Sydney wharf) 11230 (vi); (Tancook island) 11230 (vi); (Tatamagouche) 11291 (vi); (Yarmouth) 11291 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 12090 (vii); (Belle River) 12090 (vii); (Blanche River) 12090 (vii); (Blind River) 12091 (vii); (Bronte) 12092 (vii); (Bronte, dredging) 5708 (iii); (Burlington) 12092 (vii); (Chute a Blondeau) 12092 (vii); (Cobourg) 12095 (vii); (Colborne) 12095 (vii); (Collingwood) 12096 (vii); (Georgian Bay surveys) 13326 (vii); (Goderich) 12101 (vii); (Goderich, breakwater) 13350 (vii); (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii); (Juniper Island) 13350 (vii); (Lakefield) 13350 (vii); (Little Current) 13350 (vii); (McGregor's Creek) 12103 (vii); (Magnetawan) 13350 (vii); (Meaford) 12103 (vii); (Michipicoten) 13350 (vii); (Midland and Tiffin) 12105 (vii); (Petawawa) 12133 (vii); (Peterborough) 12133 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 12144 (vii); (Port Burwell) 12135 (vii); (Port Colborne) 12146 (vii); (Port Credit) 12102 (vii); (Port Hope) 12135 (vii); (Port Stanley) 12136 (vii); (Rainy River) 12136 (vii); (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Ron-

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

deau) 12137 (vii); (Rossport) 12137 (vii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 12137 (vii); (Severn) 12137 (vii); (Smeeth and McGillicuddy) 13350 (vii); (Southampton) 12137 (vii); (Stanley Island pier) 5720 (iii); (Temiskaming Lake) 13350 (vii); (Tiffin) 13351 (vii); (Tiffin, dredging) 5709 (iii); (Tobermory) 13351 (vii); (Toronto) 12137 (vii); (Victoria) 12137 (vii); (Winnipeg River) 12138 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (McPherson's cove) 11292 (vi); (New London) 11292 (vi); (repairs) 11292 (vi); (Rustico) 11293 (vi); (Souris) 13341 (vii); (Summerside) 13343 (vii).

Public Works Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 12028 (vi); (Anse a l'Ilot) 12029 (vi); (Baie St. Paul) 12029 (vi); (Barachois de Malbaie) 12029 (vi); (Batiscan) 12029 (vi); (Batiscan, river) 12036 (vi); (Berthier) 12029 (vi); (Bic wharf) 12030 (vi); (Bonaventure) 12036 (vi); (Cap St. Ignace) 12030 (vi); (Chateauguay) 12030 (vi); (Chicoutimi) 12030 (vi); (Clarke City) 12031 (vi); (East Templeton) 12031 (vi); (Escoumains) 12031 (vi); (Father Point) 12031 (vi); (Grand Mechins) 12031 (vi); (Grande Riviere) 12031 (vi); (Lake Aylmer) 12032 (vi); (Lake Megantic) 12032 (vi); (Lake St. Francis) 12033 (vi); (Lake St. John) 12033 (vi); (Lavaltrie) 12033 (vi); (Les Eboulements) 12033 (vi); (Lotbiniere) 12033 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 12034 (vi); (Malbay) 12034 (vi); (Matane) 12034 (vi); (Montmagny) 12034 (vi); (Nicolet) 12034 (vi); (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034 (vi); (Peribonka) 12035 (vi); (Petite Decharge) 12034 (vi); (Piche Point) 12035 (vi); (Pointe aux Trembles) 12035 (vi); (Quebec, harbour) 12144 (vii); (Richelieu) 12037 (vi); (Rimouski) 12035 (vi); (Riviere du Lievre) 12037 (vi); (Riviere du Loup) 12036 (vi); (Riviere Maskinonge) 12037 (vi); (Riviere Ouelle) 12037 (vi); (St. Alphonse) 12041 (vi); (Ste. Anne des Monts) 12042 (vi); (St. Francis) 12041 (vi); (St. Francois) 12042 (vi); (St. Ignace de Loyola) 12042 (vi); (St. Jacques) 12041 (vi); (St. Jean des Chaillons) 12042 (vi); (St. Jean Orleans) 12042 (vi); (St. Laurent) 12042 (vi); (St. Louis) 12040 (vi); (St. Maurice River) 12041 (vi); (St. Omer) 12042 (vi); (St. Pierre les Becquets) 12042 (vi); (St. Simeon) 12042 (vi); (Saguenay) 12040 (vi); (Sorel) 12042 (vi); (Three Rivers, deep water wharf) 13349 (vii); (Varennes) 12042 (vi); (Yamaska, dredging) 12043 (vi); (Yamaska, lock) 12041 (vi); (Yamaska, river) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Lesser Slave Lake) 5719 (iii); (Lesser Slave) 13351 (vii); (Old Man's River) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096 (vi); (cement testing) 11078 (vi); (clerical assistance) 11099 (vi); (Deep Waterways Commission) 11101 (vi); (engineering branch) 11093 (vi); (gratuities) 5730 (iii); (International Commission *re* Red River) 11118 (vi); (monuments) 11118 (vi); (technical books) 11100 (vi); (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi); (unprovided items) 11119 (vi).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Shellmouth) 12143 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 5731 (iii); (B. C. Cape Beale Lines) 5732 (iii); (cable service) 5731 (iii); (Chicoutimi) 13179 (vii); (Marconi) 12143 (vii); (operating) 13178 (vii); (Yukon) 13179 (vii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 12146 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (St. John accommodation) 12257 (vii).

Sussex St. Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Tache, J. C., Emplymt. in Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 11701 (vi).

Tenders, Lists of Papers *re* Advertisements (read) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).

Tiffin, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Tignish Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3229 (ii).

Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 682 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).

Tilbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).

Toney River Boat Harbour, Contract Price, Extras, &c. (Ans.) 9712 (v).

Toronto Harbour (eastern gap), Amount of Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 354 (i).

——— Construction of Entrance (Ans.) 355 (i).

——— Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Date, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1507 (i).

Toronto Harbour (western entrance) Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 518 (i), 4587 (iii), 10014 (v).

——— Entrance, Delay in Contract (remarks) 5915 (iii).

Toronto Island Tunnel, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5564 (iii).

Town Site Property, Section 32, Public Works *re* (Ans.) 1125 (i).

Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Transportation: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Trueman, Mr., and N. B. Cold Storage Co., Ques. of Priv., 9343 (v).

Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring (Ans.) 3429 (ii).

Uniforms and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9571 (v).

Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c. (Ans.) 4587 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Vautelet, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 642 (i).
Ventilation of H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).
*See* 'House of Commons,' &c.
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).
Victoria Beach Pier, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).
Victoria Harbour, Tenders *re* Dredging (Ans.) 8893 (v).
Welchpool Wharf, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 7935 (iv).
Western Block Extension, Total Expenditure, Area, &c. (Ans.) 512 (i).
Westville Public Building, Total Cost (Ans.) 9475 (v).
Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Expenditure *re*, on M. (Mr. Blain) for Cor., 5476 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).
Winfield Basin Dredging, Tenders, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 6461 (iv).
White Head Wharf, Report *re* Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).
Wiarton Dredging, 1907, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6236 (iv).
——— Payments to Mr. Bowman, &c. (Ans.) 6407 (iv).
Yarmouth, Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 11500 (vi).
Yukon Telegraphs, Receipts and Expenses (Ans.) 512 (i).
——— Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1934 (i).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*
Acetylene Gas Works at Prescott, Emplymt. of Political Officers (remarks) in deb. on Technical Education, 3292 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4504 (iii).
Beauharnois Canal, Lease of Water Power (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
Belleville—Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8553 (v).
Blue Books, Distribution of (remarks) 432 (i).
Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2993 (ii).
Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).
Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 188 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt., B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12853, 13052 (vii).
Canned Foods Inspection Act, Enforcement of (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6871 (iv).
*Catharine C.*, Incomplete Return (remarks) 5727 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11566 (vi).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5891 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5627 (iii).
Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
Cypress Hills, Timber Reserve, Preservation of, &c. (Ques.) 3841 (ii).
Deep Waterways Commission, St. Lawrence River Dam (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
——— Damming of St. Lawrence at Long Sault (remarks) 13151 (vii).
Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1638 (i).
——— on M. for Sup., 1875 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12941 (vii).
Doukhobors, Religious Fanatics, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 12161 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13270 (vii).
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3798 (ii).
Gilmore, Edith May Relief (B. 164) 1°*, 8377; 2°*, 8610 (v).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6269 (iv).
Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3292 (ii).
G.T.Ry., Connections at Prescott (remarks) 433 (i).
Halliday Bros., Supplies to Lighthouses, Rates, &c. (Ques.) 6236 (iv).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Claims of M. J. Haney, Arbitration *re* (remarks) 1739 (i).
Indian Lands at New Westminster, Sale of (Ques.) 3037, 3839 (ii).
I.C.R., Delays to Maritime Express, &c. (Ques.) 8614 (v).
——— Number of Tons of Steel Rails, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).
——— Rolling Stock in Service on Sundays, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).
——— Rolling Stock, Purchase of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Trains breaking down, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).
——— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, &c. (M. for ret.) 6242 (iv).
——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4469 (iii).
Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights, &c. (Ques.) 3036 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5491 (iii), 6464 (iv).
Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12139 (vii).
Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9476 (v).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl., Book-keeping, &c., ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4004 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 7327 (iv).
——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6847 (iv).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3018 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894, 7247 (iv).
Medicine Hat Building, Contract *re* Heating System (Ques.) 10791 (vi).
'Montcalm,' Collision with C.P.R. Steamer, Par. in 'Montreal Gazette' (remarks) 8086 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Contract *re* Cement, &c. (Ques.) 7199, 7499 (iv).
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment of (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).
——— Return Inquiry for, 5490 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4107 (ii).
Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6227 (iv).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of (remarks) 609 (i).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B.C., Sale to (Ques.) 6002 (iii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).
Petition. (M.) to introduce, 1682 (i).
Plains of Abraham, Lease to Ross Rifle Co., &c. (Ques.) 1348 (i).
Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3894 (ii).
P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1739 (i), 2740 (ii).
Public Accounts Committee, Meetings, &c., Adjournments, &c. (remarks) 1439 (i).
——— Production of Original Documents (remarks) 4495 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Public Works Dept., Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4890 (iii).
Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6225 (iv).
Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).
Quebec Troops, Food supplied (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3929 (ii).
Ry. Passenger Ticket Act Amt. (B. 90) 1° m., 2466 (ii); 2° m., 5244 (iii).
——— (remarks) 3404 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting (Ques.) 8613 (v).
Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4666 (iii).
*See* 'Documents.'
Returns unopposed, *re* I. C. R. (remarks) 5914 (iii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8516 (v).
St. Lawrence Power and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3009 (ii).
*See* 'Deep Waterways.'
Salmon Licenses, Leases &c., in B.C. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).
Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8560, 8610 (v).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5458 (iii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12598 (vii).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1929 (i).
Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (seed grain) 5500 (iii).
Canals—Galops (Upper entrance) 5671 (iii).
Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5664 (iii).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12223 (vii).
Canals—Soulanges (Manning & Macdonald's claims) 5669 (iii).
Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12197; (Port Colborne) 12216 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5681 (iii); (widening) 12211 (vii).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878 (vii); Interior (salaries, &c.) 616 (i); Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915; Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii).
Marine (ice-breakers) 1909 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5735 (iii); (customs dues) 12155; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (properties) 12148; (provisions) 12150;

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(R. M. College) 12153; (warlike stores) 12149 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2942, 2950; (life-saving awards) 2972; (masters and mates) 2969 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13253 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8517 (v), 10953 (vi); (Neepawa) 8544; (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10955 (vi); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8567 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 7111 (iv).

Public Works — Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7463; (Dom. renewals) 7479; (Glencoe) 7497 (iv); (Kingston) 10913 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 1450; (deptl. buildings) 1505; (House of Com., additions) 1486; (mint) 1451, 1474; (museum) 1490; (observatory) 1485 (i); (skylights) 7816 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Farnham) 7288; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Knowlton) 7292; (Levis) 7294 (iv).

Public Works — Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 12141; (St. Andrew's Rapids) 12145 (vii).

Public Works — Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Digby) 11226; (Porter's Lake) 11260 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Brighton) 12134; (Chute à Blondeau) 12092; (Colborne) 12095; (Midland and Tiffin) 12125; (Petewawa) 12133 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713 (iii); (Port Colborne) 12146; (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Stanley Island wharf) 5720 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. Quebec harbour) 12144 (vii).

Public Works — Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11090; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11116; (engineering branch) 11094 (vi); (gratuities) 5730 (iii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay survey) 12146 (vii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Campbellton) 12258; (Moncton car shops) 12250 (vii); (Pictou) 5561; (rolling stock) 5549 (iii); (St. John, increased accommodation) 12257 (vii); (train service) 10223; (Windsor Branch) 10146 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10357; (Ry. Commission) 10361 (vi).

Tenders, Advertising, *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4702, neg. (Y. 50; N. 95) 4735 (iii).

Timber Lands, Sale of to Messrs. Rutherford, &c. (Ques.) 1293 (i).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

'Victor,' Tug, Repairs by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 9774 (v).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., &c., on M. to adjn. House, 5905 (iii).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A.—*Con.*

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3463 (ii).

ROBITAILLE, Mr. L., *Quebec County.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3866 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4514 (iii).

Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production (Ques.) 12410 (vii).

Experimental Farm, Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade *re* Establishment, &c. (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

French Language, Par. in 'Le Soleil,' on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1212 (i).

Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 13059 (vii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6976, 6989 (iv).

——— Par. in 'Canadian Gazette' (remarks) 7453 (iv).

Meat and Canned Food Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7237 (iv).

Militia Dept., Quebec, Hours for Masons, &c. (Ques.) 10790 (vi).

Montmorency Falls Retaining Walls, Width, &c. (Ques.) 12410 (vii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3450 (ii).

Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditures for the last fifty years (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Printing Supt., Apptmnt. of a Frenchman (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Provincial Elections, and Federal Ministers' Speeches (remarks) 8850 (v).

Public Works Dept., New Apptmts., &c. (Ques.) 13061 (vii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare (Ques.) 8173 (iv).

——— Names of Jurymen, &c. (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13389 (vii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13491 (vii).

Quebec County Expenditures by Govt. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.) 3853 (ii).

Ques. of Priv., Deputy Minister of Public Works *re* French Canadians, 8465 (v).

Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition (Ques.) 6983 (iv).

ROBITAILLE, Mr. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10606 (vi).
Excise (methylated spirits) 821 (i).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., 909 (i).

ROCHE, Mr. W., *Halifax.*

Address, The, 267 (i).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12453 (vii).
Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4285 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8691 (iv); on M. for 3°, 13257 (vii).
Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1719 (i).
G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12323 (vii).
I.C.R., &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4486 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Accounts, Payments to Mr. Falconer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4120 (ii).
Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10693 (vi).
Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5847 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4046 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1068 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Porter's Lake) 11264 (vi).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Address, The, 485 (i).
Buffalo purchased for Elk Park, Name of Purchaser, &c. (Ques.) 5795 (iii).
Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subvention, &c. (Ques.) 5080 (iii).
Clearwater Lake, Half-breeds' Rights, &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Customs Collectors in Man., Additional Fees charged, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1183 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8012 (iv), 11762 (vi); in Com., 13005 (vii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 759 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11168, 11422 (vi).
Doukhobors bonused as Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9953 (v).
Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7633 (iv).
Fish Exportations from Man., five years to March, 1907, Value, &c. (Ques.) 4240 (iii).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c. (Ques.) 3844 (ii).
Grain Inspection and Sale Act, Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13211 (vii).
G.T.P., Engineers and Assistant Engineers, Names, &c., Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5802 (iii).
——— Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating Deductions (Ques.) 1937 (i).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6347 (iv).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5789 (iii).
Immigration, Salvation Army Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
Indian Schools, Prosecutions *re* Riots (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 626 (i).
Internal Economy Board, H. of C., Minutes, &c. (M. for copies*) 2795 (ii).
Land Sales in N. W., Purchasers' Names, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 3835 (ii).
Leech, Mr. R. A. E., Apptmt. of (notice of motion) 3477 (ii).
*See* 'Seed Grain.'
Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C. P. R. Accident (remarks) 9724 (v).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12803 (vii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension (remarks) 6222 (iv).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 7506 (iv).
Manitoba Election Frauds, Investigation Com., ref. to in debate on Address, 495 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13222 (vii).
Man. Voters Lists, Polling Divisions, made by Judges (remarks) 13141 (vii).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty from 1905-8 (Ques.) 8441 (v).
Military Stores of Rural Battalions, Care of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
Minnedosa Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
'Montague,' Dredge, Expenditure *re* Repairs (Ques.) 8172 (iv).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9188 (v).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Number, Total Receipts, Applications, &c. (Ques.) 5258 (iii).

—— Sub-Land Agency, Closing of (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads, Letter from Mr. Seaman (read) in Com. of Sup., 9992 (v).

—— Entry by Homesteaders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).

—— Timber Reserves, Squatters' Claims, &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).

St. Boniface Public Building, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 4246 (iii).

—— Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 5999 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers (Ques.) 2217 (ii).

—— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors (Ques.) 7990 (iv).

—— Title, Extinguish of, Issue of Patents, &c. (Ques.) 1932 (i).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 9167 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Land Grants, Patents, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).

Sawmill Owners, Applications refused *re* Timber Cutting (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).

Seed Grain in N. W., Distribution of, Apptmt. of Mr. R. E. A. Leeh (remarks) 3040 (ii).

—— Duties assigned to Mr. Leech (remarks) 3158 (ii).

Seed Grain for N.W., Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P. (remarks) 1442 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2909 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1373 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2775 (ii).

Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers and State Papers, Register 'B' *re* Hudson Bay Co., Custody of, &c. (Ques.) 1684 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3815 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9769 (v).

Customs—Miscellaneous (guarantees) 9577; Inspectors (salaries) 9550 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10046; (forest rangers) 10019; (surveys) 9989 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9860; (deportations) 9883 (v); (general expenses) 5754 (iii); (hospitals) 9982; (literature, &c.) 9952 (v).

Legislation (provincial voters' lists) 10508 (vi).

Militia (annual drill) 5737 (iii); (rifle and artillery grants) 12152 (vii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2775 (ii).

N.W. Ters. (school grants) 10118 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10889 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon, drill hall) 8518; (Dauphin) 8519; (Neepawa) 8536; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10962 (vi); (Winnipeg, immigration) 8574; (Winnipeg, P.O.) 8575 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7713 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582; (Saskatoon) 8603; (Yorkton) 8603 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Shellmouth) 12143 (vii).

Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W.T., Retention by Original Grantees (Ques.) 2546 (ii).

Timber Cutting by Saw-mill Owners, Applications *re* (Ques.) 2168 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2614 (ii).

Timber Permits to Saw-mill Owners, O.C. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 179 (i).

Town Site, Section 32, Man., Erection of Public Buildings, &c. (Ques.) 1125, 1348 (i).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).

Western Rifle Association, Pet. *re* Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

ROSS, Mr. A. C., *Cape Breton, N., and Victoria.*

Cement, Sydney, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11227 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 11219; (Digby) 11226 (vi).

ROSS, Mr. D., *Yale-Cariboo.*

Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 1283 (i).

Bank Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) M. to adjn. debate, 4312 (iii).

Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 606 (i).

B.C. Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905 (M. for ret.) 3435 (ii).

Canadian Naturalization, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order 12089 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10747 (vi).

Criminal Code Amendments, Ques. of Order, 9282 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10138 (v).

ROSS, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Customs Outside Service, in Com. of Sup., Members remarks checked, 9451 (v).
Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N. W. M. Police Force (Ques.) 6001 (iii).
Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1172 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1632, 1653 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8185 (iv); in Com., 11877, 11932 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13252 (vii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11176 (vi).
Edmonton, Dunvegan and B. C. Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 754 (i).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co., Application for Portion of Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1512 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768 (i).
Immigration Bonuses, Ques. of Order, *re* Discussion of former Speech, 1298 (i).
Indian Lands, B.C., Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 630 (i).
Indian Schools, Dr. Bryce's Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 625 (i).
I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).
Japanese Immigration Restriction, B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1744 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2066 (ii).
——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1602 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs., &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies, 855, 877 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 732 (i).
Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 754 (i).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11244 (vi).
Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9916 (v).
——— Ques. of Order, 10023, 'Bourinot' quoted, 10030 (v).
Obstruction Tactics, &c., Ques. of Order, 9222 (v).
Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 131) 1°*, 5337 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv).
Order, Points of, 'Bourinot' *re* Discussions on, 4103 (ii).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4955 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Rep., Ques. of Order, 13401 (vii).

ROSS, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4986 (iii).
——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118, Ques. of Order, 10663 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).
Resignation as Member *re* Chinese Question (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11106 (vi).
Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.'s (B. 49) 1°*, 891 (i); in Com., 5409, 5519 (iii).
S.A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3773 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 625 (i).
Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9244; Ques. of Order, 9222 (v).
Legislation (voters' lists) 10508 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4099 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12126 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Knowlton) 7293 (iv).

Timber Berths, Leasing of, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2287 (ii).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. *re* Amts., 908 (i).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris*.

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4520 (iii).
Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ques.) 3240 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8200 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11132; in Com., 11170, 11458, 11521; (amt.) 11943; (amt.) on M. for 3°, 11970; Neg. (Y. 28; N. 58) 11974 (vi).
Fisheries in Lake Winnipeg, Legislation *re* Closing (Ques.) 2389 (ii).
Fish Hatchery, Lake Winnipeg, Failure *re* Spawn, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).
Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13210 (vii).
Homestead Entries granted for Quarters 10-17-17 W. of 4th Meridian, &c. (Ques.) 9773 (v).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10492 (vi).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction of, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6306 (iv).
Immigrants, Amounts paid for Maintenance, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).
——— (Ques.) 5084 (iii).
Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt. (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

Immigration from U. S., Total Amount expended (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Purchase by Govt., Staff, &c. (Ques.) 3434 (ii).

Land Patents for Sections 10, and 17, Applicants *re* (Ques.) 9475 (v).

Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 2977 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Papers, Memorials, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 852 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12565, 13220 (vii).

Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres, &c. (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Montreal Harbour, Expenditure *re* Docks and Elevators (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1683 (i).

'Neptune,' Cruise in Hudson Bay, on order for Copy of Rep. (wthdn.) 850 (i).

Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Patents to (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of (Ques.) 1940 (i).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4976 (iii).

——— (demurrage) B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3366 (ii).

Railway Building to Fort Churchill, &c., Cor., Documents, &c. (M. for copies*) 1689 (i).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1367 (i).

Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Squatters on Forest Reserves in Turtle Mountain (remarks) 4739 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10074; (surveys) 10007 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9866; (deportations) 9882 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8519; (Emerson) 8534; (Neepawa) 8540; (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10964 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7490 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582 (v).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2655 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7647 (iv).

SCHELL, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11389 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).

SCHELL, Mr. J. T.—*Con.*

Dredging Contracts, Supplies, &c. (remarks) 7106 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13264 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13298 (vii).

G.T.P., Construction Tenders, Total Amounts, &c. (M. for ret.) 600 (i).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12677 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12364 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4997 (iii).

Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com on Res., 13291 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12198; (Port Colborne) 12221 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12126 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (piping) 10195 (v).

Transportation Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12221 (vii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2188 (ii).

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *Oxford S.*

Budget, The, 5616, 5957 (iii).

Canada Weather Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 37) 1°*, 753 (i); in Com., 5174 (iii).

Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4563; in Com., 4564 (iii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10835 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10560 (vi).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1550 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598 (vii).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12439 (vii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connections, Charges against Ry. Commission (remarks) 1435 (i).

Budget, The, 5338 (iii).

Imperial Pulp Co., Denial re Managing Directorship, Par. in Montreal 'Star,' Ques. of Priv., 3578 (ii).

SIFTON, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, Govt. Aid (M.) to adjn., 1349 (i).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).
Budget, The, 6615 (iv).
Can. Ensign: *See* 'Red,' &c.
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12854 (vii).
Coasting Privileges, prop. Res. (Mr. Black) withdrawn, 2795 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11986 (vi).
Debates of the House, Average Cost per Column (Ques.) 3479 (ii).
Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. Bill, on M. to introduce, 508 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 31) 1°*, 562 (i); in Com., 5248 (iii).
Fisheries Com., Sel. Standing, Apptmt. of (prop. res.) 1691 (i).
Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Violation of Act (M. for ret.*) 1513 (i).
Fishery Officers Jurisdiction, Convictions, Fines, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations, Violations of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).
I.C.R., Hanlon's Crossing Accident, Investigation *re* (M. for papers*) 5800 (iii).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3027 (ii).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) 3680 (ii).
Northwest and Gold Dredging Co., Leases, assigned, &c. (Ques.) 11702 (vi).
Postal Revenue, One Cent Rate (Ques.) 8381 (v).
Presbyterian College, Halifax (B. 154) in Com., 7667 (iv).
Red Ensign, Flying on Merchant Vessels, Authority *re* (uQes.) 12775 (vii).
Shipping, Statistics *re* Tons Registered, &c. (Ques.) 2790 (ii).
SUPPLY—
House of Commons (contingencies) 10503 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4016, 4169 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 10298 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2957; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton, additional line) 12761 (vii).

SLOAN, Mr. W., *Comox-Atlin.*
British Columbia Bank incorp. (B. 59) 2° m., 1469 (i).

SLOAN, Mr. W.—*Con.*
'Carlotta G. Cox,' Schr., Seizure, &c.: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 350 (i).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1611 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 726 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox,' on M. for Sup., 3934 (ii).
——— (notice of motion) *re* Discussion, 3156 (ii).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 2160 (ii); in Com., 4545; on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 55) 1°*, 1108 (i).
Yukon Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court (Ques.) 10301 (vi).
Yukon Telegraph Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1934 (i).

SMITH, Mr. E. D., *Wentworth.*
Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized, &c. (Ques.) 4402 (iii).
Budget, The, 5375, 5388 (iii).
Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to, &c. (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c. (Ques.) 4403 (iii).
Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6203 (iii).
Cold Storage Plants, Construction of, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3523; in Com., 3595, 3645 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).
Fruit Inspection, in Closed Packages, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).
Militia Food Supply, Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).
Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3346 (ii).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4979 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Excise (travelling expenses) 815 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5774 (iii).
Militia (stores, &c.) 5739 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1477; (museum) 1498 (i).

SMITH, Mr. G., *Oxford, N.*

Address, The, 407 (i).
Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1555 (i).
Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2866 (ii).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Brantford Stove Works Strike, Arrest *re* Picketing (remarks) 9027 (v).
Canada-Australia SS. Service, Yearly Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10548, 10745 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11373 (vi).
Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9192 (v).
Coal Land Leases, Applicants *re* (Ques.) 2395 (ii).
Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4685 (iii).
Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act, Dom. Interference (remarks) 1738 (i).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrison, Equipment, &c. (Ques.) 1293 (i).
—— Transfer to Canada (Ques.) 1293 (i).
Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations *re* with Mr. Bastedo, Reports *re* (remarks) 6849 (iv).
G.T.P. Workmen Accidents, &c. (remarks) 10624 (vi).
Immigrant Inspection on Ships, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Immigrants stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of (Ques.) 567 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6449 (iv).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6729, 7007 (iv).
Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11029 (vi).
Japanese Colony in the West, C.P.R. Application *re* (Ques.) 7196 (iv).
Japanese Immigration Act, Disallowance of *re* B.C. (Ques.) 6642 (iv).
—— Natal Act, Cor., &c., with Lt. Gov., B.C. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of (prop. Res.) 699 (i).
—— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2081 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 874 (i).
Labour Disputes Bill, Applications, &c., *re* Settlement (M. for ret.*) 605 (i).
Mail Service in B.C., Better Arrangements *re* (remarks) 3754 (ii).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4691 (iii); on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com., 12053 (vii).
Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2419 (ii).
Railway Act (working hours) Amt. (B. 157) 1° m., 6843 (iv).
Shipping Companies on Pacific Coast, Amounts of Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 6919 (iv).
Spratte, Hattie, Relief (B. 182) 1°*, 9889 (v).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10066 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 5740 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Ladysmith) 10867; (Quesnel) 10868 (vi).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland), *Essex, N.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) Remarks, 530 (i).
Adjournment of the House, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4495 (iii).
Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) Irrelevancy of Debate, 4730 (iii).
Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) Members addressing Hse. from their Seats without rising (remarks) 10922 (vi).
Banking System, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) Members remarks checked, 2307 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111, on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).
Belleville City Floods, Investigation *re*, Members remarks checked, 3319 (ii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., &c., on Qes. of Order (Mr. German) 2809; (ruling) 2810 (ii).
Bills, Royal Assent, Mess. from His Ex., 2974, 2995 (ii), 5135, 6157 (iii), 6526 (iv), 10656 (vi).
—— Mess. from Senate, 13587 (vii).
Brantford Stove Works Strike (remarks) 9027 (v).
Cigarette Restraint B. (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13045 (vii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11363, 11535, 11645 (vi).
Civil Service Commission Report, Discussion *re*, Ques. of Order (ruling) 5627-8 (iii).
Colchester Electoral District, Certificate (notification) 680 (i).
Criminal Code Amendments, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 9282 (v).
Cyr, Mr., Letter from, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) (ruling) 8461 (v).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, Members remarks checked, 1195 (i), 2305 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster)—(ruling) 11717 (vi).

——— on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 13247 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3° (ruling) 11977 (vi), 12394 (vii).

Dredging Contracts, O.C., Rule *re* Producing, 6927 (iv).

——— Ref. to Matters before Committee (ruling) 6749 (iv).

Easter Adjournment (remarks) 6843 (iv).

Eclipse Mfg. Co., Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 7470 (iv).

Electoral Districts, Certificates of Election (notification) 890 (i).

Electoral District of Nicolet, Certificate of Election (notification) 1283 (i).

Electoral District, Vacancies, Issue of Writs (notifications) 2 (i).

Election, New Members, Certificates of Election (notification) 2 (i).

Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments (presented) 1 (i).

Fire Extinguishers Ret., Members remarks checked, 4833 (iii).

——— Irrelevancy of debate, 7776 (iv).

French Language, Pet. *re*, Ques of Order, 8886 (v).

Govt. Grounds, Conditions *re*, Members remarks checked, 1741 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co.'s B. 89, Members remarks checked, 2254 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley)—(ruling) 8136 (iv).

G.T.P. Supplies via American Routes, Member's remarks checked, 9026 (v).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25, in Com., on Ruling to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, 4542 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10491 (vi).

Huron, South Riding, Certificate of Election (notification) 2541 (ii).

——— Vacancy, &c. (notification) 890 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1299 (i).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) Member's remarks checked, 13137 (vii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Indian Lands in Algoma, *re* Mr. Sifton's Telegram (remarks) 13532 (vii).

Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 8 (i).

Japanese Immigration, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Attacks on Prov. Govt. (ruling) 1763 (i).

Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

Man. Voters' Lists, Affidavits quoted by Member (ruling) *re* Laying on Table, 7948 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Misconduct of Officials, Member's remarks checked, 6633

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr .Fisher) on M. for 3°, Member's remarks checked, 7217 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. Blain) to ref. back to Com., 7227 (iv).

Members introduced, 3 (i).

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 5134 (iii).

——— Suppl. Estimates (read) 12503 (vii).

Moir, Private, Shooting, &c., Member's remarks checked, 7322 (iv).

Montmagny, Electoral District (Notification) Vacancy, 9263 (v).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher), Appeal to the Speaker, 4070; (ruling) 4071; Agreed to (Y. 59; N. 23) 4071 (ii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on Amts. (ruling) 9503 (v).

Motions, Unopposed, and Business of the Hse. (remarks) 8896 (v).

Obstruction *re* Supply, &c., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 9925 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 10024 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) to Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross)—(ruling) 10025, 10031 (v).

Opening of Parliament, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1 (i).

Order Paper, French and English Editions (remarks) 6741 (iv).

Order, Ques. of, re answering Questions by Govt. (ruling) 234 (i).

Peace Interparliamentary Union, Meeting in Ottawa, Com. from Senate (read) 13581 (vii).

Petit Rocher Wharf, Discussion *re* (ruling) 9717 (v).

Petition, on M. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to introduce, 1682 (i).

Postal Arrangements between Can. and U. S., Member's remarks checked, 3164 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry. Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 12629 (vii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Discussion of (remarks) 1109 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Member's remarks checked, 4496 (iii).

Priv., Ques. of (Mr. A. Lavergne) Member's remarks checked, 7993 (iv).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 13580 (vii).

——— Mess. from Senate, 13587 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 3085 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Johnston) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 9890 (v).

Public Works, Dep. Minister and French Canadians, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Robitaille) 8465 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) Member's remarks checked, 4910 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 4958 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 13401 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 13402 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).

Quebec County Expenditures (remarks) *re* Question, 3847 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Joint Meeting of Members and Senators (remarks) 6061 (iii).

Ques. of Order, *re* Accepting Minister's Stmnt. (ruling) 9352 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) Member's remarks checked, 2382 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) (ruling) 2383 (ii).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Reid)—(remarks) 9774 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) *re* Representation of Mar. Provs. (remarks) 9892 (v).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden)—(ruling) 11618 (vi).

——— on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 11602 (vi).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) ref. to deb. in Senate (ruling) 577 (i).

Railway Commissioners' Board Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8511 (v).

Ry. Connections at Brockville, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) Remarks checked, 9 (i).

Returns, Retention of by Members, on Ques. of Priv., Member's remarks checked, 4667 (iii).

Seed Grain Distribution, Member's remarks checked, 6635 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Seed Grain Distribution, Apptmt. of Mr. R. A. E. Leech, Discussion ruled out of Order, 3041 (ii).

Speech from the Throne (read) 3 (i).

Supplies purchased for Govt., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5830, (ruling) 5831 (iii).

——— Member's remarks checked, 5837 (iii).

SUPPLY—

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508; (contingencies) 10502; (salaries) 10491, 10501 (vi); (salary, increases) 13562 (vii); (Sergeant-at-Arms) 10503 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) Member's remarks checked, 1064 (i).

Senate (salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).

Timber Berths, on M. for Original Documents (remarks) 2984 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order, *re* Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turrig)—(ruling) 11304 (vi).

Tobacco Prohibition, Resolution *re* Moral Reform Associations, Member's remarks checked, 11302 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Barker) (ruling) 923 (i).

Vacancies in Electoral District (notification) 2 (i).

Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ (notification) 569 (i).

York, Centre, Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 1018 (i).

SPEAKER, DEP. (Mr. C. Marcil) *Bonaventure.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11828 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, Member's remarks checked, 5025 (iii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) ref. to Speaker, 8135 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3717 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Member's remarks checked, 11290 (vi).

Lord's Day Act, Violations *re* Horse Racing, Member's remarks checked, 3753 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., Discussion *re* M. to adjn., 3656 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

Ocean and River Service, Irrelevancy of debate, 2943 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 10993 (vi).

SPEAKER, DEP.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch Ry. B. 202, Member's remarks checked, 12632 (vii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Talbot) *re* Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' Member's remarks checked, 4222 (iii).

Restaurant Com., Joint, 1st Rep. (presented) 13510 (vii).

Royal Mint, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup. (ruling) 1461 (i).

School Statutes, Saskatchewan Prov. (remarks) 6854 (iv).

Tobacco, Violation of Act, in Com. of Sup. (ruling) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 9250 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *Grey, E.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3855, 3880 (ii).

Anglo-American Treaties, Inquiry for Cor., 10120 (v).

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°. 5763 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13307 (vii).

Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction (Ques.) 3848 (ii).

Banking Act Amts., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4272 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10923; in Com., 10933 (vi).

Banking Systems, Criticisms of Newspaper Report, Ques. of Privilege, 2308 (ii).

Battlefields of Quebec, Tercentenary at Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4388; in Com., 4415, 4511; on M. for 3°, 4532 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2810 (ii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552 (v).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6521 (iv).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2994 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Bonusing System, on Notice of Motion (remarks) 6290 (iv).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9740 (v).

Budget, The, 6595 (iv).



SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6171, 6173 (iii); in Com., 6408 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6872 (iv).

Catholics and Public Offices, Ref. to Speech in the Senate, Ques. of Priv., 5047 (iii).
*See* 'Employees.'

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11251 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10749, 11021 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5114 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10721; in Com., 11366, 11536, 11635 (vi), 12184 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Number distributed (remarks) 6060 (iii).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5901 (iii).

——— Report (remarks) 5628, 5633 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).

Colonization Lands, Alienation of, Inquiry for Ret., 3752 (ii), 4317 (iii).

Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4556 (iii).

Criminal Code (ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13317

Criminal Code (trade restraint) Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2976 (ii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9736 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from *re* Statement of Members, Ruling *re*, 8462 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10487 (vi).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1147, 1194 (i).

——— Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1782 (i).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Copp) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 3°, 13244; (amt.) to M. for 3°. 13255 (vii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 755 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11466 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10815, 10820 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5027 (iii).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws (remarks) 7639 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6755 (iv).

——— (remarks) 6633 (iv).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6912 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13266; in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).

Employees of Parliament and Printing Bureau, Names, Salaries, Religions, &c. (Ques.) 5206 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.) 5479 (iii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13470 (vii).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7664 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7774 (iv).

Fisheries Treaty, Boundaries with U. S., Information *re* (remarks) 6632, 6739 (iv).

Fishing Rights in Matane River, &c. (Ques.) 7446 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal (remarks) 8294 (v).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3618, 3636 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on Preparation of Stmnt. *re* Duty Units (remarks) 945 (i).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10554 (vi).

Fruit Inspection (apples) Complaints *re* (remarks) 2754 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3623, 3794 (ii), 4230 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12556 (vii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (remarks) 6287 (iv).

——— Precedence *re* Motion for Want of Confidence (remarks) 6917 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, Interference *re*, on M. for Sup., 2890 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8552, 8744, 9461 (v).

G.T.P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8836 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Investigation *re* Charges of Major Hodgins, on 1st Rep. of Com., 8515 (v).

——— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2241 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4224; on M. for 3°, 4536 (iii).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Neglect of Duty as Inspector at Halifax (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Hindus in B. C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).

Hogs saughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13094 (vii).

Horses and Cattle, Imports to U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of (Ques.) 6000 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10492 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) 6302 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6434 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1299 (i).

Immigration from England, Statements of Mr. Walker and Mr. Smith (remarks) 5491 (iii).

Immigants stranded in Toronto (remarks) 429 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6475, 6482 (iv).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Employees, Circular from Genl. Manager *re* Municipal Politics (read) 2304 (ii).

——— Employees and Municipal Councils (remarks) 2309 (ii).

——— Employees and Municipal Elections, Circular *re* (remarks) 2884 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4484 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768, 953 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2133 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Japanese Immigration, B. C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1759 (i).
Lands set apart for Settlement since 1896, (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).
Lands Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res. 8481 (v).
Lands Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6518 (iv).
Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 2393 (ii).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10953 (vi).
MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7177 (iv).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Apptmt. (remarks) 6985 (iv).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Book-keeping, &c., ref. to Com. of Sup., 4007 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
——— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8454 (v).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3020; in Com., 3035 (ii).
Meaford Harbour B. 158 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8510 (v).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6895, 7238; on M. for 3°, 7218 (iv).
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Names and Number of Establishments, &c. (Ques.) 1505 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).
Militia Dept., and Civil Service Commissioners' Rep. (remarks) 12546 (vii).
Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4065 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3451 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9477 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9495 (v)
Niagara, St Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5067 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10511 (vi).
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).
Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4691 (iii); in Com., 12054 (vii).
Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Ministerial Speeches (remarks) 10126 (v).



SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Orange Order and Quebec Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Order Paper, Differences in English and French Editions (remarks) 6740, 6850 (iv).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 9070 (v).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2837 (ii).
Patent and Proprietary Medicines, B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10552 (vi).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10412 (vi).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3979 (ii).
Petit Rocher Wharf, Inquiry for missing Papers (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9722 (v).
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption (Ques.) 5650 (iii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (remarks) 10513 (vi).
Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Funds, B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).
Prescott Lighthouse Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3097 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7191 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 2394 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co., Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Militia (remarks) 8696 (v).
Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3376 (ii).
Railway Commission (asst. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3903 (ii); in Com., 8512 (v).
——— on M. to introduce, 3751 (ii).
——— B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 11630 (vi)
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13285 (vii).
Ry. Subsidies, Bridge Subsidies (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c. (Ques) 6000 (iii) 6232 (iv).
Rules of the House, Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2988 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7677 (iv), 8562, 9068 (v).
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. McIntyre) in Com., 4232 (iii).
School Lands Exchange B 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8470; in Com., 8478 (v).
Seed Grain Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2781 (ii).
Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2773 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2922 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adn., 1361 (i).
Seed Grain Distribution, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10122 (v).
——— (remarks) *re* Purchases, 3158 (ii).
Seed Wheat, Delegation *re* (remarks) 1740 (i).
Sharbot Lake and Bathurst Station, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Shipping Rings, Combination *re*, Cor., &c. (read) 5916 (iii).
Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes (Ques.) 4765 (iii).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5416 (iii).
Smith, Mr. W. Maxwell, Dom. Fruit Inspector Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2393 (ii), 5085 (iii).
——— (M. for copies) 2398 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3761, 3832 (ii), 12595 (vii).
Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8849 (v).
Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5865 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (exhibitions) 10569, 10597 (vi); (seed branch) 5502 (iii).
Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5673; (slope walls) 5664 (iii).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12217; (surveys) 12210 (vii).
Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9740 (v).
Excise (methylated spirits) 820; (travelling expenses) 815 (i).
Experimental Farms (salaries) 12549 (vii).
House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10503 (vi); (salary increases) 13562 (vii).
Immigration (agents) 13169 (vii).
Indians—N.B. (schools) 13171 (vii).
Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5757 (iii).
Justice (Exchequer Court) 5505 (iii).
Legislation (provincial voters' lists) 10508
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773; (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5043 (iii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3986 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii), 10290 (v); (pay and allowance) 12546 (vii).
Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2773 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 5765 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2948, 2949; (naval schools) 3222; (obstructions) 3214; (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3184, 3195; (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221 (ii).
Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5510 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings — Dom. (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8519; (Emerson) 8535; (Neepawa) 8541; (Selkirk) 8550; (Winnipeg, immigration) 8574; (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8567 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax customs) 7168; (Shelburne) 7177; (Yarmouth) 7180 (iv).
Public Works—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 7455; (Guelph armoury) 7678; (Hamilton drill hall) 7692; (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston, artillery park) 7702; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7704; (Leamington) 7705; (London, military) 7707; (Markham) 7709; (North Bay) 7715 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Major's Hill Park) 11015; (rents, &c.) 10983; (repairs, furniture, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings — Que. (Cookshire) 7281; (dominion arsenal) 7435; (Farnham) 7288; (Montreal barracks) 7407; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7423; (Montreal, post office) 7410; (Montreal, station C) 7422; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (St. John's military) 7440; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Humbolt) 8586; (Maple Creek) 8601; (Medicine Hat) 8601; (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601, 8602; (Regina) 8602 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 11005 (vi).
Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (new plant) 12142 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12114 (vii).
Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11079 (vi).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11076 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Marconi) 12143 (vii).
Quarantine (Public health) 5505 (iii).
Railways—Generally (extra clerks) 10342 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10188; (Windsor branch) 10145 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10358 (vi).
Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362; (maintenance, &c.) 10385 (vi).
Senate—(salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).

Supply, Conc., 5499 (iii).
Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2864 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10701 (vi).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5387 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

Torrens Land Title Fund, (remarks) 10917 (vi).

Trent Canal, Newmarket (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Sloan) in Com., 4545 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) 6122 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid by Govt., Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for copies, 2177 (ii).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10536 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9655 (v).

——— Clements, W. H. P., Apptmt. as Legal Adviser, O.Cs., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 5801 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 5659 (iii).

Yukon—Moral Reform, Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, Inquiry for, 10623, 10689, 11016 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8483 (v).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 6646 (iv).

——— Successor to Dr. Brine, &c. (Ques.) 1735 (i).

Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships (Ques.) 6237 (iv).

——— O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Subsidy Grant (Ques.) 8184 (iv).

Doyle, P., Immigration Agents, Superannuation of (Ques.) 6923 (iv).

Govt. Steamers, Captains' Residences, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3241 (ii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6649 (iv).

Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1292 (i), 3236 (ii).

I.C.R., Compensation *re* Horses Killed at Truro (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).

I.C.R., Employees, Increased Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).

——— Ice Contract (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

——— Ice supplied by J. A. McDonald, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 7446 (iv).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Oxford and Pictou Branch, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ques.) 10733 (vi).

——— Pictou Branch, Transfer from Halifax to Sydney Division, &c. (Ques.) 12773 (vii).

——— Pictou Branch, Answer to Question (remarks) 12661 (vii).

——— Pictou to Copper Crown Co., Total Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ques.) 10733 (vi).

——— Pictou Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 10789 (vi).

——— Revenue from Terminals, &c. (Ques.) 5471 (iii).

——— Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 10734 (vi).

——— Tatamagouche, Delay of Trains, &c. (Ques.) 1292 (i).

——— Ties delivered, Change *re* Inspection (Ques.) 12052 (vii).

——— Truro Buildings, Name of Tenderers, &c. (Ques.) 6233 (iv).

——— Truro Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co. (Ques.) 1936 (i).

——— Truro Ry. Station, Sanitary Condition, &c. (Ques.) 7211 (iv).

Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4768 (iii).

Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Mail from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived, &c. (Ques.) 12653 (vii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12813 (vii).

'Midland Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertisements, &c. (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

Militia, Apptmts. of Generals, Names and Qualifications (Ques.) 5086 (iii).

Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery, &c. (Ques.) 11298 (vi).

Pictou P. O. Building, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 10518 (vi).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., Wharfs, Preventing Boats landing Cargoes (Ques.) 9274 (v).

Port au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3232 (ii).

Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c. (Ques.) 9271 (v).

Ry. Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

Skinner's Cove Boat Channel, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 10012 (v).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12599 (vii).

Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13174 (vii).
Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9577 (v).
Dom. Lands (Rocky Mountain Park) 9991 (v).
Marine (ice-breakers) 1908 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7117; (Halifax, customs) 7161; (Shelburne) 7173 (iv); (Tatamagouche) 11291 (vi); (Westville) 7179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Henri) 7439; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 7439 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Pictou) 5559; (rolling stock) 5551 (iii); (salaries) 10180 (v); (Truro) 12231 (vii).

Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 7201 (iv).
Tatamagouche, Dredging, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 11701 (vi).
Tenders, Advertisements for (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7477 (iv).
Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c. (Ques.) 9711 (v).
Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, Payments *re* (Ques.) 7204 (iv).
Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring (Ques.) 3429 (ii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c. (Ques.) 3480 (ii).
Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c. (Ques.) 9274 (v).
Westville, N.S., Public Buildings, Total Amount of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9474 (v).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*

Address, The, 383 (i).
Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4297 (iii).
Brass, Quantity and Quality of Imports into Can. (Ques.) 6232 (iv).
Buffalo Herd, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10104 (v).
Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12881 (vii).
Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2769 (ii).
Cypress Hills Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8387 (v).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11143; in Com., 11183, 11489, 11531 (vi).
Doukohobors Homestead Lands, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9958 (v).
Fence Post Fees, Memorial from Union of Man. Municipalities, &c. (Ques.) 10258 (v).
Grain Commission, Emplymt. of Members, Distribution of Evidence, &c. (Ques.) 3486 (ii).
——— Report (Ques.) 180 (i).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Grain Commission Report, Inqiury for, 609 (i).
Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13048, 13209 (vii).
G.T.P. Ry., Medical Fees, Deductions *re* (Ques.) 9473 (v).
Heath Point, Purchase of Cement from A. E. Walberg, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).
Homestead Entries in Section 27, Cor., Tels., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10495 (vi).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6379 (iv).
Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c., Disposal of (Ques.) 6402 (iv).
Judges in Man. and Ont., Salaries B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13050 (vii).
'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Crew during Winter, &c. (Ques.) 6403 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12811 (vii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12559, 13215 (vii).
Obstructions *re* Supply, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9932 (v).
Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c. (Ques.) 6403 (iv).
St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 5797 (iii).
St. Laurent Harbour, Lake Manitoba (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Seed Grain for Man. Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).
Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1357 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2930 (ii).
Smith, O. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4765 (iii).
Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c (Ques.) 567, 891 (i).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12597 (vii)
Supply (seed grain) B. 96, in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10575 (vi), 12890; (fumigating stations) 12881; (seeds) 12891 (vii); (seed branch) 5503 (iii).
Customs — Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577; (salaries) 9571 (v).
Dom. Lands (forest rangers) 10051 (v).
Immigration (agents) 9880; (agents in U. S.) 9964; (deportations) 9882; (hospitals, Winnipeg) 9982; (literature, &c.) 9950 (v).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (administration) 12729 (vii).
Interior — Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5760 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4212 (ii).
Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2771 (ii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5529 (iii).
Post Office (inspectors) 13153 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8521; (Emerson) 8534; (Neepawa) 8539; (Selkirk) 8547 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11011; (rents, &c.) 10983 (vi).
Public Works — Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Grand Marais) 12140; (Lake Dauphin) 12141; (Winnipegosis Lake) 12141 (vii).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10199 (v).

Swamp Lands in Manitoba, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
Swan Lake, Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt. (Ques.) 693 (i).
——— Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
——— Settlement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number cared for, 1906-7 (Ques.) 892 (i).
Timber Berths, Opening of Tenders, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Turriff) 11307 (vi).
———on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).
Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contract *re* Cement, Patent, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).
——— Contracts with Marine Dept. (Ques.) 3843 (ii).
Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 568 (i).

STEWART, Mr. R., *Ottawa.*

Alexander, Mrs. Mary, Relief (B. 177) 1°*, 9126 (v).
Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13572 (vii).
Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to, *re* Govt. Inspections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5944 (iii).
British-Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 3621 (ii).
Cannon, Mrs. Catherine Ann, Relief (B. 175) 1°*, 9126 (v).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5125 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10728; on M. for 2°, 11350; in Com., 11354, 11567 (vi), 12189 (vii).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Stewart) 6813 (iv).
General Chemical Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 174) 1°*, 9126 (v).

STEWART, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Geologial Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 891; 2° m., 1059 (i); in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii), 4230 (iii).
G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12070 (vii).
Paulding, Mrs. Ada Katurah Stewart, Relief (B. 176) 1°*, 9126 (v).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Alberta Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 44) 1°*, 891 (i).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12481 (vii).
Campaign Literature (French) sent by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10353 (vi).
Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6191 (iii).
Civil Service Commission Report, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Ques. of Order, 7598 (iv).
Civil Service System, Ques. of Order, Member reading speech, 9175 (v).
Documents quoted by Ministers, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7763 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4575 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13255 (vii).
Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5023 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13266 (vii).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5480 (iii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delay *re* Approval, and Imp. Treaty (Ques.) 12655 (vii).
French Language Pet. *re*, Ques. of Order, 8887 (v).
German Development Co., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10580 (vi).
Govt. Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 1741 (i).
G.T.P. Construction, Accidents *re* (remarks) 6850 (iv).
Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections (remarks) 1437 (i).
I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4459 (iii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12401 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolishing of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3446 (ii).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

Obstruction Tactics, Ques. of Order, 9223 (v).
Orange Order and Quebec Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' *re* Attack on French Canadian Ministers, 4221 (iii).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 4958 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc. in Rep., 13366 (vii).
——— Rep., Ques. of Order, 13402 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Rural Corps, &c. (remarks) 8385 (v).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10579 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4042 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1902 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1090 (i).
Public Works—Generally (armouries) 10899; Ont. (Kingston) 10912 (vi); Ottawa (museum) 1502 (i); Que. (Knowlton) 7293; (Levis) 7296; (Montreal, post office) 7413 (iv).

Timber Limits, Applications, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (ques. of priv.) 3578 (ii).
Tobacco, Violation of Act, in Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 9250 (v).

TAYLOR, Mr. G., *Leeds.*

Accounts, Sums, &c., remaining unpaid by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 352 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., History of Northern Cruise, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Bate & Co. and W. C. Edwards & Co., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4390; in Com., 4519 (iii).
Beauchemin, A., Emplymt. at Sorel (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
Boiler Inspections, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act by Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Service, Connections, &c. (M.) to adjn. Hse., 186 (i).
——— (remarks) 432 (i).
——— Charges against Ry. Commission, 1429 (i).
*See* 'G.T.R.'
Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).
Canadian Associated Press B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12644 (vii).
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 10517 (vi).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vii).
Chicoutimi Public Expenditures, Ques. of Order, 13203 (vii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5127 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367, 11558 (vi), 12184 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5909 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5626 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident *re* Ry. Bridge (remarks) 11120 (vi).
Cowie, F. W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5649 (iii).
*See* 'Govt. Steamers,' &c.
Customs and Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1, 1908 (Ques.) 10791 (vii).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8900 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11882 (vi).
Doukhobors, Letter *re* Manner of Living at Yorkton (read) 5751 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6794 (iv).
——— Quebec Harbour (remarks) 7100, 7104 (iv).
Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of accepting Apptmt. (Ques.) 4768 (iii).
——— Date of Communication of Apptmt. (Ques.) 5084 (iii).
——— (M. for papers*) 5086 (iii).
Falconer, Mr. K., Payments to *re* Bookkeeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3999 (iii).
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13468 (vii).
Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, Price, &c. (Ques.) 1510 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7639 (iv).
——— File, Cor., &c., quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7782 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4832 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5659 (iii).
Forbes, Mr. Justice, Personal Status, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 899 (i).
——— (Ques.) 2390, 3840 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1860 (i).
Gananoque Lights and Buoys, Apptmt. of Keeper, &c. (Ques.) 8383 (v).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3630 (ii).
Govt. Business (remarks) 13207 (vii).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6266 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Govt. Steamers, Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c. (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
*See* 'Cowie.'

G. T. Ry., Connections at Brockville (Ques. of Privilege) 9 (i).
*See* 'Brockville.'

G.T.R. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2222 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry., Eastern Division, Recent Estimates *re* Cost (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

——— Ties purchased in U. S. (remarks) 1448 (i).

——— Town and Development Co., Location of Lands, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

——— Winnipeg and Moncton Branch, Tenders *re* Contracts, Signatures, &c. (M. for ret.*) 935 (i).

Halifax Garrison, Retraction of Remarks by Fin. Min., 5784 (iii).

House of Commons, Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10978 (vi).

——— Rules for Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 594 (i).
*See* 'Postal.'

'Hurona'-'Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 358 (i).

Kingston Military Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).

Lacas, E., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979, 1039 (i).

Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Judgments undelivered, Action of Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2594 (ii).

Medicine Hat Building, Contract *re* Heating System (remarks) 10791 (vi).

Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. by Govt. in Geodetic Survey (Ques.) 1349 (i).

Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept. (Ques.) 11701 (vi).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).

'Montcalm' Ice-breaker, Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1897 (i).

——— Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 8441 (v).
*See* 'Govt. Steamers.'

Montreal 'Gazette' Building, Amount paid for, &c. (Ques.) 3900 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9499 (v).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9919 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10333 (vi).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Speech of Hon. Mr. Brodeur at Montreal (remarks) 10123 (v).

Orangeville Post Office Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).

Order, Ques. of, Appeal to the Chair *re* Chairman's Ruling, Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, &c., O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1294 (i).

——— Incomplete Return (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5723 (iii), 9716 (v).

——— Inquiry for, 6464, 7107 (iv).

Postal Service, H. of C., Delays, &c. (Ques.) 570 (i).

Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony and Elmira Branch Line (B. 202) in Com. on Res., 12409 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3122 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3387 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3905 (ii).

Ry. Connections: *See* 'Brockville,' &c.

Reinhardt, Mr. Paul, Emplymt. by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 10301 (vi).

——— Emplymt. in Quebec Provincial Elections, Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 10986 (vi).

Returns, Inqiury for, 2738 (ii).

Riviere du Loup Wharf Dredging, &c. (remarks) 6462 (iv).

Ross Rifles, Number in Use in Canada, Total &c. (Ques.) 5786 (iii).

——— Provisions *re* Bayonets, &c. (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3010 (ii)

St. Louis, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2780 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2904, 2920 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1366 (i).

Senate, Cost of, Outside of Indemnities (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

Sorel Irregularities, Final Rep. (remarks) 10795 (vi).

S. A. School Teachers, Recognition of Services (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3782 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* Wreck Investigations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3150 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture, &c. (dairying, &c.) 10397; (exhibitions) 10570; (Imperial Institute) 10623 (vi).
Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Murray (houses) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Quebec (steam road roller) 12225 (vii).
Canals—Rideau (improvements) 12227 (vii).
Canals—Soulanges (improvements) 12225 (vii).
Canals (statistical branch) 10320 (vi).
Canals—Trent (construction) 12225; (improvements) 12227 (vii).
Canals—Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5674 (iii).
Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1885 (i).
Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 621 (i); Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 978; Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 613 (i).
Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9223, 9253; Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9540 (v).
Fisheries (inspectors, &c.) 12261 (vii).
Immigration (general expenses) 5751 (iii).
Justice (Penitentiaries) 12265 (vii).
Labour Dept. ('Gazette') 12261 (vii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773, 5780 (iii); (pensions) 13324 (vii); (salaries) 4755 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrol) 4131 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1894 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii); (observatories) 12262 (vii); (patrol boats) 4750 (iii).
Militia (pay and allowance) 12147; (properties) 12148; (Quebec cliffs) 12148; (salaries and wages) 12147; (warlike stores) 12148 (vii).
Miscellaneous (Civil Service Commission) 13168 (vii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (seed grain) 2780 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 1049 (i), 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2968; (wrecks) 3150 (ii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5530; (maintenance) 5512 (iii).
Public Works (ass't. dep. min.) 5698 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10891; (experimental farms, repairs, &c.) 10904 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7116; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax, customs) 7166; (Shelburne) 7174; (Yarmouth) 7182 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7465; (Dom. renewals) 7482; (Glencoe) 7487 (iv); (Kingston, militia stores) 10907 (vi); (Renfrew) 7826 (iv); (R.M.C. Barracks) 10907 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 5700 (iii); (heating, &c.) 11009 (vi); (mint) 1451; (observatory) 1450 (i); (rents, &c.) 10986 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7282; (Farnham) 7288; (Knowlton) 7291; (Lachute) 7293; (Lake Megantic) 7294; (Longueuil) 7304 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11689 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Breton Cove) 11224; (Cape St. Mary) 11224; (Caribou Island) 11225; (Digby) 11227; (Glace Bay) 11228; (Hall's breakwater) 11228; (Oyster Pond) 11258; (Port Hood) 11278; (Port Joli West) 11279; (Tancock island) 11230 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Stanley Island wharf) 5720; (Tiffin) 5721 (iii); (Toronto) 12137 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Rustico) 11293 (vi).
Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 11118 (vi).
Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10391 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (double tracking) 12238 (vii); (private car of N.T.R.) 10186; (supplies) 10195 (v); (Truro) 12232 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10389 (vi).
Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 12262 (vii).

Timber Limits, Application of Mr. Gentles, &c. (remarks) 7100 (iv).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2664 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, Marine Dept., Minister's, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).

——— *re* Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3996 (ii).

U.S. Training Ships through St. Lawrence Canals, Number, &c. (Ques.) 5788 (iii).

——— (M. for copies) 5800 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6135 (iii).

Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2191 (ii).

Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

TELFORD, Mr. W. P., *Grey, N.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5102 (iii).

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2459 (ii).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.'s (B. 83) 1°*, 1732 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Registrar of Grey County, 11302 (vi).

Returning Officers in Elections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

TELFORD, Mr. W. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12109 (vii).

Tobacco Prohibition, Resolutions from Moral Reform Associations (remarks) 11302 (vi).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W. (Minister of Inland Revenue) *Victoria City, B.C.*

Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3868 (ii).

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5205 (iii).

——— Survey *re* Temagami District (Ans.) 5473 (iii).

——— Payments *re* Temagami District (Ans.) 5787 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).

Brock, Mr., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5205 (iii).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6213 (iii).

Chilvers, Francis W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 10515 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10750 (vi).

Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Cirkel, Franz., Remuneration *re* Report of Geological Survey *re* Graphites (Ans.) 7935 (iv).

——— Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7202 (iv). *See* 'Graphite,' &c.

Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c. (Ans.) 515 (i).

Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production (Ans.) 12410 (vii).

Cosgrove, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation (Ans.) 5797 (iii).

Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5204, 5473 (iii).

Dowling, Dr., Leave of Absence from Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10581 (vi).

——— Emplymt. by German Development Co. (Ans.) 5564 (iii).

——— Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5206 (iii).

Electric and Gas Power Licenses, granted under Statute, c. 16, &c. (Ans.) 360 (i).

Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1 to 15, 1908 (Ans.) 10792 (vi).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Geological Survey Dept., Total Expenditure from 1896 to 1908 (Ans.) 6402 (iv).

——— Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Geological Survey Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 11232 (vi).

Gooderham & Worts, Distiller, Deficit in Spirit Production (Ans.) 12411 (vii).

'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c. (Ans.) 5081 (iii). *See* 'Cirkel,' &c.

Harbottle, N. F., Emplymt. by Excise Dept (Ans.) 7731 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. (B. 143) 1°*, 6142 (iii); in Com., 6466; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

——— Seizures in Cornwall, Toronto, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).

——— Violations, on Inquiry for Ret., 4964 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11238 (vi).

Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* (Ans.) 6639 (iv).

Marcoun, Mr. Frank, Commission *re* Settlement of Claims (Ans.) 1122 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Accountants, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4109 (ii).

Medicine Patent Bill, *re* Apptmts. to Com. (remarks) 10689 (vi).

Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Criticism of, in Press (Ans.) 6056 (iii).

Patent Medicines Inspection (B. 146) Res. prop., 4963 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6215; 1°*, 6218 (iii); 2° m., 10551; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 10553 (vi); in Com., 12622 (vii).

Patent Medicines Bill, Govtl Legislation *re* (Ans.) 356, 608 (i), 2594 (ii).

——— Committee of Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 3900 (ii).

Peat Deposits in Canada, Development of (Ans.) 515 (i).

——— Emplymt. of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c. (Ans.) 1122 (i).

Port Hope Inland Rev. Collectorship, Apptmnt. of (Ans.) 895 (i).

Sugar Manufacture, Saccharine Standards, &c. (Ans.) 351 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Excise (inspectors' salaries) 813; Inland Revenue (salaries) 645, 646; Mines (salaries) 646 (i).

Excise (customs duty) 817; (distilleries) 814; (methylated spirits) 820; (provisional allowances) 818; (tobacco stamps) 816; (travelling expenses, rent, &c.) 814 (i).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Survey (maps, &c.) 12260; (oil borings) 13162; (specimens) 12261; (technical officers) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4109 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3189 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10874; (Victoria, immigration) 10874 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3298 (ii).

Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908 (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 566 (i).

Tobacco, Foreign, Total Amount of Refund, &c. (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Tobacco Industry, Amts. to Inland Revenue Act (Ans.) 179 (i).

——— Infractions of Inland Revenue Act, on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 9523 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9240 (v).

Tobacco Manufactures, Total Amount of Fines and Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 363 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 920 (i).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B. C., Licenses granted, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10277 (v).

Windsor Ferry, Expiration of Franchise (Ans.) 1940 (i).

THOMPSON, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4281 (iii).

Budget, The, 5405 (iii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 757 (i).

Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Mint, Gold Coins, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3954 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3919 (ii).

Treaty-Making Power, Status of Canada, Notice of Discussion, 3172 (ii).

Yukon—Finnie-Perron Case, Information *re* (remarks) 4316 (iii).

——— (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Yukon, Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commission *re* (Ques.) 894 (i).

——— Mail Service, Complaints *re*, 2022 (ii).

——— Mail Service, Nontransmissable, &c. (remarks) 5136 (iii).

——— Money Transmission, Rates *re* (Ques.) 2979 (ii).

THOMPSON, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Yukon, Morality, Correspondence, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

TISDALE, Hon. D., *Norfolk.*

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 180) in Com., 9962 (v).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4577 (iii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).

I.C.R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4444 (iii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1027 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12792 (vii).

Presbyterian Widows' and Orphans' Funds, B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2789 (ii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4581 (iii).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Pulp Wood, Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4821 (iii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*

Nicolet, Govt. Expenditure, for 1878-1896; 1896-1908 (Ques.) 12775 (vii).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134) 1°*, 5649 (iii).

Blackhall, Mrs. Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11686 (vi).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1730 (i).

Petit Rocher Breakwater (remarks) 7110 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4920 (iii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9795 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Tracadie Lazaretto) 7187 (iv); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11686 (vi); (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Petit Rocher spur) 12759 (vii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia, E.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11357 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11170, 11418, 11533, 11947 (vi).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1424 (i); in Com., 4239, 4545, 4577 (iii).

Fog Signal Co., Payments to (Ques.) 11497 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6373 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7046 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13135 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Personal Explanation *re* Land Deals, 1927 (i).

Ry. Act (construction) Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 91 (i); Discussion *re*, 3404; 2° m., 3406 (ii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3359 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Timber Leases, Denial of Stmnt. of Mr. Ames, 8697 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4233 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2922 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3765, 3831 (ii); in Com., 12605 (vii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N. W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10977 (vi); Sask. (Humboldt) 8595 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2290 (ii).

——— Opening of Tenders, Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Mr. Foster, 11303 (vi).

——— Papers used in Debate, on Inquiry for, 2386 (ii).

——— Par. in 'Toronto News,' Ques of Priv., 5077 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*

Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c. (Ques.) 238 (i).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4562 (iii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3491 (ii).

Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 7200 (iv).

Immigration Agents in Italy, Number, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).

Immigration Central Board, London, Moneys paid to, &c. (Ques.) 2545 (ii).

Montreal P. O. Building, Settlement of Strike (remarks) 8608 (v).

North Atlantic Trading Co., and Bonuses, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 803 (i).

Post Office Buildings built since 1904, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4761 (iii).

Public Works, Hours of Labour (B. 97) 1° m., 3157 (ii).

WALSH, Mr. J. C., *Montreal, St. Anne's.*

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. (B. 88) 1°*, 2214 (ii); in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953 (iii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3490 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3537 (ii).

WALSH, Mr. R. N., *Huntingdon.*

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Robert Co., Emplymt. of Mr. Deschene, &c. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

Brockville Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of (Ques.) 3234 (ii).

Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

Desaulniers, Mr. Gonsalve, Emplymt. as Translator, &c. (Ques.) 1121, 1290 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 219 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13272 (vii).

Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

International Boundary Line, Representations *re* Buildings on (Ques.) 356 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4933 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13381 (vii).

St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe, Waterway from Lake St. Francis, Letters, Plans, Surveys, &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

——— Damages *re* Floods (remarks) 6987 (iv).

——— Rep. of Engineer (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock) 12898 (vii); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dundee) 7286 (iv).

Tuberculin Tests, Results of (Ques.) 9270 (v).

WARD, Mr. H. A., *Durham.*

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 3466 (ii).

WARD, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*

Blunden, Frederick (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5211 (iii).
Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 359 (i).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary (Ques.) 510 (i).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 960 (i).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1028 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission (remarks) 7387 (iv).
Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).
Port Hope Inland Revenue Office, Apptmt. of Collector, &c. (Ques.) 895 (i).
Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8860 (v).
S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3832 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (damages) 10308 (vi).
Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9704 (v).
Militia (customs dues) 12156; (pay and allowance) 12147; (provisions) 12151; (R. M. College) 12153 (vii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5524 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon, drill hall) 8518; (Dauphin) 8529 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Hope) 12135 (vii).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10330 (vi).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2520, 2652 (ii).

WATSON, Mr. R. J., *Parry Sound.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11890 (vi).
Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1982 (i).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *Renfrew, N.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11890 (vi).
Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Final Report *re* (Ques.) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1970 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10314 (vi).
——— Rep. *re* Surveys (remarks) 11827 (vi).
G.T.P., Supplies, Contract *re* District No. 3, &c. (Ques.) 1120 (i).
McInnes, W. B., Inquiry for Ret., 6061 (iii).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence (Ques.) 7199 (iv).
Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops (Ques.) 5791 (iii).
——— Payment *re* Painting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12147 (vii).

WHITE, Mr. G. V.—*Con.*

Petawawa Dock, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 685 (i).
Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10716 (vi).
Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Chartered Accountant, Amounts paid to by Marine Dept., &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4205 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5742 (iii); (salaries and wages) 12147 (vii).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates) 2969 (ii).
Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).
Public Works — Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10901 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Petawawa) 12134 (vii).
Timber Berths, Nos. 1031, &c., on Order for Ret. (amt.) 850 (i).
———Tenders, Original Documents (M for ret.) 2983 (ii).

WILMOT, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's.*

Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Charges *re* Political Activity (Ques.) 6642 (iv).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf (Ques.) 7937 (iv).
G.T.P., Nationality of Messrs. Foley, Welsh & Stewart, Discrimination against Canadians (Ques.) 7936 (iv).
Immigration Agents in N. B., Apptmt. (Ques.) 843 (i).
Live Stock, N. B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c. (Ques.) 1506 (i).
Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Office, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).
N.B. Inland Waters, Wharfs, Construction Policy, &c. (Ques.) 5465 (iii).
Scotch Town, N.B., Wharf, Application (Ques.) 7202 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. N. F., *Russell.*

Budget, The, 6610 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2218 (ii).
Australian Representative from Canada in 1901, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2168 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4500 (iii).
British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3621 (ii).
Budget, The, 6082 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4231 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11353; in Com., 11365, 11661; (amt.) 11930 (vi).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5016 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co. B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13260; in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3625 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5496 (iii).

Governor General's Expenditure since 1892 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii).

Haycock, Mr. J. L., Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).

Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation, &c. (Ques.) 5080 (iii).

Immigrant Detention Hospitals, Amount expended (Ques.) 5081 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6434 (iv).

Immigration Agent M. C. Dunne, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington County (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Immigration Agent Miller, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Immigration Agents, Names, Addresses (Ques.) 180 (i).

Immigrant Agents in G. B., Names, Salary, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 2169 (ii).

——— Reps. received from (M. for copies*) 557 (i).

Immigration Agents, Names of those paid Commissions to in Europe, &c. (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

——— Agents in Ont., &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 3178 (ii).

——— Special Agents in G. B., Salaries, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2398 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 3300 (ii).

Immigration and Commercial Agents, Rets., Inquiry for, 1108 (i).

Immigration, O.Cs. and Circulars issued *re* (M. for copies*) 2171 (ii).

I.C.R., Dartmouth Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11240; in Com., 11247 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 806 (i).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10709 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Canals—Generally (repairs) 10312 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 635; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 984; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8880 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10878; (Victoria, immigration) 10878 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, immigration) 8573 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents) 10983; (Rideau Hall) 11007 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10379 (vi).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6186 (iii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Cavalry Brigade Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 9273 (v).

Church of England Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society, incorp. (B. 75) 1°*, 1584 (i).

Customs Duty on Militia Uniforms, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2584 (ii).

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re* Building (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation, &c. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).

Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c. (Ques.) 177 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).

Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 1125 (i).

Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6646 (iv).

Garrison Artillery, 5th Regiment, B.C., Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5792 (iii).

Lee-Enfield Rifles, Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

Militia Allowances, Arrears of (Ques.) 8442 9273 (v).

Military Camp in Eastern Townships, Proposed Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c. (Ques.) 352 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).
Militia Supplies at Halifax, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 6405 (iv).
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U. S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3167 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Accident, Material on Hand, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1290 (i).
Quebec Tercentenary, Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance (Ques.) 7992 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2024 (ii).
Rifles, Purchase of from other Cos. (Ques.) 1123 (i).
Ross Rifle Co., Advances *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).
Ross Rifle Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt. (Ques.) 5786 (iii).
——— Contracts *re* Bayonets, &c. (Ques.) 6235, 8176 (iv), 8442 (v).
——— (M. for copy*) 5476 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Bonus Loans, Service of Govt. Employees, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).
——— Consignment to N. W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c. (Ques.) 5259 (iii).
——— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c. (M. for copy*) 557 (i).
——— Contract Price, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 8174 (iv).
——— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3237 (ii).
——— Evidence before Pub. Accounts, Inquiry for Rep., 5914 (iii).
——— Imp. Govt., Cor. with *re* Defects, &c. (M. for cor.*) 5210 (iii).
——— Inefficiency and Extravagance of Dept. of Militia, 8902; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 8953; Amt. neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090 (v).
——— Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3898 (ii).
——— Military Associations, &c., Rep. from, *re* Efficiency (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).
——— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).
——— Number reported unfit for Use (Ques.) 3841 (ii).
——— Payments for since Jan. 1, 1908 (Ques.) 7209 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9333 (v).
——— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c. (Ques.) 9713 (v).
——— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of (Ques.) 3237 (ii).
——— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c. (Ques.) 365 (i).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Target Practice, Suspension by N.W.M. Police (Ques.) 3847 (ii).
——— Tests in England, Reps. *re* (remarks) 8170 (iv).
Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of (Ques.) 9273 (v).
Sutherland Rifle Sight, Contract *re* Additional Number (Ques.) 5257 (iii).
——— Number, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 569 (i).
——— Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 5476 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9567 (v); Marine (ice-breakers) 1897 (i).
Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt. (Ques.) 356 (i).

WRIGHT, Mr. A. A., *Renfrew, S.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res (Mr. Blain) 5131 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. McCool) for Plans, &c., 5228 (iii).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6270 (iv).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10494 (vi).
——— Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment (prop. Res.) 584 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4646 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5527 (iii); Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).
Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10695 (vi).

WRIGHT, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*

Address, The, 396 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., Payments *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4175 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5108 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8271 (iv), 11716; in Com., 11869 (vi), 12935 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (iii).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3613 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2018 (i).
Gravenhurst Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).

WRIGHT, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

Indian Department, Extravagant Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11057 (vi).

Indians in Man. and Sask., Investigation of Mrs. A. M. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 6919 (iv).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10849 (vi).

Ottawa Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4232 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Civil Govt.—Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12756 (vii).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12753; N.B. (salaries) 12738; Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12735 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4175 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10875; (Victoria, immigration) 10875 (vi); Ont. (Glencoe) 7491 (iv).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2188 (ii).

ZIMMERMAN, Mr. A., *Hamilton, W.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4386 (iii).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6179 (iii).

Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c. (Ques.) 6924 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3612 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4333 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5497 (iii).

——— B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12558 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3745 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7228; on M. for 3°, 7216 (iv).

Militia Uniforms, and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9569 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5066 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 664 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9569 (v).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1901 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 5745 (iii), 10294 (v).

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10902 (vi); Man. (Dauphin) 8528 (v); Ont. (Owen Sound) 7818 (iv); Ottawa (mint) 1472 (i).

# INDEX—SUBJECTS.


Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).

Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 362 (i).

——— remaining unpaid by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 352 (i).

Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3233 (ii).

Acetylene Gas Works at Prescott, Employmt. of Political Officials: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3292 (ii).

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6232 (iv).

Adams Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5798 (iii).

Address The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech from Throne: moved (Mr. Hall) 9; seconded (Mr. Lanctot) 17.

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 23; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 40; (Mr. Foster) 66; (Mr. Fielding) 94; (Mr. Cockshutt) 123, (amt.) 147; Neg. (Y. 95; N. 56)274; (Mr. Miller) 148; (Mr. Clements) 194; (Mr. Fisher) 213; (Mr. Lewis) 242; (Mr. Clarke) 254; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 263; (Mr. W. Roche) 267; (Mr. Barr) 276; (Mr. Lalor) 292; (Mr. Elson) 304; (Mr. Crawford) 316; (Mr. Armstrong) 335, 366, (amt.) 380; (Neg. Y. 54; N. 103) 505; (Mr.. J. J. Hughes) 380; (Mr. Staples) 383; (Mr. Wm. Wright) 396; (Mr. Geo. Smith) 407; (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 412; (Mr. A. A. McLean) 420; (Mr. Kemp) 434; (Mr. W. McIntyre) 445; (Mr. Perley) 449; (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 455; (Mr. Lake) 459; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 476; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 485; (Mr. Paquet) 505; (Mr. Barker) 519, (amt.) 530; (Neg. Y. 50; N. 96) 552; (Mr. Fielding) 531; (Mr. Monk) 535; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 544; (Mr. Haggart) 548 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 554 (i).

Administrative Buildings, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Admiralty Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 122.'

Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4402 (iii).

Advertisements in Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 509 (i).

Advertising in Mar. Prov. Newspapers, Amts. paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 936 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4702; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 95) 4735 (iii).

*See* 'Tenders,' &c.

Agricultural Committee, 2nd Rep.: M. (Mr. Mackenzie) to conc., 12409 (vii).

Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).

AGRICULTURE.

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).

——— Dep. Minister O'Halloran's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 12878 (vii).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 645, 671 (i), 10569 (vi), 12879 (vii).

Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8611 (v).

——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8615 (v).

——— Purchase of Goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).

——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896: Ques. Mr. Armstrong) 2167 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2795 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).

——— Cable *re* Removal by G. B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13228 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2767 (ii).

Cattle Exports and Imports from Canada to G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6460 (iv).

Cattle Registered, Importation from U. S., from 1904-7: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6238 (iv).

Cattle Inspection *re* Ocean Service: in Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).

Cattle sold from Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2389 (ii).

Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 351 (i).

Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*
Dairying and Fruit Industry: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (vi).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
——— Amount of Subsidies paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4406 (iii).
Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4584 (iii).
Experimental Farm, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1018 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12549 (vii).
Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for Seeds, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 556 (i).
——— Sale of Cattle, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2795 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7990 (iv).
——— in Quebec District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2593 (ii).
——— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8182 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Number controlled by Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3897 (ii).
——— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c: (Mr. Armstrong) 4585 (iii).
Fumigation Stations: in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 9280 (v).
Hogs slaughtered, Compensation paid, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13085 (vii).
Horses and Cattle, Imports to U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii).
Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 10623 (vi).
Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5079 (iii).
Live Stock, N.B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 1506 (i).
Piggeries at Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).
Seeds Inspection Act: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vii).
Sheep Quarantine by U. S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 13064 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Christie) 13537 (vii).
Tuberculin Tests, Results of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 9270 (v).
Aids to Navigation, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5010 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, Construction of Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
*See* 'Marine.'
Alberta and B. C. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 192'
Alberta Development Co., Control of Coal Lands: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3037 (ii).
Alberta Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Alberton Fire Damage Claims: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. Lefurgey) 1209 (i).
Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry: prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3853 (ii).
Alexander, Mary, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 892 (i).
Algoma Steel Co., Orders from Govt. for Steel, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8606 (v).
*See* 'I. C. R.'
Alien Act: *See* B. No. 130.'
Alien Labour, Protection to Canadians: Pet. (Mr. Boyce) read in Com. of Sup., 12156 (vii).
*See* 'Immigration,' &c.
Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
All-Red Line: prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12414; Agreed to (Y. 109; N. 47) 12501; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. (Y. 108; N. 48) 12499 (vii).
——— Irish Route, Opposition by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10253 (v).
——— Negotiations, Canadian Representative in England, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 353 (i).
——— Omission of, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 28 (i).
——— Route, Letter to Mr. Sifton from Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 948 (i).
——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 947 (i).
All-Red Route, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 87 (i).
——— Remarks *re* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12162 (vii).
——— Statement *re* Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 366 (i).
——— Tenders, Proposals, &c., Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6460 (iv).
——— Mr. White's Duties in England: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 694 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 608 (i).
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2593 (ii).
*See* 'Post Office,' &c.
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3484 (ii).

Amherst Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Ancoin *vs.* The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N. S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McLennan) 558 (i).
Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 8439 (v).
Anglo-American Treaty, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 937 (i), 6985 (iv).
—— Further Information: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7447, 7834 (iv).
—— Information *re* Presenting (Mr. R. L. 8516 (v).
—— Anglo-American Treaties, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9715 (v).
—— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Sproule) 10120 (v).
—— Treaty submitted to Can. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6926 (iv).
*See* 'Fisheries,' &c.
Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Anglo-Canadian Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8611 (v).
—— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8615 (v).
—— Purchase of Goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).
—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).
Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification by Imperial Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11705 (vi).
*See* 'Franco-Canadian.'
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor., Reps., &c.; M. for copies (Mr. Monk) 594 (i).
*See* 'Japanese,' &c.
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 12653 (vii).
Annapolis Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11207 (vi).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
*See* 'Militia.'
Anuities by Govt. for Old Age: *See* 'B. No. 120.' *See* 'Old Age,' &c.
Anse à la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Anse à l'Ilot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Anse St. Jean Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Anthracite Coal, Qantity imported from U. S. and other Countries: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1510 (i).
Anti-Cigarette Bill: *See* 'Tobacco.'
Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tels., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. Chisholm) 1131 (i).
Antigonish, Increased Accommodation, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Antigonish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv).
Appeal Court, B.C., Salary of Judge: M. to withdraw Res. (Mr. Aylesworth) 7992 (iv).
*See* 'Justice,' &c.
Apple and Fruit Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 353 (i).
Apples, &c., Marking of: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1508 (i).
Architects of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 88.'
Architectural Institute of Canada: M. (Mr. Ethier) to Refund Fees, 11234, 11404 (vi).
Architects on Public Works Payments, &c.: Remarks, in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Architectural Branch, Public Works Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11096 (vi).
Archives Dept., Index Cards purchased, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6057 (iii).
Archives Fittings, Furnishings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 671 (i).
'Arctic, Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904, to June, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 184 (i).
—— History of Cruise in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Armouries, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
*See* 'Militia,' &c.
Army and Navy Veterans at the Tercentenary: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7448 (iv).
*See* 'Que. Tercentenary.'
Arnprior Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1347 (i).
Arthabaskaville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Artz, J. G., Apptmt. of. Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13578 (vii).
Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Ashcroft-Dawson Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Ashouapmouchouan, Peribonka Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment: Notice of Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4221; M. 4314 (iii).
Asiatic Immigration into B.C.: *See* 'Immigration Act.'
Asiatic Labour in B.C., Rep. in Victoria 'Times': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6526 (iv).
*See* 'Japanese,' &c.
Assaults on Women, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13573 (vii).
Assurance Fund of Saskn. and Alta.: *See* B. No. 168.'
Astronomical Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9737 (v).
Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 1450, 1485 (i).
Atlantic, Que. and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction: in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Atlantic Steamers, Mail Service, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii). *See* 'Post Office,' &c.
Aud. Gen.'s Office: in Com. of Sup., 635 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (Vol. i): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
——— (Vol. ii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 766 (i).
——— (Vol. iii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
Auditor General's Salary: *See* 'B. No. 208.'
Audits and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12658 (vii). *See* 'Banks,' 'Finance,' &c.
Australia, G. B. and Canada Fast Line Steamers, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i). *See* 'Can. and Australia.'
Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2218
Australian Representative from Can. in 1901, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 2168 (ii).
Automobiles injuring Persons: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
Autonomy Act, Validity of: Return, Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 5727 (iii).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 1506 (i).
Aylmer Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11219 (vi).
Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1937 (i), 2217 (ii).
Baie St. Paul, Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Co., N.B., Lease of Land to, Cost and Terms: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 563 (i).
——— Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i). *See* 'Cold Storage,' 'New Brunswick,' &c.
Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 3848 (ii).
Balsam Lake Section, Trent Canal, Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
Balsam Lake and Gull River, Ret. Incomplete: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6059 (iii). *See* 'Canals, Trent.
Bank Act, (additional circulation), Amt. *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Banks, Financial Stringency: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Banks, Govt. Assistance *re* Grain Blockade: *See* 'No. 159.'
Bank of Hamilton, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Banking System: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Pringle) *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Financial Post': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 4770 (iii). *See* 'Can. Bank of Commerce.'
Bank of Vancouver: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Bank of Winnipeg: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure, Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9335 (v).
Barachois de Malbaie Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Barachois Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11223 (vi).
Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5205 (iii).
——— Survey *re* Temagami District: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5473 (iii).
——— Payments *re* Survey of Temagami District: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5787 (iii).
Bate & Co., and W. C. Edwards & Co., Amts. paid to *re* Supplies: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 3435 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3234 (ii).
Batiscan River, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Batiscan Wharf, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Battlefields: *See* 'Can. Patriotic,' &c.
Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 219.'
Battlefields: *See* 'Quebec.'
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8576 (v).
Bayfield, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv). *See* 'Grand Bend,' &c.
Bay St. Lawrence, Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Bear River Station Dwelling House, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2161 (ii).
Beauchemin, A., Emplymt. at Sorel (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3038 (ii).
——— Lease, Conditions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1131 (i).
———Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 1740 (i).

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Robert Co., Employment of Mr. Deschenes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 8443 (v).
——— Lease of Water Power to McIntyre and Roberts Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
——— Robert Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13475 (vii).
——— Water Power, New Lease, Copy of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 946 (i).
Beaver Harbour Wharf: Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090, 13344 (vii).
Becancour, &c., Counties, Dredging at during 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3040 (ii).
*See* 'Dredging,' &c.
Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2392 (ii).
——— Dredging, Commencement of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7212 (iv).
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1733 (i).
——— Sir C. H. Tupper's Travelling Expenses: Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 4669 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2883 (ii).
Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Belgian Syndicate, Royal Commission, and Chap. 138, R.S.C., Judges as Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13569 (vii).
Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4830 (iii).
Belle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure, *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1509 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1737 (i).
Belleville Floods, Investigation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 3319 (ii), 4744 (iii).
Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6237 (iv).
——— Total Revenue, Expenditure for 1903-7: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2592 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 2983 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Porter) 4408 (iii).
Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 4830 (iii).
———M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 5211 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 7506 (iv).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Northrup) 2796 (ii).
Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 7933 (iv).
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co. Bill, on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 681 (i).
Belleville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv).
Bell Memorial Association, Grant by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).
*See* 'Brantford.'
Bell Rapids P. O., Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 8883 (v).
Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports, &c., Flagged by him: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5208, 5466 (iii).
Berthier Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
'Bessie Butler,' Str., Dimensions, Use of by R. C. Clergy: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 12411 (vii).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
——— Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 9713 (v).
Big Lorraine Harbour, Dredging Entrance Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Bills of Exchange Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 142.'
Bills, Royal Assent, Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2974, 2995 (ii), 5135, 6157 (iii), 6526 (iv), 13587 (vii).
BILLS:
Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier)
1°*, 3 (i).
Bill (No. 2) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 90 (i); 2°m., 3014; in Com., 3034 (ii).
Bill (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 91; 2°, 570; in Com., 583; 3°*, 583 (i).
Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°, 91 (i); 2°m., 3406 (ii).
Bill (No. 5) Respecting Co-operation.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 92; 2°m., (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii); 2°m., 4547; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4566 (iii).
Bill (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Maclean, South York).
1°, 93; 2°m., 938 (i), 3320, 3363 (ii).
Bill (No. 7) To incorporate the North Empire Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Adamson).
1°*, 231; 2°*, 463 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 8) Respecting the Tobique Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to 'Fraser Lumber Company, Limited.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°*, 231; 2°*, 463 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 9) Respecting Surveys of Public Lands of the Dominion and the Surveyors entitled to make such surveys (Mr. Oliver).
1° 231; 2° and in Com., 754, 948; 3°*, 953 (i), Sen. Amts., 3755 (ii).

Bill (No. 10) To amend the Irrigation Act. —(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 231; 2°, 766; in Com., 767, 953 (i); wthdn., 2974 (ii).

Bill (No. 11) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Maclean, S. York).
1°, 231 (i).

Bill (No. 12) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Maclean, Lunenburg).
1°, 313 (i); 2°, 3414 (ii).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 14) Respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. McColl).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*; 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 15) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—(Mr. Sloan).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 16) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., 1894; 3°, 1929 (i).

Bill (No. 17) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. McCarthy, N. Simcoe).
1°, 349 (i); 2°m., 3414 (ii).

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Kennedy).
1°, 350; 2°, 938 (i).

Bill (No. 19) To incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Bole).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 680 (i); in Com., 2787; 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 20) Respecting the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company.—(Mr. Porter).
1°*, 430; 2°m., 681, 779; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 7669 (iv), 8332, 8552, 8609, 9066 (iv).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the British Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Stewart).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 3621 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1894 (i).

Bill (No. 23) Respecting the Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 2788; 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645; in Com., and 3°*, 1468 (i).

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 3194, 3226; M. to ref. back to Com., 3228; in Com., 3362, 3621, 3692, 3793 (ii), 4224; 3° m., 4357, 4536 (iii).

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash.)
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 27) To amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Macdonald.)
1°, 430 (i); 2°, 5211; in Com., 5246; 3°*, 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 28) To amend the Copyright Act.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°, 508; 2°, 939; in Com., 940 (i); 3°*,3014 (ii).

Bill (No. 29) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 508 (i); 2°, 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 30) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Ethier).
1°, 560 (i).

Bill (No. 31) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Sinclair).
1°*, 562 (i); 2°, and in Com., 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 32) To incorporate the Bank of Vancouver.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 606; 2° m., 779; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4582 (iii).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 779 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 779; in Com., 1894; 3°*, 1931 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 35) To incorporate the Travellers Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 37) To incorporate the Canada Weather Insurance Company.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford).
1°*, 753; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 5077, 5174; 3°*, 5174 (iii).

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*,754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059; in Com., and 3°*, 1895 (i).

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 754; 2°*. 1059 (i); in Com., 6182 (iii), 6227; 3°*, 6231 (iv).

Bill (No. 41) To incorporate the Standard Plate Glass Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 6183; 3°*, 6184 (iii).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 827; 2°, 1741 (i).

Bill (No. 43) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Barr).
1°, 840 (i); 2° m., 5212 (iii).

Bill (No. 44) To incorporate the Alberta Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Talbot).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Monk).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1109 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. Stewart).
1°*, 891; 2°, 1059 (i); in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii), 4230; 3°*, 4230 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) To incorporate the Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 5109; 3° m., 5519 (iii).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Copp).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., 4231; 3°*, 4231; Sen. Amts., 5785 (iii).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 52) Respecting a Patent of Eugene Francois Giraud.—(Mr. Gordon).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the New Brunswick Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5762 (iii).

Bill (No. 54) To incorporate the Northwestern Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 1108; 2°, 1468 (i).

Bill (No. 55) To incorporate the Western Rivers Improvement Company.—(Mr. Sloan).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i)

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Bank of Hamilton Pension Fund.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 1207; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting a certain Convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 941; in Com. on Res., 1213; 1° m., 1215, 1384 (i); 2°, 2221, 3493; in Com., 3577, 3581, 3636 (ii); 3° m., 4317, 4372 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 59) To incorporate the Chartered Bank of British Columbia.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 60) Respecting Patents of the Goodwin Car Company.—(Mr. Osler).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2924 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 61) Respecting Patents of Montague Moore and Thomas James Heskett.—(Mr. Osler).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., 5077, 5174; 3°*, 5175 (iii).

Bill (No. 63) Respecting Patents of the Sutherland Rifle Sight Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 64) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Porter).
1°, 1283 (i); on order for 2°, 5226 (iii).

Bill (No. 65) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1284 (i).

Bill (No. 66) To amend the House of Commons Act.—(Mr. Borden).
1°, 1346 (i); 2° m., 5226 (iii).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240; Sen. Amts., 5955 (iii).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., 4239, 4545, 4577; 3°*, 4579 (iii).

Bill (No. 69) To incorporate the Ruthenian Catholic Mission of the Order of Saint Basil the Great in Canada.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3194 (ii).

Bill (No. 70) To incorporate the Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., 4231, 4546, 4579; 3°*, 4580 (iii).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting the Standard Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to 'the Standard Fire Insurance Company.'—(Mr. Maclean, South York).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting Patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting the Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.—(Mr. Power).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. Grant).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240; Sen. Amts., 6189 (iii).

Bill (No. 75) To incorporate the Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. Worthington).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2790 (ii).

Bill (No. 76) Respecting the Interprovincial Railway Bridge Company of New Brunswick.—(Mr. C. Marcil).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Dubeau).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Provisions of the Criminal Code respecting Offensive Weapons.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1668 (i).

Bill (No. 79) To amend the Provisions of the Criminal Code respecting Assaults on Women and Children.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1670 (i).

Bill (No. 80) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Alcorn).
1°, 1671 (i); 2°, 5228 (iii).

Bill (No. 81) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 1732; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., 4231; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. Adamson).
1°*, 1732; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., 4996, 5049; 3°*, 5077 (iii); Sen. Amts., 10511 (vi).

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. Telford).
1°*, 1732 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 84) To incorporate the Dominion Transportation and Storage Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 1859 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lavergne, Montmagny).
1°, 2021 (ii); 2° m., 5242 (iii).

Bill (No. 86) To incorporate the Northern Empire Railway Company.—(Mr. Caron).
1°*, 2160; 2°*, 2386 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 87) To incorporate the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Sloan).
1°*, 2160; 2°*, 2346 (ii); in Com., 4545; 3°*, 4545; Sen. Amts., 6189 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 88) To incorporate the Institute of Architects of Canada.—(Mr. Walsh, Montreal, Ste. Anne).

1°*, 2214; 2°*, 2386 (ii); in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953; 3°*, 5955 (iii).

Bill (No. 89) To authorize the Sale to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, of a portion of Major's Hill Park, in the City of Ottawa, as a Hotel Site.—(Mr. Pugsley).

Res. prop., 1584 (i), 2221; in Com. on Res., 2258; 1°*, 2260 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 12061; 3°*, 12084 (vii).

Bill (No. 90) To amend the Passenger Ticket Act.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).

1°,2466 (ii); 2° m., 5244 (iii).

Bill (No. 91) To amend the Act respecting the Supreme Court of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2542 (ii).

Bill (No. 92) To amend the Criminal Code with regard to the Speedy Trial of Indictable Offences.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2543 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) To amend the Criminal Code and punish homicide while hunting.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2590 (ii).

Bill (No. 94) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending 31st March, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 2780; 1°, 2°, and in Com., 2782; 3°*, 2785 (ii).

Bill (No. 95) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°, 2974 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) To amend the Criminal Code with regard to conspiracy in restraint of trade.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2976 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) Respecting the hours of labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).

1°, 3157 (ii).

Bill (No. 98, from the Senate) Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Blain).

1°, 3315 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4580 (iii).

Bill (No. 99) To amend the Irrigation Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 3315 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 4671; 3°*, 4674 (iii).

Bill (No. 100) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Martin, St. Mary's).

1°*, 3316 (ii).

Bill (No. 101) Respecting the Fort William Terminal Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 3477 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 6180 (iii), 6223; 3°*, 6225 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 102) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 3477; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3933 (ii).

Bill (No. 103, from the Senate) Respecting the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 3653 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 104, from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 3653 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5492; 3°, 5495 (iii).

Bill (No. 105) To regulate the placing and maintaining of Booms in International Streams.—(Mr. Pugsley).

1°, 3654 (ii).

Bill (No. 106) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lavergne, Montmagny).

1°, 3655 (ii).

Bill (No. 107 from the Senate) Respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. Girard).

1°*, 3834 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 5386; 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 108 from the Senate) Respecting the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke).

1°*, 3834 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) To authorize a Bounty to Volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 3316; in Com. on Res., 3756, 3805; 1°* of B., 3834 (ii); Res. prop., 11938; in Com on Res., 12595; 2°, and in Com., 12595, 13047; 3°, 13207; Sen. Amts., 13524 (vii).

Bill (No. 110, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Patent of Frederick C. Rehm, Elias Frank and Isidore Frank.—(Mr. Béland).

1°*, 3896 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4996 (iii).

Bill (No. 111) Respecting the Canadian Battlefields at Quebec.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Res. prop., 3579; in Com. on Res., 3901; 1°, 3902 (ii); 2° m., 4376; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; 3° m., 4529 (iii).

Bill (No. 112) To amend the Railway Act as respects the Constitution of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 3751; in Com. on Res., 3903; 1°*, 3933 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 4964 (iii), 8510; 3°*, 8514 (v).

Bill (No. 113) To amend the Land Titles Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 4221 (iii); 2° m., 6517; in Com., 6518; 3°*, 6520 (iv).

Bill (No. 114) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°, 4312 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 115) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4566 (iii); 2° m., 7835, 7939, 7998; on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8076, 8089, 8138, 8185 (iv), 8296, 8332, 8387, 8619 (v), 11707; Amt. wthdrn., and in Com., 11796; in Com., 11827, 11885 (vi), 12919, 12984; 3° m., 13229; 3°*, 13258; Sen. Amts., 13579 (vii).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4576 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8501; 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 117) To amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 4576; 2°, and in Com., 4994; 3°*, 4995 (iii).

Bill (No. 118) To amend the Railway Act with respect to Telegraphs and Telephones, and the Jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 4658 (iii); 2°, 10625; in Com., 10636, 10658; 3° m., 10777, 11124, 11590; ref. back to Com., 11633; 3°*, 11633 (vi).

Bill (No. 119) To encourage the Construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 4314; in Com. on Res., 4675; 1°*, 4689 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6911 (iv); in Com., 10761; 3°*, 10771; Sen. Amts., 11633 (vi).

Bill (No. 120) To authorize the Issue of Government Annuities for Old Age.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Res., 4689; 1°*, 4702 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 10848 (vi), 12053; 3°*, 12054; Sen. Amts., 13316 (vii).

Bill (No. 121) To amend the Supreme Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4826; 2°, and in Com., 5497; 3°*, 5499 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) To make better Provision for the exercise of Admiralty Jurisdiction within Canada, in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4835; 1°*, 4867 (iii).

Bill (No. 123, from the Senate) To amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, and in Com., 5495; 3°*, 5497 (iii).

Bill (No. 124, from the Senate) For the relief of Andrew Walker.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 5336; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7142 (iv).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6183; 3°*, 6189 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) To change the name and head office of the Anglo-Canadian Insurance Company.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°*, 5256; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7725 (iv).

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate) Respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.—(Mr. Pringle).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6183 (iii), 6231; 3°*, 6231 (iv); Sen. Amts., 12773 (vii).

Bill (No. 128, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Michaud).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6181 (iii), 6225; 3°*, 6227 (iv).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) To incorporate the London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464 (iii).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) To amend the Naturalization Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

1°*, 5256 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 11990 (vi); 3°*, 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 131, from the Senate) Respecting the Occidental Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv); 3°*, 8332 (v).

Bill (No. 132, from the Senate) To incorporate the Standard Accident and Guarantee Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, 5464; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate) To amend the Boards of Trade Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 5337 (iii); 2°, 11987; in Com., 11987 (vi), 12393; 3°*, 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Marcil).

1°*, 5649; 2°, 5763; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 135) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 5657 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6429; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Bill (No. 136) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1908, and the 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 5919, 5955; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5957 (iii).

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment).

1°*, 5913; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 8332 (v).

**BILLS**—*Con.*

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate) Respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment).
1°*, 5913; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., 8610, 9069; 3°*, 9070 (v).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 5913; 2°, 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141; 3°*, 7142 (iv).

Bill (No. 140) To amend the Criminal Code respecting injuries to Persons due to Motor Vehicles.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°*, 5993 (iii).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate) To incorporate the Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank.—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 6054; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., 7724; 3°*, 7724 (iv).

Bill (No. 142) To amend the Bills of Exchange Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 6054 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6520; 3°*, 6523 (iv).

Bill (No. 143) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Templeman).
Res. prop., 5161; in Com. on Res., 6118; 1°*, 6142 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6466; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Bill (No. 144) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 6142 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6523; 3°*, 6525 (iv).

Bill (No. 145) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Mr. Brodeur).
Res. prop., 3493; in Com. on Res., 6161, 6191; 1°*, 6215 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6408; 3°*, 6429 (iv).

Bill (No. 146) Respecting Proprietary and Patent Medicines.—(Mr. Templeman).
Res. prop., 4963; in Com. on Res., 6215; 1°*, 6218 (iii); 2°, 10551 (vi); in Com., 12622; 3°*, 12628 (vii).

Bill (No. 147) To repeal the Canned Goods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 6221; 2°, and in Com., 6870; 3°*, 6890 (iv).

Bill (No. 148) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 6221; 2°, 6900; in Com., 6900 (iv), 10553; 3°*, 10569 (vi).

Bill (No. 149) To amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 6221; 2°, and in Com., 6890; 3° m., 7215; ref. back to Com., 7227; 3°*, 7257 (iv).

Bill (No. 150) To amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 6221 (iv); 2° m., 8481; in Com., 8483 (v), 10518; 3°*, 10526 (vi).

**BILLS**—*Con.*

Bill (No. 151, from the Senate) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Crawford).
1°*, 6287; 2°, 6561; in Com., 7141, 7667, 8125 (iv), 8332, 8552, 8609, 8741, 9066, 9377, 9461; 3°*, 9472 (v).

Bill (No. 152) Respecting Signal Dues at Halifax.—(Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 6457 (iv); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8560, 8610, 9166; 3° m., 9167 (v).

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) Respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—(Mr. Sinclair).
1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., 7667; 3°*, 7669 (iv).

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate) Respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8332 (v).

Bill (No. 156, from the Senate) Respecting the Northern Bank and Crown Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., and 3°*, 7725 (iv).

Bill (No. 157) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°, 6843 (iv).

Bill (No. 158) Respecting Meaford Harbour.—(Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 7195 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 8510; 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 159) Respecting a certain Issue of Dominion Notes.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 7307 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10795; 3°*, 10848 (vi).

Bill (No. 160) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 7307 (iv); 2°, 10919; in Com., 10933; 3°*, 10952 (vi).

Bill (No. 161) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Beauparlant).
1°, 7307 (iv).

Bill (No. 162) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).
1°, 7931 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10703; 3°*, 10716 (vi); Sen. Amts., 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 163) To authorize the exchange of certain School Lands for other Dominion Lands.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°, 8086 (iv); 2° m., 8467; in Com., 8478; 3°*, 8480 (v).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith May Gilmore.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).
1°*, 8377; 2°*, 8610 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 165) Respecting the Court of Appeal of British Columbia.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 8185 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8465; 1°, 8466 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10862; 3°*, 10863 (vi).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) To amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act in so far as the same affects the Province of Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 8604 (v); 2°, 10690; in Com., 10691; 3°*, 10693 (vi).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) Respecting the Phœnix Assurance Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).

1°*, 8603; 2°*, 9070; in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 168) To authorize the payment to the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta of part of the Assurance Fund under the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 7094 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8480; 1°*, 8481 (v); 2°, 10525; in Com., 10526; 3°*, 10528 (vi).

Bill (No. 169) To amend the Yukon Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 8604 (v); 2°, 10528; in Com., 10529; 3°, 10545; Sen. Amts., 11634 (vi).

Bill (No. 170, from the Senate) Respecting the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool).

1°*, 8694; 2°*, 9070; in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 171) Respecting the Government Guaranteed Bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 8835 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10771; 3°*, 10777 (vi).

Bill (No. 172) To incorporate the Dominion Power Company.—(Mr. Hall).

1°*, 9021; 2°*, 9168 (v).

Bill (No. 173) To restrain the Use of Tobacco by Young Persons.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 9021 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10693; 3°*, 11235 (vi); Sen. Amts., 13044 (vii).

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) Respecting certain patents of the General Chemical Company.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate) For the relief of Catherine Ann Cannon.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate) For the relief of Ada Katurah Stewart Paulding.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) For the relief of Mary Alexander.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°* 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate) Relating to the Water-Carriage of Goods.—(Mr. Johnston).

1°*, 9330 (v); M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Bill (No. 179, from the Senate) To incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 9330; 2°*, 10008 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 11460 (vi).

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate) Respecting the Crown Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Tisdale).

1°*, 9330; in Com., 9962; 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 181) To consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 9333 (v); 2°, 11125; in Com., 11158, 11408, 11460, 11502, 11940; 3° m., 11970 (vi), 12394; 3°*, 12399; Sen. Amts., 13522 (vii).

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate) For the relief of Hattie Spratte.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 9889; 2°*, 10008 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 183, from the Senate) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°*, 10119 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12851, 13052; 3°*, 13223 (vii).

Bill (No. 184, from the Senate) To amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 10008 (v); 2°, 10545; in Com., 10546, 10743, 11020; 3°*, 11022 (vi).

Bill (No. 185, from the Senate) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal.—(Mr. Johnston).

1°*, 10008; M. for 2°, 10122 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 12595 (vii).

Bill (No. 186) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 10510; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 10510 (vi).

Bill (No. 187, from the Senate) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. Black).

1°*, 10717 (vi); 2° m., 13506; in Com., 13507; 3°*, 13508 (vii).

Bill (No. 188, from the Senate) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 10717 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12559, 13207; 3°*, 13215 (vii).

Bill (No. 189) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 11300; in Com. on Res., 11351; 1°, 10717; 2°, 11315; in Com., 11362, 11535, 11634 (vi), 12163; 3°*, 12189; Sen. Amts., 13520 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate) Respecting Juvenile Delinquents.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°*, 10915 (vii); 2°, and in Com., 12399; 3°* 12406 (vii).

Bill (No. 191) Respecting the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores Mined in Canada.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 10952; in Com. on Res., 10952; 1°* of B., 10953; 2°, 11235; in Com., 11243; 3°, 12054 (vii).

Bill (No. 192, from the Senate) To incorporate the Alberta and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).
1°*, 11120; 2°*, 11460 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12594 (vii).

Bill (No. 193) To amend the Timber Marking Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 11120 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12408; 3°*, 12408 (vii).

Bill (No. 194) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. Paterson).
Res. prop., 11233; in Com. on Res., 11312; 1°* of B., 11315; in Com., 11980 (vi).

Bill (No. 195, from the Senate) To incorporate the Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Zimmerman).
1°*, 11589; 2°*, 11885 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12595 (vii).

Bill (No. 196, from the Senate) For the relief of Arthur James Townsend.—(Mr. Copp).
1°*, 11589; 2°*, 11885 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 197, from the Senate) Respecting the Sale and Marking of Manufactures of Gold and Silver, and Gold and Silver Plated Ware.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°*, 11990 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12554; 3°*, 12559 (vii).

Bill (No. 198, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Patent of William B. Smith.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 12393; in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 199) To provide for the payment of Bounties on Crude Petroleum.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 12162; in Com. on Res., 12406; 1°* of B., 12407; 2°, and in Com., 12644; 3°*, 12644 (vii).

Bill (No. 200) Respecting the Salary of the Superintendent of Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res prop., 12162; in Com. on Res., 12407; 1°* of B., 12407; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12644 (vii).

Bill (No. 201) To assist in maintaining an Independent and Efficient service of Telegraphic news from Great Britain for Publication in the Canadian Press.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12407; 1°* of B., 12408; 2°, 12644, 12837; in Com., 12848; 3°*, 12851 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 202) To authorize the Construction of a Branch Line of the Prince Edward Island Railway from Harmony, on the Souris Branch to Elmira.—(Mr. Graham).
Res. prop., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12408; 1°* of B., 12409; 2°, 12628; in Com., 12631; 3°*, 12643 (vii).

Bill (No. 203, from the Senate) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act as regards Grain.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 12594; 2°, and in Com., 13048, 13208; 3°*, 13215 (vii).

Bill (No. 204) To amend chapter 38 of the Statutes of 1907, in amendment of the Railway Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 12549; 2°, and in Com., 13046; 3°*, 13047 (vii).

Bill (No. 205) To Prohibit the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Opium for other than Medicinal Purposes.—(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 12503; in Com. on Res., 12550; 1°* of B., 12551; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12851; Sen. Amts., 13523 (vii).

Bill (No. 206) To amend the Judges' Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
Res. prop., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12551; 1°* of B., 12554; 2°, and in Com., 13048; 3°*, 13051 (vii).

Bill (No. 207, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Metal Shingle and Siding Company, Limited.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 12649; 2°, 12649; in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 208) Respecting the office of the Auditor General.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 12502; in Com. on Res., 12644; 1°* of B., 12645; 2°, and in Com., 12645; 3°*, 12645 (vii).

Bill (No. 209) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12645; 1°* of B., 12649; 2°, and in Com., 13053; 3°*, 13207 (vii).

Bill (No. 210) To amend the Northwest Territories Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°*, 12650; 2°, and in Com., 13051; 3°*, 13052 (vii).

Bill (No. 211) To amend the Act of the present session intituled 'An Act respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.'—(Mr. Pringle).
1°*, 2°*, 12773; in Com., and 3°*, 13224 (vii).

Bill (No. 212) To amend the Criminal Code, and to repeal section 415 of the Railway Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 12919; 2°, and in Com., 13316; 3°*, 13320 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 213) Respecting Aid for the extension of the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13066; M. for Com. on Res., 13258; in Com. on Res., 13278; 1°* of B., 13282; 2°, and in Com., 13419; 3°*, 13420 (vii).

Bill (No. 214) Respecting certain Aid for the Extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13069; in Com. on Res., 13282; 1°* of B., 13285; 2°, and in Com., 13420; 3°*, 13420 (vii).

Bill (No. 215) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the Lines of Railway therein mentioned. —(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13071; in Com. on Res., 13285; 1°* of B., 13315; 2°, and in Com., 13478; 3°*, 13490 (vii).

Bill (No. 216) Respecting the Canadian Patriotic Funds Association.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

1°*, 2°, and in Com., 13320; 3°*, 13321 (vii).

Bill (No. 217) Respecting the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13080; in Com. on Res., 13416; 1°* of B., 13417; 2°, and in Com., 13491; 3°*, 13493 (vii).

Bill (No. 218) To authorize the sale or other disposal of certain Ordnance Lands in the Cities of Toronto and Montreal.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

Res. prop., 13226; in Com. on Res., 13417; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 13418; 3°*, 13419 (vii).

Bill (No. 219) Respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

1°, 13495; 2°, and in Com., 13501; 3°*, 13506 (vii).

Bill (No. 220) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 13579; in Com. on Ways and Means, 13579; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 13579; 3°*, 13579 (vii).

Binder Twine Bounty, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).

Binder Twine in Kingston Penitentiary, Sale and Contracts: in Com. of Sup., 5522 (iii).

Binder Twine, Purchasers' Names and P. O. Addresses: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 9715 (v).

——— Seizures, and Payments to Mr. A. Smith: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Blackhalls Estate, Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 11686 (vi).

Blairmore Townsite: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4584 (iii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Clements) 6465 (iv).

Blind River Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, Changes: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 194 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 241 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 432 (i).

Blunden, Fred. W., Imprisonment of: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 12902

——— Trial and Conviction, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Ward) 3466 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ward) 5211 (iii).

Boards of Trade Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 133.'

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., Protection *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2992 (ii).

——— Transfer of Power Plant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).

*See* 'Canals—Trent.'

Boiler Inspection Insurance Co., Payments to Mr. R. Stewart: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).

Boivin, Cote & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12650 (vii).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1291 (i).

Bonaventure River Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).

Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3230 (ii).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Establishment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).

Bonusing System *re* Immigration: Notice of Motion (Mr. Monk) 6288 (iv).

*See* 'Immigration,' &c.

Booms in International Streams: *See* 'B. No. 105.'

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244, 5083 (iii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 5476 (iii).

Borden, Sir Frederick, and Cold Storage Co.: *See* 'New Brunswick.'

Boundary Delimitations, Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9738 (v).

Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Bounties on Crude Petroleum: *See* 'B. No. 199.'

Bounties on Lead: *See* 'B. No. 191.'

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amount from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).

*See* 'Lead,' &c.

Bounties, Total Amount paid by Govt since 1906: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 895 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1130 (i).
Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. R. L Borden) 13226 (vii)
Boyle Concessions, Memorials from Dawson Legislature: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 509, 562, 681 (i).
Brampton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).
Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
Brantford Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10891 (vi).
Brantford Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Brantford Stove Works Strike, Arrests *re* Picketing: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 9027 (v).
——— Cor. with Justie Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 10016 (v).
Brantford Telephone Monument: on Conc., 13567 (vii).
*See* 'Bell.'
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagnoris, Charges *re* Political Activity: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6642 (iv).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6232 (iv).
Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector of Port Maitland Pier: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6404 (iv).
Bridge Strengthening, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Bridge Subsidies to Rvs.: Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com. on Res., 13310 (vii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (iv).
Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9473 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9266 (v).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5913 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 12133, 12138 (vii).
B.C., Chartered Bank of: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
B.C., Court of Appeal: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
B.C., Fisheries Commission, Report *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
B.C., Fishing Licenses issued to Packers' Association: Ques. (Mr. Kennedy) 8173 (v).
*See* 'Fisheries,' &c.
B.C., Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. D. Ross) 3435 (ii).
B. C. Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
B. C. Telegraphs, Claims of C. P. Ry. *re* Cape Beale Lines: in Com of Sup., 5732(iii).
British Pensioners, Notice from Imp. Govt. of Deductions: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7501 (iv).
British Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5474 (iii).
Brock, Mr., Emplymt. *re* Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5204 (iii).
Brockville, Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 3897 (ii).
———Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 3234 (ii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Connections, Charges against Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1429 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. House, 186 (i).
——— Connection with C.P.R.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 432 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Advances *re* Travelling Expenses for Priv. Sec., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1690 (i).
——— Travelling Expenses since July, 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1689 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i).
*See* 'Travelling Expenses.'
Brome County, Number of Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 6241 (iv).
Bronte Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii).
——— Dues for Wharfage, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
——— Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 686 (i).
Buchanan Townsite, Application *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10079, 10083 (v).
——— Homestead Entry by Mr. Ramsland: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10082 (v).
Buctouche Channel, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Budget, The, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 5137 (iii).
Debate:—(Mr. Foster) 5260; (Mr. Paterson) 5296; (Mr. Cockshutt) 5314; (Mr. Sifton) 5338; (Mr. Bergeron) 5357; (Mr. Pardee) 5364; (Mr. E. L. Smith) 5375, 5388; (Mr. Thompson) 5405; (Mr. M. S. Schell) 5616, 5957; (Mr. W. Jackson) 5959; (Mr. Armstrong) 6046, 6062; (Mr. Guthrie) 6011; (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6097; (Mr. U. Wilson) 6082 (iii); (Mr. Loggie) 6553; (Mr. Mackenzie) 6573; (Mr. Sinclair) 6615; (Mr. Sproule) 6595; (Mr. N. F. Wilson) 6610 (iv).
*See* 'Financial Review,' &c.

Budget Speech sent out by Deptl. Clerks: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10349 (vi).
Budget Speech: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 519, 559 (i), 4316, 4670 (iii).
Buell, W. S., Emplymt. *re* Telephone Commission: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 10011 (v).
Buffalo imported for Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 847 (i).
Buffalo purchased for Park Reserves, Authority for Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 896 (i).
Buffalo Herd, Location at Elk Park, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5208 (iii).
—— Name of Purchaser: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5795 (iii).
—— Purchase of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (ii), 10102 (v).
Buildings B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Buildings, Cost of Construction: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12661 (vii).
—— Construction of: Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 12771 (vii).
*See* 'Public Works.'
Buildings, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Buildings, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 10953 (vi), 13335 (vii).
Buildings, Man. and N. W., Amounts paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 698 (i).
Buildings, Man. and N. W. T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v).
—— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv), 13328 (vii).
—— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv), 13326 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).
—— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
—— Saskatchewan and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
*See* 'Public Works.'
Burlington Channel, Lighthouse, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5467 (iii).
—— Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
—— Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c.: Ques (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4403 (iii).
Business of the House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii).
—— Precedence *re* Questions: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 430 (i).
—— Precedence on Tuesday: Remarks: (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2982 (ii).
—— Public Bills and Orders, Priority of Procedure: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2939 (ii).
Business of the House, Public Bills, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) *re* Procedure, 2786 (ii).
—— Remarks on M. for Sup., 10688 (vi).
*See* 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Butler, Mr. M. J., Dep. Min. of Rys., Salary: in Com. of Sup., 12755 (vii).
Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 2162 (ii).
Butter Imports, Quantity and Countries of Origin: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1116 (i).
Cabinet Changes: ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 24; (Mr. Foster) 80; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 44 (i).
Cabinet Ministers and Govt. Contracts, &c.: *See* 'Cold Storage,' &c.
Cable Service in St. Lawrence: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Calgary P.O., and Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8578 (v).
Calgary Town Sites: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) on M. for Sup., 9775 (v).
Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4769 (iii).
Campaign Funds, Charges by Min. of Public Works, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 26 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 65 (i).
Campaign Literature sent out by Depts.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 14.'
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ontario Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 236 (i).
Campbellton, Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v)
—— I.C.R. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
Campbellton Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi), 13344 (vii).
—— Tenders *re* Piling Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Canada-Australia SS. Service, Yearly Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1289 (i).
—— Discontinuance of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 941 (i).
Canada and Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
Canada and China, Japan, &c., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12391
*See* 'Franco-Canadian.'

Canada and Germany Trade Relations: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 13081 (vii).
Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 12, 17, 183, 209.'
Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'
Can. Temperance Act Amt.: *See* 'Bill No. 187.'
Canada Temperance Act: M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13493 (vii).
Canada Weather Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
Canadian Associated Press: *See* 'B. No. 201.'
Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subventions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5080 (iii).
Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. B. E. Walker: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 6005 (iii).
Can. Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111, 219.'
Canadian Battlefields: *See* 'Battlefields,' &c.
Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Canadian Ensign: *See* 'Red Ensign.'
Canadians entering U. S., Deportation of Macedonians, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 2738; Letter of Messrs. Allen, Cassels & Defries: Read, 2739 (ii).
Canadian Naturalization and British Rights: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 12084 (vii).
Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by U. S. Customs Officers: Remarks (Mr. Bristol) 11121 (vi).
Can. Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Can. Northern Ry. Extension, Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 214.'
Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Can. Northern Que. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Canadian Northern Ry., Erwood and Pas Mission Branch, Rep. of Engineer: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 13309, 13475 (vii).
C. P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B No. 45.'
C. P. Ry., Compensation *re* Right of Way: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii).
——— Land Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 5049 (iii).
——— Papineauville and Little Nation River Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).
——— Plaster Rock Branch Line Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
——— Saskatchewan Bridge Subsldy: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vii).
Can. Patriotic Funds Association: *See* 'B. No. 216.'
Canadians repatriated from U. S., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Canadian Timber used in Govt. Works: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).
Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., Payments *re* Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
Canada and U. S., Boundary Treaties: Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7834 (iv).
——— Trade Treaty Negotiations, Completion of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 937 (i).
*See* 'Anglo-American.'
CANALS—
Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure, *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3038 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal, Lease, Conditions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1131 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 1740 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 946 (i).
——— Lease to Robert Co., Emplymt. of Mr. Deschenes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 8443 (v).
——— Lease of Water Power to McIntyre and Roberts Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
——— Robert Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13475 (vii).
Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Extra Remuneration: in Com. of Sup., 5697 (iii).
——— Generally, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10325 (vi).
——— Remuneration *re* Sunday Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Staff and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
——— Statistical Branch: in Com. of Sup., 10317 (vi).
——— list of officers: Read (Mr. Graham) 10317 (vi).
Carillon Dams and Slides: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
Chambly Canal, Towpath: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident *re* Banks: Statement (Mr. Graham) 11120 (vi).
——— Further Information *re* Break: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11406 (vi).
——— Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
——— Repairs *re* Break in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Graham) 12161 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with M'f'g. Cos. *re* Water Power: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 13084 (vii).

CANALS—*Con.*

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).

——— Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).

——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Pringle) 12095 (vii).

Galops Canal, Upper Entrance, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5671 (iii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Reps., &c.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8378 (v).
*See* main heading.

Lachine Canal, Basin Walls: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).

——— Compensation to Richards *re* Horse: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).

——— Lock Repairs: in Com of Sup., 5672 (iii).

——— Slope Walls, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).

——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5696 (iii).

Murray Canal, Bridgemen's Houses: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).

Quebec Canals, Steam Road Rollers: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).

Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8613, 9476 (v).

——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).

St. Lawrence Canal, District Office: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).

Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c.: M. for Reports* (Mr. Boyer) 6239 (iv).

——— Electric Power, Contract with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10011 (v).

——— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10513 (vi).

——— Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).

——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).

——— Investigation *re* Charges against Overseer: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).

——— Report of Mr. Boyer: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12413 (vii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).

——— Manning & Macdonald's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).

Trent Canal, Balsam Lake Section, Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).

——— Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., Protection *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2992 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*

Trent Canal, Bobcaygeon Dam, Transfer of Power Plant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).

——— Bradford Canal, Building of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 13476 (vii).

——— Buckhorn Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).

——— Cameron Lake Water Levels, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).

——— Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).

——— Clearing of Logs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 10310 (vi).

——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).

——— Contracts, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1734 (i).

——— Damages *re* Floods: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).

——— Engineers Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6925 (iv).

——— Extension from Balsam Lake to Gull River, Reps., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2991 (ii).

——— ret. incomplete: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6059 (iii).

——— Holland River Dredging, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).

——— Holland River Extension: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11939 (vi).

——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).

——— Lindsay Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).

——— Newmarket Canal Reps., Surveys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).

——— Newmarket Canal Extension to Devil's Elbow: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi), 12225 (vii).

——— Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 10338 (vi).

——— Surveys, Reports *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6988 (iv).

——— Tributary Works, Completion of Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1115 (i).

——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).

——— Wilberforce Dam, Obstructions to Traffic, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2988 (ii).

Welland Canal, Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).

——— Contract Power Co., Amount diverted at De Cew Falls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 897 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*
Welland Canal, Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Deepening, Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).
——— Dredging Deep Cut Slide: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
——— Electric Lighting, Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 12195 (vii).
——— Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lalor) 852 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 174 (i).
——— Piers and Bridges at Queenston Heights: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Port Colborne Elevator and Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).
——— Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4403 (iii).
——— Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Resignation of John R. Scott: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6058 (iii).
——— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 12210 (vii).
Canned Foods Inspection Act, Enforcement of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3846 (ii).
——— Cor. *re* Regulations, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 557 (i).
——— Names of Counties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Canned Goods Act: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3847 (ii).
Cannon, Catherine Ann, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6646 (iv).
——— Successor to Dr. Brune: Ques. (Mr Stanfield) 1735 (i).
Cape St. Mary, Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3236 (ii).
Caraquet Wharf, Ice-breakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
Caribou Island Causeway: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Carillon Dams and Slides: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
'Carlotta G. Fox,' Schr., Seizure of: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10517 (vi).
Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6059 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Conditions of Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).
*See* 'Marine,' &c.
'Castle,' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6641 (iv).
Cataract Power Co., Welland Canal, Amount diverted at De Cew Falls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 897 (i).
'Catharine C.,' Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5727 (iii).
Catholics and Public Offices, Ref. to Speech in Senate: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sproule) 5047 (iii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2167 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2795 (ii).
——— inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).
——— Cable, *re* Removal by G. B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13228 (vii).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Armstrong) 13081 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Cattle Exports and Imports from Canada to G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6160 (iv).
Cattle exported to U.S. during 1900-7, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1507 (i).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2767 (ii).
Cattle Inspection *re* Ocean Service: in Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).
Cattle Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Cattle registered, Importation from U.S. from 1904-7: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6238 (iv).
Cattle sold from Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2389 (ii).
Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Cement Testing Laboratory: in Com. of Sup., 11078 (vi).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 11206, 11250 (vi).
Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 673 (i), 12879 (vii).
Census Map, Publishing of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4406 (iii).

Census (complete) of the N. W. Provs., Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 3422 (ii).
Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4767 (iii).
'Challenge,' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 12651 (vii).
Chambly Canal, Towpath: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5653 (iii).
Chambly Common, Area, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5652 (iii).
'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).
Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 513 (i).
Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).
Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 11495 (vi).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 685 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5202 (iii).
Charlotttown Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Sailing Vessels: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 6240 (iv).
Charlottetown Pipe Line to Tank, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5655 (iii).
Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 517 (i).
——— Specifications, &c., *re* Construction: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3241 (ii).
Chartered Bank of B. C.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Chartered Banks of Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Charwomen, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7937 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030
Chatham, N.B., Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12757 (vii).
Cheese Adulteration: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8174 (iv).
Chicoutimi, Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 7203 (iv).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
——— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).
——— Public Works, Expenditures, &c: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 8894, 9266 (v), 10515 (vi).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 513 (i).
Chinese and Japanese Riots, B.C., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13155 (vii).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 754 (i).
Church of England, Missionary Society, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Church Point Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Chute a Blondeau Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5087; Amt. (Mr. Macpherson) to adjn. Debate, agreed to (Y. 61; N. 51) 5133 (iii).
——— on M. to resume adjn. debate: Remarks Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5246, 5251 (iii).
Cigarettes, Legislation *re*, Res. of W.C.T.U. of Brampton: Read (Mr. Blain) 7278 (iv).
Cigarettes: *See* 'Tobacco.'
Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones: Ques. (Mr. Dubeau) 12390 (vii).
Cimon, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2545 (ii).
——— Payment *re* Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
——— Residence in District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2218 (ii).
Cirkel, Franz, Remuneration *re* Rep. of Geological Survey *re* 'Graphites': Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
*See* 'Graphite.'
Civil Servants, General Increases to: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com of Sup., 12913 (vii).
Civil Service Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 189.'
Civil Service Bill, Correction in 'Hansard' *re* Increases: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11494 (vi).
——— and Employees of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13528 (vii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8516 (v).
——— Procedure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11124 (vi).
——— Resolutions *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11016 (vi).

Civil Service Commission, Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13168 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Distribution to Press: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 5723 (iii).
—— Govtl. Action, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7322 (iv).
—— Inquiry for (Mr R. L. Borden) 3317 (ii), 4963, 5408, 5567 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5491 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 938, 1740 (i), 2787 (ii), 4315, 4495 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Perley) 90 (i).
—— Issue of Commission of Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6466 (iv).
—— Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassel's Powers: (amt.) to Com. of Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7506, Neg. (Y. 48; N. 99) 7618 (iv).
—— Instructions to Judge Cassels: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7505 (iv).
—— O.C. to Mr. Justice Cassels *re* Investigations: M. to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
*See* 'Cassels,' &c.
—— Marine, Deptl. Dismissals: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6003 (iii).
—— Number distributed: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6060 (iii).
—— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5882 (iii).
—— Report: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 5620 (iii).
—— Translation into French: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6222, 6925 (iv), 11312 (vi), 13477 (vii).
Civil Service Employees, 1905-6-7, Dates of Apptmts., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 558 (i).
Civil Service Examiners: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
—— Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Civil Govt.: *See* 'Supply.'
Civil Service List: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 93 (i).
Civil Service System, Reorganization of: Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9132; Neg. (Y. 30; N. 72) 9218 (v).
—— Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) M. to drop, 6242 (iv).
Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).
—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Clarke City, Seven Islands: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
—— Expenditure *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Clarke's Harbour, Dog Fish Works: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Clearwater Lake, Half-breeds Rights: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
—— Squatters Rights to Lands: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Clement, Mr. W. H. P., Services in Yukon, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
*See* 'Yukon.'
Clerical and Temporary Clerks, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 11099 (vi).
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Office: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Clerk of Works on Public Buildings: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 695 (i).
Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4831 (iii).
Closure Rule: *See* 'Obstruction.'
Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8380 (v).
Coal and Govt. Lands, Acres in possession of Gov.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 843 (i).
Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5469 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5468 (iii).
—— held by F. E. Keniston, Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 5476 (iii).
—— Names and Addresses of Agents *re* Applications: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5789 (iii).
Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 515 (i).
Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Zimmerman) 6924 (iv).
Coal Lands in Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9278 (v).
—— Royalty Fees, Sale or Lease of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11019 (vi).
Coal Lands, Applicants, Names, Price, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3434 (ii).
Coal Land Leases, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2395 (ii).
Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt., Original Applicants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3480 (ii).
—— Leased by Govt., Names of Original Grantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3232 (ii).
—— Leased, Sold or Assigned, since March, 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
Coal Lands in N.W.T., Leases granted, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 5087 (iii).
Coal Lands, O.Cs., Regulations, &c., *re* Disposal: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 4246 (iii).
—— Purchase Price on Sections 16, 20 and 21: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10512 (vi).
—— Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
—— Sale through J. W. Bettes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6242 (iv).

Coal Lands, sold by P. E. Lessard: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
——— Sale by McGivern & Hayden: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Coal Lands in Sections 2, 4, 9, 15, 17 and 28, First Applicants, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
——— Section 13, First Applicants, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3851 (ii).
Coal Lands, Timber, &c., Dates of Regulation, O.Cs., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 12656 (vii).
Coal Mining Privileges in Section 11, Applications, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
Coal Mine Royalties in Alberta, Sums received: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 12391 (vii).
Coal Mining in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10257 (v).
Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. from Board of Trade, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5470 (iii).
*See* 'Shipping,' &c.
Coasting Privileges, Prop. Rps. withdrawn, 2795 (ii).
Coasting Trade, O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4586 (iii).
Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6237 (iv).
Cobourg Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
——— Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 359 (i).
Colborne Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
Colchester Election, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 39 (i).
Colchester Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 680 (i).
Colchester Point, Essex County Pier,, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 351 (i).
Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8379 (v).
Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1685 (i).
——— Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 236 (i).
——— Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1937 (i).
*See* 'Butter,' 'Cheese,' 'Brockville,' &c.
Cold Storage Ret., Letter of Mr. McKeown, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4223, 4407 (iii).
*See* 'N.B. Cold Storage,' &c.
Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6403 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12096 (vii).
Colonial Conference, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 82; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 41 (i).
*See* 'Intercolonial,' &c.
——— Travelling Expenses, ref. to in Com. of Sup. on Marine Estimates, 3985 (ii).
——— Travelling Expenses of Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 998, 1040 (i).
*See* 'Travelling Expenses.'
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor., &c., Govtl. Action: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 174 (i).
Colonization Lands: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 3752 (ii).
Colonization Societies, Quebec, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Commercial Agents, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
Commercial Travellers, Provincial Tax, Agreement *re* Abolition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Guthrie) 5794 (iii).
Commerical Treaty with Italy: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10593 (vi).
Commissions appointed between 1896 and 1908, Costs, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 1295 (i).
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc. in Rep., 90 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 1207 (i), 3315 (ii).
Committee Meeting, Rep. in Toronto 'Globe': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) 2382 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 2383; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2383 (ii).
Committees, Organization of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 507, 560 (i).
——— Sitting concurrently with Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9579 (v).
*See* 'Pub. Accts.'
Companies Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Conciliation Boards, Applications *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3482 (ii).
Concrete Wharfs, Dissatisfaction in Ont.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Congdon, Mr. F. T., Instructions *re* Trust Estates: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12413 (vii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Estates Administration: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10111 (v).
——— Reply from Yukon: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 841 (i).
*See* 'Yukon.'

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 238 (i).
Cookshire Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7281 (iv).
Co-operation: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Cooper & White, Payments *re* Rental for Govt. Lands, Welland County: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 3841 (ii).
Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 11913 (vi).
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 28.'
'Coquitlam,' Str., Seizure of, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2389 (ii).
Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident to Banks: Statement (Mr. Graham) 11120 (vi).
——— Arrangements with Mfg. Cos. *re* Water Power: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 13084 (vii).
——— Electric Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
——— Further Information *re* Break: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11406 (vi).
———Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
——— Repairs *re* Break in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 12161 (vii).
——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Pringle) 12095 (vii).
Corry Building, Total Rental per Annum, Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 11938 (vi).
Cosgrave, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Cotton, Raw, Imported from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Cotton Strikers, Montreal, Commission Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Court of Appeal, B.C.: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Cowie, Mr. F. W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5649 (iii). *See* 'Marine,' &c.
Cowly, and Highwood, Railway Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Credit by False Pretences: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Criminal Code Amendments, Placing on Govt. Orders: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 9281 (v).
Criminal Code (assault) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
——— (homicide while hunting) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
——— (injuries by motor vehicles) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
——— (libel) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
——— (offensive weapons) Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 65. 78.'
——— (speedy trials) Amt. *See* 'B. No. 92.'
——— (trade restraint) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
——— (trading stamps, credit) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Criminal Statistics: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) 10916 (vi).
Crossings of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Crown Bank of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Crown Life Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 180.'
Crude Petroleum Bounty: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Cumberland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi).
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 7731 (iv)
Customs Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 194.'
CUSTOMS :
Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3484 (ii).
Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U.S. and other Countries: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1510 (i).
Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1508 (i).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1347 (i).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 1506 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports, &c., Flagged by him: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5203, 5466 (iii).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Can.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6232 (iv).
B.C., Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. D. Ross) 3435 (ii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
Butter Imports, Quantity and Countries of Origin: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1116 (i).
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3847 (ii).
Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Zimmerman) 6924 (iv).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Cotton, Raw, Imports from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).

Customs Dept., Apptmts. and Civil Service Report: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).

——— Criticism of Civil Service Commission: (Mr. Cockshutt) on M. for Sup., 10428 (vi).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).

——— Estimates, Obstruction in Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 10133 (v).

——— Inspectors, Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 9536 (v).

——— Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

——— Outside Service, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 9226, 9430 (v).

——— Printing, Stationery, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).

——— Salaries, Payments of, Speech of Hon. Mr. Paterson, *re* Obstruction: Remarks (Mr. Owen) to Com. of Sup., 9894 (v).

Customs and Excise Revenues from June 1st to 15, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10791 (vii).

Customs Receipts and Expenditures, 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12655 (vii).

Customs Statistics, and Trade and Commerce Rets., Dupliate Printing: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr Foster) on M. for Sup., 9732 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, Duties on Construction Material, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1116 (i).

——— Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials: M. for O.Cs.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).

——— Ques (Mr. McLaren) 3840 (ii).

——— Material entered free of Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 10254 (v).

——— Material imported for Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4583 (iii).

Detroit River Tunnel and Customs Tariff on Material from U.S.: M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10417 (vi).

——— Explanation (Mr. Paterson) 13524 (vii).

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 13060 (vii).

Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Shipments from Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4763 (iii). *See* main heading.

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5200 (iii).

——— Dismissal from Customs Service: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5473 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9442 (v).

French Books, Reductions of Customs *re* French Treaty: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2160 (ii).

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).

Guarantee Cos.: in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).

Halifax Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 7144 (iv).

Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8177 (iv).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11703 (vi).

Imports and Exports, Values from June to Dec., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).

——— ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 350 (i).

Imports from France, Value for Five Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1124 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13063 (vii).

Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897 (i). *See* main heading.

Man. Customs Collectors, Brokerage Fees charged, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).

Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8441 (v).

Montreal Examining Warehouse, Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).

Montreal Customs Frauds, Penalties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9558 (v).

Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, &c., Customs Officers, Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6980 (iv).

Opium, Amount received *re* Customs Duties, Pet. from B.C., *re* Prohibition: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8614 (v).

Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5200 (iii).

Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).

Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9271 (v).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Prince Rupert Customs Collectors, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 6401 (iv).
Pulp Wood, Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Revenue Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, imported from G.B. in 1904-5-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 1506 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 898 (i).
Seizures for 1905-7, Reasons, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Cockshutt) 4588 (iii).
Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8616 (v).
Venoit, Mr., Collector of Customs at Bathurst, N.B., Political Interference: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 7730 (iv).
Windsor Customs, Pepin, J. A., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
——Customs Officers, Ages, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12655 (vii).
—— Wallace, Michael J., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7500 (iv).
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5201 (iii).
Cypress Hill Homestead Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Cypress Hills Timber Reserve, Preservation of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3841 (ii).
Cyr, Mr., Letter from *re* Stmnt. of Mr. Foster: Read (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 8460; Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 8460; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 8461 (v).
Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).
Dairying and Fruit Industry: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (vi).
Dairy Products: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5204, 5473 (iii).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
—— Valuation of Site: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Dawson City Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Debates of the House, Statement *re* Speakers (Mr. Kennedy) 13537 (vii).
Debates, Official Reports of, Analytical Index: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10504 (vi).
—— Average Price per Column: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3479 (ii).
Debates, French Edition, Apptmt. of French Supt. of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Delay in Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Delay in Distribution: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3486 (ii).
Debates Committee, Correction of Clerical Error in Res. of House (Mr. Gervais) 824 (i).
—— 1st Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 2590 (ii).
—— 2nd and 3rd Reports of Committee: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 6979 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 7834 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep., Adoption of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 12504 (vii).
—— 2nd Rep. of Com.: Amt. (Mr. Gervais) on M. to adopt, 13224 (vii).
—— 4th Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 8835 (v).
—— Conc. without Notice: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8896 (v).
—— M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10225; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 94) 10252 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Monk) *re* conc., 9709, 9889, 10119 (v).
*See* 'Hansard.'
Debt of Canada, Portions falling due, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
—— Falling Due, 1908: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
*See* 'Finance.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Deep Waterways Commission, Proceedings *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11205 (vi).
—— St. Lawrence, Damming at Long Sault: Remarks (Mr. Broder) 13142 (vii).
*See* 'St. Lawrence.'
—— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11101 (vi).
Demurrage on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9474 (v).
Deptl. Buildings, Mackenzie Avenue: in Com of Sup., 1505 (i).
*See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).
Desaulniers, Mr. Gonzalve, Emplymt. as Translator: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1121, 1290 (i).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re*, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5464 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5801 (iii).
Detroit Tunnel, Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials: M. for O.Cs.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).

Detroit Tunnel, Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1116 (i), 4583 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10417 (vi).
——— Material entered free of Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 10254 (v).
——— explanation (Mr. Paterson) 13524 (vii). *See* 'International.'
Devil's Elbow, Canal Work: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Grant: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 8184 (iv).
Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11226 (vi).
Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7203 (iv).
Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N.W.M. Police Force: Ques. (Mr. D. Ross) 6001 (iii).
Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Diocese of the Synod of Keewatin: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Diseases and Public Health Bureau, Establishment of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2562 (ii).
Distilleries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
Divorce of Mary Alexander: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Divorce of Catherine Ann Cannon: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Divorce of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Divorce of Edith May Gilmore: *See* 'B. No. 164.'
Divorce of Ada Katurah Stewart Paulding: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Divorce of Hattie Spratte: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Divorce of Arthur James Townsend: *See* 'B. No. 196.'
Divorce of Andrew Walker: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Docks, Piers, &c., constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2397 (ii).
Dockyards, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Documents in Departments, Access to Originals by Members: M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 1132; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 86) 1201 (i).
Debate:—(Mr. Oliver) 1133; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1137; (Mr. Foster) 1135; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1140; (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1143; (Mr. Sproule) 1147; (Mr. Brodeur) 1140; (Mr. Bennett) 1151; (Mr. Lennox) 1155; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1160; (Mr. Barker) 1162; (Mr. Galliher) 1170; (Mr. D. Ross) 1172; (Mr. Haggart) 1175; (Mr. Devlin) 1177; (Mr. Bergeron) 1180; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1183; (Mr. Northrup) 1190; (Mr. Sproule) 1194; (Mr. Ames) 1195 (i).
Documents, Original, Production of, &c., Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 1617, 1622; Agreed to, 1668 (i).
Debate:—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1623; (Mr. Foster) 1628; (Mr. D. Ross) 1632, 1653; (Mr. Oliver) 1636; (Mr. Barker) 1655; (Mr. Northrup) 1658; (Mr. Bristol) 1663; (Mr. Boyce) 1666 (i).
Documents, Original, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 1766 (i).
Debate:—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1775; (Mr. Haggart) 1778;; (Mr. Sproule) 1782; (Mr. Lennox) 1786; (Mr. Barker) 1793; (Mr. Bristol) 1797; (Mr. Osler) 1800; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1801; (Mr. Fielding) 1805; (Mr. Lancaster) 1814; (Mr. Perley) 1818; (Mr. Broder) 1825; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1827; (Mr. Northrup) 1830; (amt.) 1839; Neg. (Y. 50· N. 95) 1883; (Mr. Lake) 1839; (Mr. Alcorn) 1843; on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to adjn. debate (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1844; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1847; (Mr. Foster) 1851; (Mr. Crocket) 1861; (Mr. Blain) 1871; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1875; (Mr. Armstrong) 1878 (i).
Documents, Original, Custody of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7810 (iv).
——— Detention, &c., Par. in Press. Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Clements) 6010 (iii).
——— Examination of by Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) 3853 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion, on Order being called: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2794 (ii).
——— Production of Originals, Announcement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1425 (i).
——— Production in Committees: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1427 (i).
——— Production of on Order from Hse. Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1617; Agreed to, 1667 (i).
——— Production of to Members: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 1766 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1927 (i).
——— and Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2305, 2308 (ii).
——— Member's remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 2305 (ii).
Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 5655 (iii).
*See* 'Halifax.'
Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Canso, Operation at: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5651 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii)
——— Total Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 5790 (iii).
Dog Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1126 (i).
*See* 'Clarke's,' &c.
Dokis Indian Land Sale, Commission to Mr. P. Ryan: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

Dokis Indians Reserve, Consent from Chief, *re* Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8175 (iv).
—— Name of Govt. Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5084 (iii).
—— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 7500 (iv).
—— Protests *re* Sale: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10918 (vi).
—— Sale of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).
—— Surrender of Timber, O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5087 (iii).
—— Surrender of Title, Negotiations *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3849 (ii).
—— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7991 (iv).
Dominion Arsenal, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7434 (iv), 12154 (vii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 50.'
Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation of: Ques (Mr. Worthington) 3238 (ii).
Dom. Buildings, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
—— Ont., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7467 (iv).
—— Que., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
—— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi). *See* 'Public Works—Buildings.'
Dom. Coal Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10066 (v). *See* 'Coal,' &c.
Dom. Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 29, 80, 115.'
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) 2° m., 7835.
Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 7859; (Mr. Greenway) 7880; (Mr. Alcorn) 7890; (Mr. Bole) 7939; (Mr. Boyce) 7949; (Mr. Conmee) 7982, 7998; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8012; (amt.) 8076; (Mr. Crawford) 8076, 8089; (Mr. Monk) 8116, 8138; (Mr. Devlin) 8143; (Mr. Lake) 8150; (Mr. D. Ross) 8185; (Mr. Schaffner) 8200; (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 8242; (Mr. W. Wright) 8271; (Mr. Dugas) 8282 (iv); (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8296 (v); (Mr. Foster) 8321; (Mr. Burrows) 8357; (Mr. Staples) 8387; (Mr. Carvell) 8401; (Mr. R. L. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8423; (Mr. Galliher) 8619; (Mr. Armstrong) 8645; (Mr. Oliver) 8659; (Mr. Bergeron) 8681 (v); (Mr. Miller) 11707; (Mr. Conmee) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11727; (Mr. Boyce) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11739; (Mr. Alcorn) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11753; (Mr. Aylesworth) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11755 (vi).
In Com., 11796 (vi).
Ballot Papers, Fraudulent Marking (sec. 20) 11890; Amt. (Mr. White) 11890; Amt. (Mr. Porter) 11892 (vi), 13013; Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 13022, 13027; Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 13025; Amt. (Mr. Borden) 13026; (Mr. Crocket) 13028; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 13028; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 13036; Amt. (Mr. Bennett) 13037; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 13037; Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 13037 (vii).
Boards of Registration (sub.-sec. 4) 12995 (vii).
Canvassing by Aliens (sec. 25), Amt. (Mr. Lake) 11898 (vi).
Contributions for Political Purposes (sec. 28) Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11927; Amt. (Mr. Wilson) 11930; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 11931 (vi).
Contributions, Statement (sec. 18) 11884; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11884 (vi).
Conveyances of Voters (sec. 23) 11894; Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 11896; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 11897 (vi).
Conveyances, paying for (sec. 10) 11829; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11835 (vi).
Corrupt Practices, Amt. (Mr. Fowler) 13044 (vii).
Enumerators, Posting of Notices (sec. 6) 11824 (vi).
Lists transmitted by Clerk of Crown in Chancery (sec. 1, sub.-sec. 8) 13004 (vii).
Manitoba Lists, Transmission (sec. 1, subsec. 10) 13009 (vii).
—— Polling Divisions (sec. 1, subsec. 2) 13005 (vii).
Nomination Papers, Address of Candidate (sec. 3) 11815; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 11816; Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 11820; Amt. (Mr. Ames) 11820, 11827 (vi), 13010 (vii).
Ontario, Unorganized Territories (sec. 1) 11796 (vi), 12919 (vii).
Persons on General List, omitted from Special List (sec. 13) 11865 (vi), 13009 (vii); Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 11881 (vi).
Polling Divisions (sec. 6) 13001 (vii).
Posters, Names and Addresses (sec. 26) 11922; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11922 (vi).
P.E.I., Oath (sec. 16) 11882 (vi).
Returning Officers, Instructions to (sec. 11) 11845 (vi); Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13032 (vii).
Voters' Lists Preparation (subsec. 5) 12998 (vii).
Yukon Enumerators (sec. 5) 11823, 11829 (vi), 13013 (vii).
3° m., 13229; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13230; Neg. (Y. 60; N. 99) 13249; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13251; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 13255; Amt. (Mr. Foster) 13257; 3° Agreed to, 13258 (vii).
Dom. Elections, Forms, Writs, Instructions, &c., issued in 1907: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 555 (i).
Dom. Elections Act, and Govt. Measures, Proceeding with: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7721 (iv).
Dom. Elections Bill and Obstruction Tactics: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).
Dom. Guarantee Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. Nos. 127 & 211.'
Dom. Govt. Employees, Interference at Election: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 9 & 181.'

Dom. Lands, Agents, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10038 (v).
—— Area disposed of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3431 (ii).
Dom. Lands and Exchange of School Lands: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 8182 (iv).
Dom. Lands, Sales of, during 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 3435 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 5727 (iii).
—— Total Area disposed of from 1896 to 1905, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 3852 (ii).
Dom. Lands Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9987, 9996 (v).
Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2217 (ii).
*See* 'Finance.'
Dom. Loan and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 313 (i).
Dom. Notes, Issue of : *See* 'B. Nos. 159 & 160.'
Dom. Notes, Outstanding, Total Amount, 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 691 (i).
—— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Dominion Police Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
Dom. Post Offices, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
Dom. Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 172.'
Dominion Power Co.'s Bill: Inquiry for (Mr. Cockshutt) 10919 (vi).
Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1733 (i).
Dom. Transportation and Storage Co.: *See* 'B. No. 84.'
Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 13060 (vii).
Doukhobors bonused as Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).
Doukhobors, Condition of: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Foster) 2218 (ii).
—— Destitute Condition at Fort William (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5007 (iii).
—— Homesteads cancelled, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).
—— Manner of living, Letter from Yorkton: Read (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).
—— Prisoners at Fort William, Release of by Justice Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 6847 (iv).
—— Religious Fanatics: Par. in 'Press' (Mr. J. D. Reid) 12161 (vii).
—— Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept.: Ques.: (Mr. Lake) 6983 (iv).
Doukhobors, Yorkton, Tel. from Sec. of Bard of Trade: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7620; Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 7621 (iv).
Dover Wharf on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 11692 (vi).
Dowling, Dr. D. B., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5206 (iii).
—— Emplymt. by German Development Co.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5564 (iii).
—— Leave of Absence from Geological Survey: Remarks (Mr. Templeman) in Com. of Sup., 10581 (vi).
Doyle, Mr. P., Immigration Agent, Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 6923 (iv).
Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
—— and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Office: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 687 (i).
Dredges registered in Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11497 (vi).
Dredging Companies, Contracts, Investigations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5924 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9710 (v).
—— Midland, &c., Renewals without Tender, O.Cs. *re*: M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 6741 (iv).
—— advertisements *re* tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 7195 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, O.C. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Bennett) 6853, 6927 (iv), 8696 (v).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).
—— Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).
—— Quebec Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7104 (iv).
—— Renewal without Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6633 (iv).
—— Tenders *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9773 (v).
Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8839 (v).
Dredging Instructions to Inspectors, Circular Letter: Read in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Pugsley) 12043 (vi).
Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 1129 (i).
Dredging in Ontario and Quebec, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging, Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).

Dredging in Quebec Counties in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3240 (ii).
Dredging in Quebec Province, Claims Pending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7200 (iv).
Dredging in St. Lawrence, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 2896 (ii).
Dredging Plant (new) for Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River (lower): in Com. of Sup., 4754 (iii).
Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3896 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4247 (iii).
Dredging Work at Rigaud River, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyer) 6240 (iv).
Dredging in Vaudreuil County, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
*See* 'Public Works,' &c.
Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 177 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 556 (i).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).
Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
*See* 'Militia.'
Drop Letter, One-Cent Rate: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 3158 (ii).
*See* 'Post Office,' &c.
Drug Contracts with Bole Drug Co.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bole) 5562 (iii).
—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5513 (iii).
Drury, R. L., O.C. *re* Apptmt. to Japan: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4963 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4769 (iii).
Dry Docks, Construction of: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Acceptance of Office: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4768 (iii).
—— Date of Communication *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5084 (iii).
—— O.Cs. &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Taylor) 5086 (iii).
Dundee Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act and Dom. Interference: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 1738 (i).
—— Tel. from Sec. of State: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1859 (i).
—— Cor. with Govt. *re* Legislation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1861 (i).
Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 694 (i).
Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464, 6843 (iv).
Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
Eastern Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, &c., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1125 (i).
East Templeton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3239 (ii).
—— Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 3435 (ii).
Eclipse Manufaturing and Office Specialty Co., Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).
Edmonton, Dunvegan and B.C. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 68 & 213.'
Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5257 (iii).
Eight Hour Day for Ry. Employees: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Elder-Dempster SS. Subsidy to South Africa: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2792 (ii).
Election Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 29, 80, 115.'
Election in N.B., Interference of Dom. Govt. *re* Patronage: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 3043 (ii).
*See* 'N. B.' &c.
Election of New Members, Certificates: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Elections, Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Election Writs, Issue of: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Electoral Districts, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
—— Ottawa and Labelle, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
Electrical Power exported from Niagara Falls, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Electric and Gas Power Licenses, granted under Statute, c. 16, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 360 (i).
Elmwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Emerson Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Empire and Ascension Day Adjnmt.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8894 (v).
Employees of Parlt. and Printing Bureau, Salaries, Religions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5206 (iii).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5479 (iii).
Engineering Branch, Public Works Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11093 (vi).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).
Escoumains Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Equipment, of &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1128 (i).
——Maintenance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1117 (i).
—— Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Essex County, Junior Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1939 (i).
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).
Estimates, Basis of Appropriations *re* Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5919 (iii).
—— Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5661 (iii).
—— Discussions on Resolutions: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
—— Insufficient Votes *re* Public Works, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5923 (iii).
Estimates of 1908-9: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— Suppl. (1908): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii), 12503 (vii).
Exchange of Schools' Lands: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Exchequer Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Exchequer Court, Printing Reports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5508 (iii).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
Excise Collectors, Payments for Customs Collections: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Excise, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 813 (i).
—— Inspectors' Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
—— Provisional Allowance to Inland Revenue Officers: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4406 (iii).
Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4584 (iii). *See* 'Anglo-French.'
Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for Seeds, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 556 (i).
Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10904 (vi).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7990 (iv).
—— Number controlled by Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3897 (ii).
Experimental Farm in Quebec District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2593 (ii).
—— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8182 (iv).
Experimental Farm, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1018 (i).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12549 (vii).
—— Sale of Cattle, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2795 (ii).
—— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4585 (iii).
Express Charges in Mar. Provs., Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 518 (i).
Expropriation of Lands by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Facilities and Increased Accommodations, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 7200 (iv).
Falconer, Kenneth, Arrangement *re* Balance of Payments: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10516 (vi).
—— Emplymt. by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5078 (iii).
—— Payments to *re* Services: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8890 (v).
—— Payments by Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Falconer, Mr. K.: *See* 'Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping.'
Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Custom Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 13060 (vii).
Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7731 (iv).
Farnham Post Office, Alterations: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
—— Vote *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Father Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 846 (i).
Fence Posts Fees, Memorial from Union of Manitoba Municipalities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 10258 (v).

Fernie Public Building, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days Working, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7199 (iv).
Financial Arrangements with Banks: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Financial Review: Amt. (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).
——— Reply (Mr. Fielding) 13442 (vii).
*See* 'Budget.'

FINANCE:
Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 362 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 352 (i).
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2593 (ii).
Audits and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12658 (vii).
——— Independent Audit, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 11232 (vi).
Bank Act Amendments: Prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4248 (iii).
——— Par. in 'Financial Post': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 4770 (ii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).
Banks, Financial Stringency: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9335 (v).
Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amount from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).
Bounties paid by Govt., for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13226 (vii).
Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. B. E. Walker: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 6005 (iii).
Chartered Banks of Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor., &c., Govtl. Action: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 174 (i).
Debt. of Canada, Portions falling due, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
*See* 'Loans.'
Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2217 (ii).
Dom. Notes Outstanding, Total Amount, 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 691 (i).
Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1733 (i).
Estimates of 1908-9: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
——— Suppl. (1908): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii), 12503 (vii).
Financial Arrangements with Banks: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'



FINANCE—*Con.*
Finance, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i), 12914 (vii).
Financial Review: Amt. (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).
——— Reply (Mr. Fielding) 13442 (vii).
See 'Budget.'
Financial Stringency, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 35 (i).
Govt. Securities in Gold *re* Dom. Notes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 6235 (iv).
Grain Shipments, Financial Aid, Extended Explanation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 607 (i).
*See* 'Wheat.'
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 241 (i).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where Discounted: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
Loans to Govt. Outstanding, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11501 (vi).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 313 (i).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 13582 (vii).
Loans, Temporary, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 233, 314 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 554 (i).
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8612 (v).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Caron) 5210 (iii).
——— Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11296 (vi).
——— Issue of Gold Coins: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2593 (ii).
——— Sums expended, Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 557 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Amounts collected and expended, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1688 (i).
——— Claim of Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
——— Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1931 (i).
——— Bonds, Payment of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2979 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3436; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3442; Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3299 (ii).
Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Govt. Deposit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3485 (ii).
N.B. Credit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1937 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present Agreement and Previously: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 315 (i).
——— Dates of last Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237, 564 (i).
——— Increased Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 173 (i).
——— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 79; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 61 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2394 (ii).
——— Investigation *re*: M. for Sel. Com.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2547 (ii).
*See* main heading.
Receiver General's Office: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).
Treasury Board: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3480 (ii).
Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'
Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., Cor., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 2173 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1938 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 173 (i).
*See* 'Grain.'
Fire caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1510 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 1690 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 4832 (iii).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7663 (iv).
——— File, Cor., quoted by Minister, custody of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on M. for Sup., 7763 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Original Papers (Mr. Foster) 8901, 9281 (v).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) on M. for Sup., 7639 (iv).
Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 3433 (ii).
Fisheries Act (jurisdiction of officers) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
FISHERIES:
Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Plant in St. John, N.B., Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 563 (i).
FISHERIES—*Con.*
Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 3848 (ii).
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1733 (i).
——— Expenses of Sir Charles H. Tupper: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2883 (ii).
——— Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 4669 (iii).
Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Bounties paid to Cape Breton Fishermen, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
B.C., Licenses issued to Packers' Ass'n.: Ques. (Mr. Kennedy) 8173 (iv).
——— Grants to Japanese: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 7445 (iv).
——— Negotiations, Instructions to Mr. Bastedo: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4407 (iii).
——— Reports *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 6849 (iv).
'Carlotta G. Cox,' Seizure of: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Clarke's Harbour, Dog Fish Works: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5651 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).
——— Total Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 5790 (iii).
Dog Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1126 (i).
Fisheries Committee, Sel. Standing, Apptmt. of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1691 (i).
Fisheries Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
——— Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12390 (vii).
Fisheries Jurisdiction with Provinces, Conference *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3235 (ii).
——— Instructions to Agent: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3429 (ii).
——— Jurisdiction *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 2395 (ii).
Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Violation of Act: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1513 (i).
——— Officers Jurisdiction, Convictions, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4247 (iii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Fisheries Negotiations, &c., Between U.S and Canada: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2023 (ii), 6844 (iv).
——— Boundary between Can. and U.S.: Information *re* (Mr. Sproule) 6632, 6739 (iv).
——— Regulations, Violation of: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).
Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3427 (ii).
Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Noble and Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
——— Report from Mr. Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5729 (iii).
*See* 'Noble.'
Lake Winnipeg Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).
——— Fisheries, Legislation *re* Closing: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2389 (ii).
Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1683 (i).
Leases, Sessional Papers No. 207: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Licenses granted in Clearwater, &c., Lakes, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
——— on Lesser Slave Lake, Date of Lease, Protest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6398 (iv).
Licenses issued in Saskatchewan Lakes, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. T. Chisholm) 559, 697 (i).
——— Issue of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 351 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2896 (ii).
Lobster Fish Factory, License to E. H. McLennan, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2983 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 10256 (v).
——— Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 5475 (iii).
——— Fishing in Lunenburg, &c., Complaints *re* Undersized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2792 (ii).
——— Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10257 (v).
——— Fishing at Pictou: Inquiry for Ret (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).
——— Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
——— Overseers in Lunenburg, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2793 (ii).



FISHERIES—*Con.*
Lobster Fishing, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N.S. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 6644 (iv).
——— P.E.I. Pets. *re* Issue of Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2388 (ii).
Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4406 (iii).
Man., Fish Exportations from, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4240 (iii).
Mar. Provs., Fisheries, Violation of Act: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1513 (i).
Markey Fishing Leases, Copy of Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 11404 (vi).
Matane River Fishing, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 7446 (iv).
Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5650 (iii).
*See* 'Georgian Bay.'
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox': on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sloan) 3934 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Sloan) 3156 (ii).
Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10254 (v).
Pound Net Licenses granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 2795 (ii).
Protection, Amounts expended since 1885, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Protection Service: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Change: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1940 (i).
River John Licenses, Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10511 (vi).
Salmon Licenses, Leases, &c., in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5652 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5801 (iii).
——— Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5652 (iii).
——— Number granted in B.C., Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5998 (iii).
——— Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 5651 (iii).
Salmon Net Fishing in Restigouche River Privileges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13518 (vii).
Seizures of Schooners, B.C., Compensation by Russian Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 8894 (v).
Townsend Whaling Licenses: *See* 'Whaling.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9476 (v).
Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7204 (iv).
Washington Fisheries Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1732 (i).
Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2165 (ii).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c.: M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10259 (v).
——— Moneys Due, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5996 (iii).
Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6058 (iii).
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8294 (v).
Floods at Chatham, Damages, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 4742 (iii).
Fog Signal Co., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11497 (vi).
Forbes, Mr Justice, Personal Status, &c., Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Taylor) for Copies*,899 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2390, 3840 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1860 (i).
Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3427 (ii).
Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).
Foresters, Ancient Order of: *See* 'B. No.62.'
Foresters, Order of, Charges in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bennett) 6005 (iii).
Forest Rangers *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10049 (v).
Forest Reserves, Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10049 (v).
Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8613 (v).
Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6646 (iv).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Foss, Mr. C. O., Apptmt. on G.T.P. Engineering Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Franco-Canadian SS. Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty: Prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 941 (i).
——— Preparation of Stmnt. *re* Duty Units (Mr. Foster) 943 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., Stmnt., 1213 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Discussion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3754 (ii).
——— *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products enjoying Benefits of Minimum Tariff, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 851 (i).
——— Consideration of Proposed Convention: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Monk) 923 (i).
——— Correction *re* Travelling Expenses of Sir Charles Tupper (Mr. Ames) 1424 (i).
——— Delay in Approval, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 12655 (vii).
——— Delay due to Canadian Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13534 (vii).
——— Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1206 (i).
——— Distribution to Members: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 605 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12651
——— Favoured Nation Clause, Foreign Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 845 (i).
——— Favoured Nation Clause: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 514 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
——— and German Surtax, Effect of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 844 (i).
——— Imports from U.S., Exclusion of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 845 (i).
——— Information in Detail asked for (Mr. Foster) 1585 (i).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 570 (i).
——— Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 178 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
——— Papers to be Distributed (Mr. Fielding) 848 (i).
——— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 844 (i).
——— Printing and Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 93 (i).
——— Ratification by French Senate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13083 (vii).
——— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 28; (Mr. Foster) 82; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 43 (i).
——— Shipments from Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4763 (iii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Tariffs: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8 (i).
——— U.S. Exports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 896 (i).
Fraser, Mr. A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3478 (ii).
——— Payments to for Legal Services: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2979 (ii).
Fraser, Mr. Donald, Dismissal from Customs Service: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5473 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Defalcations: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5200 (iii).
*See* 'Customs Defalcations,' &c.

Fredericton Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Fredericton Ry. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12758 (vii).
Free Transportation of Members by SS. Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St. John, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 2397 (ii).
French Books, Reduction of Customs Duties *re* French Treaty: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2160 (ii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Language, Legislation *re*, Par. in 'La Presse': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8291 (v).
——— Par. in 'Le Soleil': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1209 (i).
French Language, Pet. *re*: Read (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8886; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 8886 (v).
French Language on Ry. Crossings, &c. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2021 (ii).
French Translation of Govt. Statutes and Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 3179 (ii).
*See* 'Debates.'
French Treaty, Taking Effect: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8614 (v).
French Treaty: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Fritz Cirkel, Mining Engineer, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7202 (iv).
*See* 'Graphite.'
Frozen Wheat, Shipments from Man., Inspection under Seed Act: M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn. House, 825 (i).
Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2166 (ii).
Fruit Inspection in Closed Packages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 2981 (ii).
Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Apple Packing: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 2754 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act, Prosecutions *re* Apple Packing: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 4830 (iii).
Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 516 (i).
Fumigation Stations: in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Fushimi, Prince, Expenditure *re* Visit: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (iii).
Gaetz Brothers, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10514 (vi).
Galops Canal, Upper Entrance, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5671 (iii).
Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments for Buffalo imported from Montana: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 847 (i).
Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, Buoys, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8383 (v).
Gananoque Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5792 (iii).
Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 353 (i).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3844 (ii).
*See* 'Lake Aylmer.'
Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 355 (i).
Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1120 (i).
——— Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 515 (i).
Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 654, 668 (i).
General Chemical Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 174.'
Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on Conc., 13568 (vii).
*See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Geological Specimens: in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
Geological Survey Department, Total Expenditure from 1896 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6402 (iv).
——— Technical Officers, Salaries, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13574 (vii).
——— Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11231 (vi).
Georgetown Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Reports, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. McCool) 1941, 1992 (i), 5228 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal Scheme: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10312 (vi).
——— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 12053 (vii).
——— inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 12836 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Survey, Final Report of Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 240 (i).
——— Final Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. White) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. White) 11827 (vi).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Haggart) 1739 (i).
——— Reps., &c.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8378 (v).
Georgian Bay Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12145 (vii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Noble and Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
——— Report from Mr. Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5729 (iii).
*See* 'Fisheries.'
German Development Co.: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10579 (vi).
*See* 'Dowling.'
German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 510 (i).
Gilmore, Edith May, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 164.'
Girard, Eugene Francois, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11938 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11634 (vi).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7139 (iv).
Glencoe Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3846 (ii).
Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 7486 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Glucose, Quantity imported from G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6980 (iv).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Retirement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Goderich Harbour, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
——— Claims of Smeeth & McGillicuddy: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c.: Ques. (Mr Bristol) 9712 (v)
——— Remarks (Mr. Maclaren) 9779 (v).
Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 123 & 197.'
Gold Commissioner's Office, Yukon, Number of Clerks, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).
*See* 'Yukon.'
'Golspie, Str., Payments *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 1084 (i).
Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Goodwin Car Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Gore's Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Govt. Business: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7834 (iv), 12049, 12163 (vii).
——— Introduction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10258 (v), 10303, 10403, 10511, 11123, 11826 (vi).
——— M. for Precedence on Mondays (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6287 (iv).
——— Precedence *re* Motion for Want of Confidence: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6917 (iv).
——— Ry. Subsidies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12504 (vii).
Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 13207 (vii).
——— Suppl. Estimates, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 11016 (vi).
Govt. Employees at Ottawa, Number of Permanent and Temporary, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Northrup) 558 (i).
Govt. Grounds, Condition of: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) 1741 (i).
*See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sproule) 2890 (ii).
Govt. Officials as Political Partizans in Elections: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).
Govt. Ownership, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 75; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 51 (i).
Govt. Rys. Act: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
Govt. Railways System: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Govt. Securities in Gold *re* Dom. Notes, &c.: Ques. (Mr Marshall) 6235 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for Three Years: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
——— Captains' Residences, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3241 (ii).
——— Ice-breakers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
——— Maintenance and Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).
——— Number purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10731 (vi).
——— Pay of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10736 (vi).
——— Purchase of Supplies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1099 (i).
——— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3288 (ii).
Governor General's Expenditure since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 3581 (ii).
Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 610 (i).
Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Grain Blockade in the West: *See* 'B. No. 159.'

Grain Commission, Names of Members, Distribution of Evidence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3486 (ii).
Grain Commission's Report: Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 2381 (ii), 4224, 4316 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr .Staples) 180 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Staples) 180, 609 (i).
Grain Inspection in 1906, Total Expenditure, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4586 (iii).
Grain Shipments, Financial Aid, Extended Explanation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 607
*See* 'Wheat,' &c.
Grain Standards Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
Grand Bend, &c., Pier, Delays in Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 4408 (iii).
——— Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8892 (v).
Grand Bend Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5085 (ii).
*See* 'Public Works—Wharfs,' &c.
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Grand Marais Harbour, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 12140 (vii).
Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Grand Mere Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13059 (vii).
Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8382 (v).
Grande Riviere Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
G.T.P. Ry. Co., Guaranteed Bonds: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY:
Accidents to Employees: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6655, 7447 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr Talbot) 6850 (iv).
——— Investigation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 10624 (vi).
Application for Portion of Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. D. Ross) 1512 (i).
Apptmt. of District Engineer at Kenora: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 895 (i).
Bond Issue, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8440 (v).
Classification of District 'B' and 'F,' Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 12051 (vii).
*See* 'Hodgins.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Commissioners' Rep., Printing and Distribution: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7 (i).
——— Commission, Total Salaries, Expenses &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13226 (vii).
Commission issued to Inspectors: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9716 (v).
Construction, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
——— Estimated Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 10393 (vi).
——— Inclusive of Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9265 (v).
——— Inquiry for Figures (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10916, 11939 (vi).
——— M. to Lay Statement on Table (Mr. Graham) 12049 (vii).
——— Total Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii), 9265 (v), 11407 (vi).
——— Statement (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12238 (vii)
——— Reply to Mr. Borden's Statement (Mr. Graham) 12662 (vii).
Construction Tenders, Total Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. J. T. Schell) 600 (i).
Contracts, Date, Estimated Cost, Mileage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6458, 6636 (iv).
Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6234 (iv).
Contracts, Safeguard Clauses in Govt. Contracts: M. for Copies* (Mr. Morin) 2398 (ii).
Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5563 (iii).
——— Recent Estimate of Cost: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5259 (iii).
Eastern Limit, Mountain Section, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 9265 (v)
Engineers and Assistant Engineers, Names, &c., Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5802 (iii).
Engineering Staff, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 509, 681 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 853 (i).
——— Resignation of Mr. Hodgins: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 516 (i)
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 558 (i).
*See* 'Hodgins.'
Foss, Mr. C. O., Apptmt. on Engineering Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9266 (v).
G.T.P., and N.T. Ry., Disputed Questions: Ques (Mr. Barker) 6235 (iv).
Hodgins, Major, Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
——— Retirement of, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 366 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Hodgins, Major, Charges *re* Classification, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6844, 6925 (iv).
——Amt. to M. to ref. to Special Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7213, 7320 (iv).
—— Statement from Hon. Mr. Parent: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6985; Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7097 (iv).
—— Investigation *re*, 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Geoffrion) 8515 (v).
—— M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12265; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) Minority Rep., 12291 (vii).
—— Counsel Fees, Payment: M. (Mr. Macdonald) 13578 (vii).
Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 10390 (vi).
La Tuque Branch, Damages by Flooding: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8607 (v).
—— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 8894 (v).
Liquor, Prohibition Zone, Cor., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2024
Location, Conference in Montreal *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7809 (iv).
Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7991 (iv).
Madawaska Right of Way: Remarks (Mr. Michaud) 12661 (vii).
Marier, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating Deductions: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1937 (i).
—— Deductions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 9473 (v).
Medical Officer Parent, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8618 (v).
Miles under construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 165 (i).
Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5256 (iii).
Montreal Branch Line Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Mountain Division, Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Nationality of Contractors: Discrimination against Canadians: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7936 (iv).
Payments to Mr. A. Brunet: in Com. of Sup., 10378 (vi).
Policy *re* Police Patrol: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7997 (iv).
Port Arthur Branch Line Subsidy: in Com on Res., 13303 (vii).
Prohibition Zone, Reduction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 516 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Protests *re* Land Acquisitions: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 6640 (iv).
Rails purchased, Name of Manufacturers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 10738, 10790 (vi).
—— Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 12775 (vii).
—— corrected answer (Mr. Graham) 13065
Rails for Eastern Division, Purchase of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9263 (v).
Return: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6288 (iv).
Route, Financial Reasons for Change of Route: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 8089 (iv).
Sections B. and F., Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 5211 (iii).
Securities *re* Construction Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 356 (i).
Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 9025 (v), 10375 (vi).
Supply Transportation, Award of Contracts *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2171 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1932 (i).
—— Contractor for District No. 3: Ques. (Mr. White) 1120 (i).
Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12728 (vii).
Ties purchased from U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1443 (i).
Town and Development Co., Location of Lands, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
Winnipeg and Moncton Route, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 2386 (ii).
——Number of Miles completed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6643 (iv).
—— Tenders *re* Contracts, Signatures, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 935 (i).
G.T. Ry. and C.P.R. Connection at Wingham: Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 191 (i).
G. T. Ry., Connection at Brockville: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
——Connections at Prescott: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 433 (i).
——Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 556 (i).
G.T.R. Hotel Site at Ottawa: *See* 'B No. 89.'
G.T.Ry. Hotel: *See* 'Major's Hill.'
'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5081 (iii).
*See* 'Fritz Cirkel,' &c.
Gratuities to Marine *re* Accidents to Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Gratuities to Public Works Officials: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).
Gravenhurst Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Graving Docks, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).

Grazing Lands leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13062 (vii).
Grazing Lands Reservations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3850 (ii).
Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Wood, Fleck and Finnie: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 238 (i).
Grazing Leases, Irrevocable for 21 years, Applications for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1511 (i).
Grazing and Irrigation Lands reserved by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3479 (ii).
Grazing Lease of H. Rivière, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13060 (vii).
Grazing Ranches, Names and Addresses of Lessees in Townships 12 to 19: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7210 (iv).
G. B. and Canada Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 12728 (vii).
*See* 'Post Office,' &c.
G. B. and U. S. Treaties: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8694 (v).
*See* 'Anglo-American.'
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Griffith Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1508 (i).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Buildings: in Com. of Sup.,7289 (iv).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. A. F. Maclaren) 184 (i).
Gunn, Mr. B. B., Decease of: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 431 (i).
Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3844 (ii).
Hackett Dock, Purhase of at Amherstburg: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7730 (iv).
Halifax Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 7144 (iv).
—— Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7211 (iv).
Halifax Dominion Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (iv).
Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10015 (v).
—— Disbandment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
—— Discontent *re* Delay of Pay: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
—— Occupation by Imp. Troops: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
—— Retraction of Remarks of Minister of Finance: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5784 (iii).
*See* 'Esquimault.'
Halifax Immigration Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7142-3 (iv).
Halifax Immigration Frauds. Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8605 (v).
—— Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
*See* 'Immigration.'
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
—— Military Buildings (Wellington Barracks): in Com. of Sup., 7143 (iv).
Halifax Platform *re* Conservative Speeches, ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 47; (Mr. Foster) 66 (i).
Halifax Quarantine Station, Lawlor's Island: in Com. of Sup., 7171 (iv).
Halifax, Signal Dues at: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Halifax Southwestern Ry. (Tusket Wedge) Subsidy: in Com. of Res., 13296 (vii).
Halliday Bros., Supplies to Lighthouses, Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6236 (iv).
Hall's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Hamilton Bank, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Hamilton, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7692 (iv).
—— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7696 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Hamilton Radial Electric B. 25: in Com., *re* Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).
Haney, M. J., Claims *re* P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12762 (vii).
'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 9128 (v).
*See* 'Debates,' &c.
Harbottle, N. F., Employmt. in Excise Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7730 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11693, 12031 (vi).
—— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii).
—— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— N. B., Members' Remarks checked: (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 11290 (vi).
—— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— P. E. I., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
—— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
*See* 'Public Works.'
Harlaka Junction Ry. Connection: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
*See* 'I. C. R.,' &c.
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).

Hawkeye, Mr., Emplymt. as Returning Officer: Remarks (Mr. Avery) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* Municipal Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3430 (ii)

——Political Interference, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Haycock, Mr. J. L., Interference in Elections: Remarks (Mr U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5791 (iii).

Hay and Straw Embargo by G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4765 (iii).

Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7210 (iv).

—— Purchase of Cement from A. E. Wallberg, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).

Higgin's Shore Pier Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 694 (i).

High Commissioner's Office, Increase in Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 10737 (vi).

Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I. Ry., Claims of M. J. Haney, Arbitration, &c.: Remarks (Mr J. D. Reid) 1739 (i).

—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Barker) 3042, 3690 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Construction, Land Purchases, &c., Reps., &s.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2170 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 6160 (iii).

—— Total Expenditure *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).

Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii)

—— Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Hindus Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) 5337 (iii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests against Treatment: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Foster) 5489 (iii).

—— Tel. *re* Contract Labour: Remarks (Mr Foster) 4407 (iii).

*See* 'Immigration.'

Hintz, Fred., Location of Homestead: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6238 (iv).

*See* 'Homesteads,' &c.

Hodgins, Major: *See* 'G.T.P.'

Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 9280 (v).

—— Compensation paid, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13085 (vii).

Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. P. D. McLean) 2081 (ii).

Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2980 (ii).

—— Divisional Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).

—— Name of Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3037 (ii).

Holliday, Mr. P., Payments of Additional Living Allowance: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 2161 (ii)

Homestead Application of Mr. John Haddock: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. on B. 181, 11197 (vi).

Homestead Cancellations: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 10090 (v)

Homestead Entries, Declarations, &c., by Mr. R. Cruickshanks: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 698 (i).

Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6920 (iv).

Homestead Entries granted for Quarter 10-17-17, W. of 4th Meridian: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9773 (v).

Homesteaders for Sections 15, 16 and 27, &c., Issue of Patents: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7503 (iv).

Homestead Entry for s.e. ¼ Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2167 (ii).

Homesteading on Section 18, Extensions *re* Time Allowance: Quese. (Mr. Ames) 8381 (v).

Homestead Entries in Section 27, Cor., Tels., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).

—— n.e. ¼ Sec. 28, Permission *re* Grants: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1941 (i).

—— N.W. Quarter Section 35, History of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4762 (iii).

—— Records of Payments of Sale by Peter Luenson to F. Heintz, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Porter) 1294 (i).

*See* 'Hintz.'

Homestead Entry by Mr. Tanguay: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Homestead Entries: *See* 'Land Patents.'

Homestead Patents, Settlement Conditions: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10095 (v).

—— Sale of in Township 13, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7206 (iv).

Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8177 (iv).

Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).

Horses and Cattle, Imports to U.S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii).

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Applications, &c., *re* Coal Mining Lands: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 698 (i)

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Sales of Lands to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 364, 568 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 3319 (ii).
House of Commons Act (election writ) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Estimates: in Com of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Colchester Electoral District, Ceretificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 680 (i).
Committees sitting concurrently with Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9579 (v).
Debates of the House, Statement *re* Speakers (Mr. Kennedy) 13537 (vii).
Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Electoral Districts, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
——— Ottawa and Labelle, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, Nationalities, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5479 (iii).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members in New Wing: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 10490 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
——— Additional Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1486 (i).
——— Civil Service Bill, and Employees of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13528 (vii).
——— Clerks, Changes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Owen) 4247 (iii).
——— Employees, Recommendations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 3899 (ii).
——— Increase of Salaries: in Com. of Sup 13562 (vii).
——— Delays in Mails: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 11939 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 570 (i)
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
——— Delay, &c.: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 12044 (vi).
——— Salary Increases to Sessional Clerks: in Sup., Conc., 13578 (vii).
——— Ventilation and Cooling: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10978, 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
House of Commons and Senate, Cost, &c., Outside of Indemnities: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4760 (iii).
Huron Electoral Division, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
———Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2541 (ii).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Internal Economy Commission, Minutes: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2795 (ii).
Legislation, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10507 (vi).
Library of Parlt. Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
——— Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
——— Montreal Directory: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 4764 (iii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds: Read (Mr. Bole) 7942 (iv).
Members, New, Certificates: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emolument, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 555 (i).
Montmagny Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9263 (v).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1283
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, Bourinot quoted, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii)
——— Appeal to Speaker from Chairman's Ruling (Mr. Taylor) Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 609 (i).
Peace Union, Parliamentary, Meeting at Ottawa: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13581 (vii).
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
Private Bills Com., Extension of Time: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 891 (i).
Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10122 (v).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13580 (vii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings and Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1439 (i).
——— Meetings of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings concurrently with Sittings of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9504 (v).
——— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1383 (i), 4495 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Joint Meeting of Members and Senators: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 6061 (iii).
Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate: M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).
——— 1st Rep.: Presented (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 13510 (vii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Returning Officers, Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Telford) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).
Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to complete, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 4242 (iii).
Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 6983 (iv).
Rules of the House, Amendments to: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2984 (ii).
Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. A. Wright) 584 (i).
Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11501 (vi).
Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
——— Days of Sitting, Cost for 1895 and 1906-7, of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114 (i).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
South Huron, By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).
Speaker's Expenses, Comparison, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
——— Pianos rented, &c., for Speakers' Rooms: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 563 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
——— Reply (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1584 (i).
Stanstead By-Election Papers, Destruction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8087 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8887 (v).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Spaker) 569 (i).
Voters' Lists, Manitoba: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 10793 (vi).
——— Manitoba Polling Divisions by Judges: Remarks (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13139 (vii).
——— Provincial: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks (Mr. Burrows) 13066 (vii).
Watson, Mr., K.C., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6848 (iv).
Wednesday Evening Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).
York Electoral District: Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1018 (i).
Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 11702 (vi).
Hudson Bay Co., Original Land Register of Lord Selkirk's Estate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4403 (iii).
Hudson Bay Patrol System: in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction: M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5789 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Financial Review, 13467 (vii).
——— Surveys, Locations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
*See* 'Railways.'
Hudson, Que., Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11703 (vi).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11704 (vi).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8582 (v).
Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1292 (i), 3236 (ii).
Hunter, J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Hunting, Killing of Persons, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
'Hurona-Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 358 (i).
Huron Electoral Division, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
——— Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2541 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1128 (i).
——— River St. Lawrence and Gulf: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 166 (i).
Ice-breakers for Govt. Service: in Com. of Sup., 2941, 2949 (ii).
Ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
——— Progress *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1734 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).
*See* 'Marine,' &c.
Immigration: *See* 'Chinese,' &c.
Immigration Act (concealed weapons) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Immigration Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
IMMIGRATION:
Agents in G. B. and France: in Com. of Sup., 9840 (v).
——— Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2169 (ii).
——— Reps. received from, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 557 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Agents, Special, Salaries, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 2398 (ii).

Agents in East Elgin, Number employed: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 692 (i).

—— Italy, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 4584 (iii)

—— Kent County, Ont., on M. for Sup. (Mr. Clements) 3172 (ii).

—— payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).

Agents appointed in Ontario, Names, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1129 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3041 (ii).

Agents, Names, Addresses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 180 (i).

—— Names of those paid Commissions to in Europe, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 3844 (ii).

Agents in N.B., Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 843 (i).

Agents, Special Prizes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3484 (ii).

Agents in U.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).

Asiatic Immigration into B.C.: *See* 'Japanese.'

Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).

Bonuses, Abolition of: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6663, 6945, 6989 (iv).

—— Notice of Motion (Mr. Monk) 4769 (iii), 6288 (iv).

Bonuses, Abolition of: on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i), 3300 (ii).

—— Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) *re* Discussion of former Speech, 1298; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1299 (i).

—— Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1287 (i).

—— Increase to Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3429 (ii).

Bonuses, Par. in 'Canadian Gazette': Remarks (Mr. Robitaille) 7453 (iv).

B.C., Immigration, O.C. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 9890 (v).

British Subjects, Regulations *re*, Deportations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).

Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).

Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).

Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i)

Chinese Immigration, Decision of N.S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 513 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Colonization Societies, Quebec, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).

Detention Hospitals, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5081 (iii).

Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 5655 (iii).

*See* 'Halifax.'

Doukhobours bonused as Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).

—— Homesteads cancelled, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).

—— Ques. of Priv. *re* (Mr. S. Hughes) 7321 (iv).

—— Religious Fanatics: Par. in Press (Mr. J. D. Reid) 12161 (vii).

Doyle, Mr. P., Immigration Agent, Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 6923 (iv).

Dunne, M. C., Agent, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington County: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).

Expenditure from March, 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 5080 (iii).

Expenditure *re* Maintenance of Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5084 (iii).

French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).

French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).

Gimli Galicians, Relief to (Mr. Oliver) Rep. of Mr. Walker read: in Com. of Sup., 9979 (v).

Halifax Immigration Frauds, Par in Press: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4834 (iii).

—— Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).

—— Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8605 (v).

—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5567 (iii).

—— Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6465 (iv).

—— Rep. of Mr. Robertson: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9127 (v).

—— Restitution *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) 5659 (iii).

—— Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) 4963 (iii).

Halifax Immigration Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7142-3 (iv).

Hindus in B.C., Protests against Treatment: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr Foster) 5488 (iii).

—— Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) 5337 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Hindus, Tel. *re* Contract Labour: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4407 (iii).

Immigrants, Amounts paid for Maintenance, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 5476 (iii).

——— Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto: Tel. read (Mr. Macdonell) 185 (i).

Immigrants at Chatham, Deportation of Five Families: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 6922 (iv).

——— Names and Causes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5796 (iii).

Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5080 (iii).

——— Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 177 (i).

Immigrants Destitute, Stranded in Toronto: Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Macdonell) 242 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 429 (i).

Immigrants distributed in West Kent, Certificates of Farmers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1513 (i).

Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii).

Immigrant Inspection on Ships, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1289 (i).

Immigrants landed in Canada June, 1907, Number deported, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3339 (ii).

Immigrants, Number entering Canada, Bonuses paid on, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5256 (iii).

——— Number settled in Canada in 1905-6-7, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).

——— Reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6921 (iv).

——— Stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 567 (i).

——— Total Number entering Canada for ten Months, Deportations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 240 (i).

Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re*: Ques (Mr. Lennox) 7500 (iv).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 8171, 8607, 8696 (v).

Immigration Act, B.C., Natal Act, Disallowance of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 567 (i).

Immigration, Circular issued to Immigrants *re* Fraudulent Powers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 606 (i).

——— Co-operation with N.B. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).

——— Deportations: in Com. of Sup., 9882 (v).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Immigration from England, Statements of Mr. O. Smith, &c.: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Sproule) 5491 (iii).

Immigration Forms, Number returned by Farmers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3847 (ii).

Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Clerical and Lay Agents: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).

Immigration, General Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).

Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6402 (iv).

Immigration and Commercial Agencies Rets.: Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 1108 (i).

Immigration Literature: in Com. of Sup., 9948 (v).

——— Contingencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9948 (v).

Immigration, O.Cs. and Circulars issued *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 2171 (ii).

——— Regulations, O.C. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).

Immigration from U.S., Total Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii).

Japanese Immigration: *See* main heading.

La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet. *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr Monk) 4244 (iii).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4773 (iii).

London Immigration, Central Board, Moneys paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2545 (ii).

McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 8617 (v).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Alcorn) 4773 (iii).

Miller, Agent, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).

Oriental Immigration, B.C., Legal Expenses *re* Commission: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).

Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5468 (iii).

Quebec Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).

——— Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).

Relief to Settlers: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 9983 (v).

Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7094 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).

——— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2390 (ii).

Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Terms of Settlement, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 4774 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number cared for: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 892 (i).
U. S. Labourers: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
U.S., Total Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii)
Victoria Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 10874 (vi).
Waugh, James S., Distribution of Immigrants, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gordon) 1690 (i).
——— Refund to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4765 (iii).
Waugh and Perrin, Agents, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Winnipeg Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
Imperial Conference, 1907, Expenditure by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 511 (i).
——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1513 (i).
*See* 'Colonial.'
Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 10623 (vi).
Imperial Pulp Co., Denial *re* Managing Directorship: Par. in Montreal 'Star': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sifton) 3578 (ii).
Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 1939 (i)
Imports and Exports ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 350 (i).
——— Values from June to Dec., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
Imports from France, Value for Five Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1124 (i).
Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13063 (vii).
Independence of Parlt. Act, Violation of *re* R. Stewart, M.P. for Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).
Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 11232 (vi).
Indiantown and Blackville Branch Ry., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
INDIANS:
Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).
Clearwater Lake, Halfbreeds' Rights: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 10916 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
Destitute Indians, Relief, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Dokis Indian Land Sale, Commission to Mr. P. Ryan: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).
Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent from Chief, *re* Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8175 (iv).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Dokis Indian Reserve, Name of Govt. Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5084 (iii).
——— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 7500 (iv).
——— Protests *re* Sale: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10918 (vi).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
Dokis Indians, Surrender of Timber, O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5087 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3849 (ii).
——— Sale of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).
Indian Affairs: in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
——— Extravagant Management of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Armstrong) 11022 (vi).
——— Generally, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Lands in Algoma, Sale of, 13095; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13122; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 101) 13138 (vii).
——— Tel. from Mr. Sifton read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13416 (vii).
——— Ques. of Priv. *re* Mr. Sifton's Telegram, 13528 (vii).
Lands in Algoma, Withdrawal from Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2396 (ii).
Lands in B.C., Provincial Rights: Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) in Com. of Sup., 627 (i).
Lands and Islands owned by Indians, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5078 (iii).
Lands at New Westminster, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3037, 3839 (ii).
Land Sales in N.W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
Lands, Number of Acres sold since 1896, Total Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4586 (iii).
Land Sales: in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
Man. and Sask. Indians, Investigation of Mrs. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. Wright) 6919 (iv)
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinions of Justice Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2381 (ii).
Muskoday Reserves, Negotiations *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5082 (iii).
N. B., Agents Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 13170 (vii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12736 (vii).
——— School Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 13170 (vii).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).
Piegan Indian Reserve, Shipping and Weighing of Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8610 (v).
St. Mary's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
St. Peter's Reserve Title, Extinguishment of, Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1932 (i).
—— Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2217 (ii).
—— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 7990 (iv).
Schools. Dr. Bryce's Report: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
Sioux Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Six Nation Indians. Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 6242 (iv).
—— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6239 (iv).
Swan Lake Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 693 (i).
—— Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
—— Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Yeomans, Agent. Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Knowles) 1513 (i).
Ingonish Lightkeeper, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8618 (v).
Inland Revenue Act (excise duties, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'

INLAND REVENUE:
Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Excise, Provisional Allowance to Inland Revenue Officers: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Inland Revenue Act, Violations: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4964 (iii).
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 6 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 645 (i).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Port Hope Inland Revenue Office, Apptmts. of Collector: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 895 (i).
Seizures, 1906-7, in Cornwall, Toronto, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 3846 (ii).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 3851 (ii).
—— Seizures in Cornwall, &c., Names of Officers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 4247 (iii).
Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1903: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Tobacco Manufacturers in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 363 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers in P.E.I., Violation of Inland Revenue Act: Cor. read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9514 (v).
Tobacco. Protection to Canadian Industry, Pets., &c., *re* Amt. to Inland Revenue Act: M. for Copies (Mr. Dubeau) 899 (i).
Tobacco Seizures, at Charlottetown, Penalties, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2982 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
—— (dairy products, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
—— (grain) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
—— (oat standards) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Inspection of Staples: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
Inspection of Steamboats: *See* 'Canada Shipping Bills.'
Inspectors of Food Products, Number, Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
Institute of Architects of Can.: See 'B. No. 88.'
*See* 'Architects.'
Insurance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*: Personal Explanation *re* Par. in Montreal 'Star' (Mr. Foster) 1860 (i).
—— Introduction of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9272 (v).
—— Discussion *re* (Mr. Foster) 1107 (i).
—— Introduction of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7099 (iv), 8386 (v).
Insurance Commission, Exhibits of Commercial Travellers' Mutual Benefit Society, Originals asked for (Mr. Macdonell) 7988 (iv).
—— Evidence, Sale of for Private Profit: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 6059 (iii).
—— and Political Campaign Literature: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 10792 (vi).
—— Rep.: Ques. of Priv. *re* Stmnt. of Sir Frederick Borden, 9337; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 9352, 9461 (v).
—— Total Expenditure, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 241 (i).
Insurance, Supt. of: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).

Insurance, Supt.'s Salary: *See* 'B. No. 200.'
Intercolonial Conference in London, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 13225 (vii).
—— Expenses of Ministers: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 13511 (vii).
*See* 'Colonial.'
I.C.R. Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
Accidents, Letter *re*: Read (Mr. S. Hughes) 6985 (iv).
Advertising for Supplies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 10186 (v).
Amherst Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Amqui Station, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10012 (v).
—— Vote *re* Construction, Amount Expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12774 (vii).
Answer to Questions: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 13415 (vii).
Antigonish Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Audit System: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 10214 (v).
Book-Keeping System, Correction of Par. in St. John 'Daily Telegraph': (Mr. Graham) 5260 (iii).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Campbellton Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
Cars sent to U.S., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).
Cars in Service on Sundays: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
Chatham, N.B., Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12757 (vii).
Circular *re* Delay in Payment of Salaries: Read (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10126 (v).
—— Par. in St. John Press: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Fowler) 10016 (v).
Claims Agent, E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3480 (ii).
Claims for Damages by A. W. Belyea: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9472 (v).
Claims for Damages to Property or Personal Injury, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 6002 (iii).
Claims for Damages, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).
Claims Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 10176 (v).
Cold Storage Cars for Dairy Produce, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1688 (i).
Collection of Revenues: in Com. of Sup., 5693 (iii).



INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Compensation *re* Horses killed at Truro: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
Concrete Pipes, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6640 (iv).
Dartmouth Branch Line Ry., Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Delays to 'Maritime Express': Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8614 (v).
Deterioration of Service: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 10147 (v).
Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 12236, 12250 (vii).
Earnings and Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13510 (vii).
Employees, Apptmts. in N.B. during Jan. and Feb., 1908, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5793 (iii).
—— Circular from Genl. Mgr. *re* Municipal Politics: Read (Mr. Sproule) 2304 (ii).
—— Circular *re* Municipal Elections: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2884; on M. for Sup., 2890 (ii).
—— Employees and Municipal Elections: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2309 (ii).
—— Increased Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2981 (ii).
—— Provident Fund Act, Names on List: ues. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4582 (iii).
—— and Quebec Provincial Elections: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9777 (v).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10126 (v).
Extension to Great Lakes, Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2435 (ii).
Extension Policy, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 73 (i).
Fredericton Ry. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12758 (vii).
Freight Rate Discrimination against Fredericton, N.B., Cor., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Crocket) 2558 (ii).
Gross Earnings for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Halifax Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
—— Civic Elections in Halifax, Interference of Employees: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6845 (iv).
Halifax to Sydney Division, Transfer: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12773 (vii).
Hanlon's Crossing Accident, Investigation *re*: M. for Paper* (Mr. Sinclair) 5800 (iii).
Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3233 (ii).
Harlaka Junction Ry. Connections: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 434, 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
*See* 'Que. Central.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Ice Supply Contract: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5259 (iii), 7446 (iv).
Increased Accommodations: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry., Change of Name, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6243 (iv).
Lac Saumon Station, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12652 (vii).
Legal Costs to Mr. MacIlreith: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 5553 (iii).
Legal Services: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 10190 (v).
Locomotives: in Com. of Sup., 10149 (v).
Locomotive and Car Shops, Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Moncton, Additional Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 12760 (vii).
Moncton Car Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1509 (i).
——— Car and Locomotive Shops: in Com. of Sup., 12250 (vii).
——— Lease, &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. E. A. Wallberg: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8892 (v).
——— Tenders *re* Leasing: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5800 (iii).
Motor Cars, Tests *re* Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 565 (i).
Mulgrave Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
N.B. Elections and I.C.R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3317 (ii).
Newcastle Station, Inspector of Works: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13511 (vii).
New Glasgow Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
North Sydney Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Notices printed in French and English: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7936 (iv).
Number of Men employed in N.B., for Jan., Feb., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Daniel) 6241 (iv).
'Ocean Limited,' Date of Beginning and Ending of Running, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 6054 (iii).
Officials, A. T. LeBlanc, &c., Accounts, Vouchers, &c., for Travelling Expenses, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 2982 (ii).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Issue of Pass: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Oxford and Pictou Branch, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10733 (vii).
Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 10157 (v).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Passes issued to Mr. P. S. Archibald: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2387 (ii).
Petit Rocher Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
Pictou Branch, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 12661 (vii).
Pictou to Copper Crown Co., Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10733 (vi).
Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1683 (i).
——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii).
——— Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10789 (vi).
Piping: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10195 (v).
Private Car for Mr. Schreiber, Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10186 (v).
Quebec Central Ry. Connections: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 189 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Rails, &c., Number of Tons of: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 9269 (v).
Railway Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 5046 (iii).
Rates, Increase in Winter to P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5995 (iii).
Receipts and Expenditures: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 10514 (vi).
Revenue from Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5471 (iii).
Ricard, Mr., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
Riviere du Loup Station, Improvement *re* Platforms: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5468 (iii).
——— Station Master, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 7445 (iv).
Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 5549 (iii), 12257 (vii).
——— Purchase, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
——— Statement *re* Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Graham) 5697 (iii).
Running of Official Cars on Limited Trains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5474 (iii).
St. Cyrille Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12756 (vii).
St. John Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).
Springhill, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Station, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5466 (iii).
Stationery Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10181 (v).
Stellarton Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10734 (vi).
Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9712 (v).
——— Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).
Sunday Cars, Instructions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 10734 (vi).
Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 10188 (v).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation: in Com., of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7201 (iv).
Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
——— Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).
Tatamagouche, Delay of Trains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1292 (i).
Ties delivered, Changes *re* Inspection: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12052 (vii).
Trains breaking down, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
——— Explanations *re* Delays, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6242 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10159 (v).
Transportation Question, Statement, on M. for Sup., 4420 (iii).
Trois Pistoles Station, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 12652 (vii).
Truro, Buildings, Name of Tenderers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6233 (iv).
——— Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1936 (i).
——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12231 (vii).
——— Sewerage Frontage: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5800 (iii).
——— Station, Unsanitary Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7211 (iv).
William, Thos., Emplymt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2388 (iii).

INTERIOR:
Clearwater Lake, Squatters' Rights to Lands: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Cypress Hill Homestead Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Interior, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
——— Deptl, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 616 (i), 9693 (v).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads: Letter from Mr. Seaman read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9992 (v).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion *re* Interior Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Rocky Mountain Park: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 8185 (iv).
Squatters' Claims in Alberta: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Swamp Lands in Man.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
*See* 'Immigration,' 'Indians,' &c.
Internal Economy Board of H. of C., Minutes: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2795 (ii).
——— Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
International Boundary Line: Representations *re* Buildings on: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 356 (i).
——— Correction of Answer (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 519 (i).
International Commission, Red River of the North: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stocks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4246 (iii).
International Tunnel, Windsor, Customs Duty *re* Construction Material: Ques. (Mr. McLaren) 3840 (ii).
*See* 'Detroit.'
Interprovincial Bridge Co., N.B., Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).
Interprovl. Ry. Bridge Co. of N.B.: *See* 'B. No. 76.'
Inverness County, Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. McLennan) 12233 (vii).
Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5792 (iii).
Inverness Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5997 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 4244 (iii).

Irrigation Act: *See* 'B. No. 10, 99.'
Irrigation in West, Investigation *re* Measurements: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 9989 (v).
Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5079 (iii).
Japanese Colony in the West, Application from C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 7196 (iv).
Japanese entering B.C., Passports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 4243 (iii).
Japanese Immigration Act, Disallowance of *re* B.C.: Ques. Mr. R. Smith) 6642 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
Japanese Immigration and Natal Act, Cor. with Lt.-Gov. of B.C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 2170 (ii).
*See* 'Dunsmuir.'
Japanese Immigration, Cor. *re* Limitations, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 94 (i).
—— Debate in Japanese Diet, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4737 (iii).
—— from U.S., Deportations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3900 (ii).
—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 947 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B.C., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 692 (i).
—— O.Cs., Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 854 (i).
—— Restriction of: Prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 699; (Mr. Macpherson) 719; (Mr. Sloan) 726; (Mr. D. Ross) 732; (Mr. Kennedy) 748 (i).
—— M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 854 (i).
—— Parliamentary Control of (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2025; Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2043; Neg. (Y. 45: N. 100) 2158 (ii).
Japanese in B.C., Ques. of Priv. and Political Pamphlets: (Mr. Lemieux) 12659 (vii).
Japanese Immigration, Recent Eentries into B.C.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3751 (ii).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 32; (Mr. Foster) 77; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 58 (i).
—— Rep. of Mr. King laid on Table (Mr. Lemieux) 1550 (i).
—— Restriction, B.C. Legislation: on M. for Sup. (Mr. D. Ross) 1744 (i).
—— Result of Mission: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 1585 (i).
—— Riots, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (iii).
—— Statement of Postmaster General: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208, 1424 (i).
—— Syndicate *re* Purchasing of Land in Alberta, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897 (i).
Japanese Treaty, Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1928 (i).
*See* 'Anglo-Japanese,'
Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6980 (iv).
Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5201 (iii).
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Joly, Sir Henry, Lt.-Gov. of B.C., Cor., &c., sent to by Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Judges' Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Judges' Salaries, Application *re* Payments: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmt. on Commissions: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
Juniper Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
JUSTICE:
Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3233 (ii).
Ancoin vs. The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McLennan) 558 (i).
Appeal Court, B.C., Salaries, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Aylesworth) 8185 (iv).
Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Ward) 3466 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ward) 5211 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).
Chinese and Japanese Riots, B.C., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13155 (vii).
Cimon, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Residence in District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2218 (ii).
—— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2545 (ii).
Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 238 (i).
Drysdale, Hon. Justice, Date of Acceptance of Office: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4768 (iii).
—— Date of Communication *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5084 (iii).
—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Taylor) 5086 (iii).
Essex County Junior Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1939 (i).
Exchequer Court, Printing Reports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5508 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
Exchequer Court, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
Forbes, Mr. Justice, Professional Status, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2390, 3840 (ii).
—— Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Taylor) for Copies*, 899 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1860
Fraser, Mr. A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3478 (ii).
—— Payments to for Legal Services: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2979 (ii).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 510 (i).
Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. P. D. McLean) 2981 (ii).
Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmt. on Commissions: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
*See* 'Quebec.'
Judges Salaries, Applications *re* Payments: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Justice, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Bureau) 185 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii), 10396 (vi).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4768 (iii).
—— P.E.I., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4764 (iii).
MacIlreith, Mr. R. T., Payments to for Legal Services, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 695 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Delay in delivering Judgments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2594 (ii).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of, O.C. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Lanctot) 557 (i).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2822 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 9579 (v).
—— Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 13081 (vii).
Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 12265 (vii).
—— B.C., Land Purchases: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
—— Generally, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
Quebec Judges, Apptmt. to Superior Court: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 11825 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).
—— Apptmt. of Additional Judge: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
St. Louis, Mr. H., Emplymt. by Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
—— Holidays for Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 2791 (ii).
—— Meat Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Léonard) in Com. of Sup., 5519 (iii).
—— Officers and Municipal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 2791 (ii).
—— Warden Beauchamp, Interference in Elections, Charges *re* (Mr. Léonard) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).
Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12413 (vii).
Supreme Court Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents: *See* B. No. 190.'
Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 39.'
Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3036 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3850 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5491 (iii), 6464 (iv).
Keewatin, Synod of the Diocese of: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Lands, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13587 (vii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Ref. to in debate on Budget (Sir Frederick Borden) 5290 (iii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iv).
'King Edward' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13063 (vii).
Kingston, Artillery Park: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).
Kingston, Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 7700 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
—— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
—— withdrawal of vote: in Com. of Sup., 7814 (iv).
—— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
*See* 'Militia,' &c.
Knowlton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Koenig, Capt., Duties, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 11699 (vi).

Kun, Agnes Ballum, Exercise of Clemency by Justice Dept.: Res. of Town Council Sydney: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9580, 9710 (v).
Labour, Deptl. Rep: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 841 (i).
——— (Japanese Investigation) Rep.: Presented (Mr. Lemieux) 1583 (i).
———Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12159 (vii).
Labour Disputes Bill, Applications, &c., *re* Settlement: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 605 (i).
'Labour Gazette,' Cost of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
'Labour Gazette': in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
Labour, Hours on Public Works: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Labour Organization *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8289 (v).
Labour, Unemployed, Protection to: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10735 (vi).
Lacas, Mr., Payments to, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 979 (i).
——— Statement (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Lachine Canal, Basin Walls: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Compensation to Richards *re* Horse: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Lock Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5672 (iii).
——— Slope Walls, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5696 (iii).
Lachine Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).
Lachute, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii).
La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5082 (iii).
Lacoste, Sir Alexandre, Amount of Pension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 1934 (i).
Lac Saumon Station, I.C.R., Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12652 (vii).
'Lady Evelyn,' Date and Place of Wintering, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7936 (iv).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Purchase by Govt., Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3434 (ii).
——— Crew during Winter: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6403 (iv).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8176 (iv).
Lafferty, Thos., Payment *re* Removal of Snag in St. John River: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8379 (v).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privilege *re*: Ques. (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6058 (iii).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Lake Aylmer Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Lakefield Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Lake François Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11299 (vi).
Lake St. Francis Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Peter, Piers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4752 (iii).
Lakeville Harbour Opening: Conc., 13568 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* at R.M.C., on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
Lands applied for by Mr. Aylwin, under Irrigation Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7209 (iv).
Lands, Dom.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred. Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3235 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N.W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1st, 1896: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13512 (vii).
——— Selection and Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4766 (iii).
Lands in Sections 2, 10, 14, 22 and 24, Disposal of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5083 (iii).
Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3234 (ii).
Land Patents, Entry of Dates, Applications, Inspections, &c., of Quarter Section 16, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3432 (ii).
Land Patent for E. ½ S. E. ¼ Section 2, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 2169 (ii).
——— S. E. ¼ Sec. 2, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 2171 (ii).
Land Patents, Section 8, Twp. 53, &c., Occupation of Present Owner, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3430 (ii).
——— Sections 10 and 17, Applicants *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9475 (v).
——— Sections 36, &c., Issue of: Ques (Mr. Lake) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N.W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii)
Land Sales in N.W., Purchasers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3835 (ii)
Lands set Apart for Settlement since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule), 2796 (ii).
Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-6: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8613 (v).
*See* 'Railways,' &c.
Lands, Surveys of: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Land Titles Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 113 and 168.'
Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2393 (ii).
Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
*See* 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr. Monk), 4244 (iii).
——— Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4773 (iii).
Lavaltrie, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lead Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Lead Production by Lead Producers, Stmnt. *re* Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11407, 11705 (vi).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Leech, Mr. R. A. E., Apptmt. of: Notice of Motion (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3477 (ii).
Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes), 10014 (v).
——— Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6644 (iv).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provinces, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sandfield) 4768 (iii).
——— P.E.I., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4764 (iii).
Legislation, House of Commons, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10507 (vi).
Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
Leonardsville Wharf, Contract *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
——— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
'Le Soleil,' Par. *re* Voting of French Members: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bergeron) 7992 (iv).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7993 (iv).
Lesser Slave Lake Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Lethbridge Armoury: in Com. of Sup, 13336 (vii).
Letter Carriers, Boots, Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).
——— Hours of Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7728 (iv).
Level Ry. Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Levis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Levis Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Lewis, N.W.M. Policeman, Murder of, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Herron) 8867 (v).
Liability of Ry. Employees: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Libel Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
——— Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Life-Boats in B. C., Purchase of from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Life-Saving Stations and Awards: in Com. of Sup., 2972 (ii).
Life-Saving Stations, Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).
Lighthouses, Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9476 (v).
*See* 'Canals—Rideau.'
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039, 5773 (iii), 12262, 13323 (vii).
Lighthouse-Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3837 (ii).
Lighthouses in Quebec, Classifications, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 172 (i).
——— Rep. of Inspectors, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gauvreau) 697 (i).
Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Steamers chartered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11299 (vi).
Light-Keepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Lightship Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lime Kiln Crossing, Charter of Capt. Hackett's Tug, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7729 (iv).
Lime Kiln Crossing Lightship: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vii).
Lindsay Armoury: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
*See* 'Militia.'
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).

Literature, &c., distributed through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).
Literary Aid Fund, Establishment of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1286 (i).
Lithographing and Printing, Expenditure by Govt. outside of Canada: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1506 (i).
Little Current Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin), 2397 (ii).
Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 12894 (vii).
Live Stock, N.B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot), 1506 (i)
Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 9475 (v).
Loan og 1874, Commission for Renewal: Ques. (Mr. Foster), 11501 (vi).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where Discounted: Ques. .Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
Loans to Govt. Outstanding, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235 (i).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, &c.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster), 13582 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafs: *See* 'Dom. Loans,' 'Finance.'
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans, Temporary, by Govt., Names of Lenders, Rates of Interest, &c.: M. for Ret.* Mr. Monk) 554 (i).
——— Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 314 (i).
——— since Oct., 1906, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 314 (i).
Lobster Fish Factory, License to E. H. McLennan, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2983 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey), 10256 (v).
Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler). 9472 (v).
——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin), 4404 (iii).
Lobster Fishing in Lunenburg &c., Complaints *re* Undersized, &c.: (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2792 (ii).
——— Overseers, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2793 (ii).
Lobster Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 5475 (iii).
Lobster Fisheries, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N.S. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean), 6644 (iv).
Lobster Fishing at Pictou: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).
Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Issue of Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2388 (ii)
Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10257 (v).
Lockerby & McCombe, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 11935 (vi).
Locomotive and Car Shops, Moncton: in Com. fo Com of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Co.: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
London Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10294 (vi).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
*See* 'Militia.'
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
Longueuil Public Building: in Com of Sup., 7394 (iv).
Lord's Day Act, Violations at Ottawa *re* Horse Racing: Remarks (Mr. Elson) 3753 (ii).
'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7198 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Lotbinière Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4406 (iii).
Louisburg Harbour, N.S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7503 (iv).
——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3428 (ii).
Louisburg Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4401 (iii).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 230 (i).
Lower Newcastle Wharf on Miramichi River: in Com. of Sup., 11695 (vi).
Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2977 (ii).
Lumber Duties from U. S., on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9504 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10259 (v).
*See* 'Pulp.'
Lumber manufactured in N. W. Provs., Royalty Payable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3835 (ii).
Lunenburg Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G. T. P. Terminals at Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7991 (iv).
——— Storage of Refuse of Montreal Harbour Property: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 11936 (vi).

MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 12220 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 695 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Apptmt.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6985 (iv).
Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).
Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Macleod Post Office, Report *re* Accommodation: Remarks (Mr Herron) in Com of Sup, 9110 (v)
McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 8617 (v).
McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road, P. O.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 5087 (iii).
McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 688 (i).
McGee, Hon. T. D'Arcy, Monument *re*: Remarks (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6288 (iv).
McGregor's Creek, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
McGuire, Hon. Thos., Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10514 (vi).
McInnes, Hon. W. B., Emplymt. in the Yukon, Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5794 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. White) 6061 (iii).
McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent at Edmonton: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6981 (iv).
McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I., Post Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5087 (iii)
McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry: Ques (Mr. Lake) 6401 (iv).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229, 11292 (vi).
Madawaska River Extension Dyke: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Magdalen Islands Breakwater and Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Magee, Hon. Justice, Delay in delivering Judgments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2594 (ii).
Magnetawan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Magog Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Mails from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12653 (vii).
Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C. P. R. Accident: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9724 (v).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing, Inspection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
——— lost in C. P. R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re*: (Mr. Lake) 9281 (v).
——— Mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2214 (ii).
Mail Service to Atlantic Steamers, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
Mail Service in B. C., Improvements *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3754 (ii).
Mail Service beteen Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4828 (iii).
Mail Service, Irregularity of in Argenteuil County: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).
Mail Service in N. B. and N. S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 852 (i).
Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Steamer, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
Mail Subsidy to France: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5799 (iii).
Major's Hill Park and G. T. R. Hotel Site: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Major's Hill Park and G. T. R. Hotel: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 11015 (vi).
Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of Moneys belonging to Mr. Walter Dick: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Man., Additional Judges: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Man. Boundaries, Bill *re* Extension: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1741 (i).
——— Consent of Legislature, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 936 (i)
——— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2882 (ii), 11706 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6222, 7506 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Papers, Memorials, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Schaffner) 852 (i).
——— Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12776 (vii).
Manitoba Election Frauds, Investigation Com., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. J. Roche), 495 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1288 (i).

Man. Lands, Section 32, Town Site, Applications *re* Public Buildings: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1348 (i).
Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 26.'
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds: Read (Mr. Bole) 7942 (iv).
——— Polling Divisions by Judges: Remarks (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13139 (vii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 10793 (vi).
Manitoba Voters' Lists: *See* 'Dom. Elections Act.'
Manitoba and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 137.'
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).
——— Reps. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 893 (i).
Manning & Macdonald's Claims *re* Soulanges Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Maple Creek Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).
Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* Violations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6639 (iv).
Maps, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12260 (vii).
Marconi Co. and Commercial Press Business, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Interruptions *re* Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2161 (ii).
Marconi System: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
——— Regulation of Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 174 (i).
*See* 'Wireless.'
Marcoun, Mr., Commission *re* Settlement of Claims: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Marier, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Margaree Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).
MARINE:
Aids to Navigation, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5040 (iii).
——— Construction of Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
'Arctic' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904 to June, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 184 (i).
——— History of Cruise in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4830 (iii).
Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9473 (v). *See* 'Marine Signals.'
Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5467 (iii).
MARINE—*Con.*
Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6059 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Conditions of Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Marine Dept.: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).
——— Absence of Mr. Watson: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 10918 (vi).
——— Apptmnt. of Ass't Judge in Exchequer Court: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11311 (vi).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6845 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7322 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron as Counsel: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6926 (iv).
——— Counsel Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8837 (v).
——— Delay in Investigation, &c., C. S. Report, &c.: M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8445 (v).
——— Delay *re*, on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9725 (v).
——— Distribution of Evidence: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10789 (vi).
——— Evidence *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 11203 (vi).
——— remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8516 (v).
——— Evidence presented day by day to House: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8203 (v).
——— Evidence, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11301 (vi).
——— Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
——— Letter of Instructions to Mr. Watson laid on the Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 7621 (iv).
——— Method of Procedure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10741 (vi).
——— Officers under Suspension: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6846 (iv).
——— Mr. Perron's Duties: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 10743 (vi).
——— Postponment of by Judge Cassels: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).
——— Proceedings in Public, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7321 (iv).
——— Rep. of Judge Cassels: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10915 (vi).
*See* 'Mar. and Fish.,' &c.
'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6058 (iii).
Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, Buoys, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8383 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for Three Years: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
—— Captains' Residences, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3241 (ii).
—— and Ice-breakers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
—— Maintenance and Supplies (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).
—— Number of purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10731 (vi).
—— Pay of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10736 (vi).
—— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Gratuities *re* Accidents to Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7210 (iv).
Ingonish Light-keeper, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8618 (v).
Life-boats in B.C., Purchase of from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Lighthouse Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighthouses, Classification, &c., Rep. of Inspectors, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gauvreau) 697 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 12262, 13323 (vii).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755 (iii).
Lighthouse-keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Light-keepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Lighthouses, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3837 (ii).
Lighthouses in Quebec, Classifications, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 172 (i).
Lightship Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Louisburg Harbour, N. S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7503 (iv).
Louisburg Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4401 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, Reorganization: in Com. of Sup., 3988 (ii).
—— O.Cs., Cor. *re* Change of System: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 852 (i).
—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 510 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 4223 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4747 (iii).
—— Acting Deputy Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11939 (vi).
—— Defalcations of Mr. Roy: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10741 (vi).
—— Dep. Min., Ass't.: in Com. of Sup., 12915 (vii).
—— Dep. Minister, Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7938, 7995, 8088: Letter of Dep. Min. Read (Mr. Brodeur) 8088 (iv).
—— Deptl. Investigation by Minister: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6526 (iv).
—— remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6636 (iv).
—— Deptl., Misconduct of Official: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 6633 (iv).
—— Deptl. Officers under Suspension, Dates of Aptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6982 (iv).
—— Deptl. Officials, Suspension of: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6003 (iii).
—— Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8889 (v).
—— Purchase of Supplies for 1892-1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Johnston) 6241 (iv).
—— Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2883 (ii).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
—— contingencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
—— Steamers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13062 (vii).
Marine Signalling at Briar Island, Change of System: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9266 (v).
*See* 'Briar.'
Masters' and Mates' Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2969 (ii).
Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11701 (vi).
'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended *re* Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Foster) 1886 (i).
—— Collission with C.P.R. Str., Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8086 (iv).
—— Investigation re: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8171, 9715 (iv), 10121 (v).
—— Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8441 (v).
—— Services as Ice-breaker: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5202 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*
Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).
Red Ensign Flying from Merchant Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 12775 (vii).
St. Louis, Mr. H., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Shipping Statistics *re* Tons Registered: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2790 (ii).
Sorel Property for Marine Dept., Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4751 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Life-Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4586 (iii).
'Vigilant,' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 682 (i).
Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v).
Mar. Provs., Harbours and Rivers, Creosoted Timber: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Markey Fishing Leases, Copy of Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 11404 (vi).
Markham Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Maskinonge River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8441 (v).
Masters and Mates Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2969 (ii).
Masters' and Mates' Act Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on order for 2°: Remarks 583 (i). *See* 'B. No. 2.'
Matane Breakwater and Landing Pier: in Com of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Matane River Fishing, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).
Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton, Amt. expended: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 566 (i).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 7179 (iv).
Meaford Harbour: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Meat and Canned Foods Act Enforcement: in Com. of Sup., 12893 (vii).
——— Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
——— Inspectors, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 172 (i).
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Names and Number of Establishments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1505 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 1690 (i).
Meat Inspection Act and Packing Houses, Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 4589 (iii).
Meat Inspection Regulations, Speech of Mr. Fisher at Chatham: ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Clements) 196 (i).
Meat Inspection Act, Violations: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3042 (ii).
Medicine Hat Buildings, Contract *re* Heating System: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 10791 (vi).
Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).
Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Members appointed to Offices, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 46 (i).
Members introduced 3, 680 (i), 2542 (ii).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emoulment, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 555 (i).
Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. in Geodetic Survey, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1349 (i).
Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11701 (vi).
Mess. from His Ex., Franco-Canadian Treaty: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
——— (Suppl. Estimates, 1908): Read (Mr. Speaker) 12503 (vii).
*See* 'Estimates,' &c.
Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5650 (iii).
Metal Shingle and Siding Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Methyated Spirits, Supplies to Manufacturers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 820 (i).
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinions of Justice Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2381 (ii).
Michipicoten Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Middle River, Shear Dam Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).
Midland Dredging Co., Statement *re* Mr. McMullen: (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).
Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).
Midland and Tiffin, Dredging, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3428 (ii).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8181 (iv).
'Midland Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertisements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3235 (ii).

Midland Towing and Wrecking Co., Contract *re*, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
Milford, Haven, N.S. Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13060 (vii).
MILITIA :
Allowances, Arrears of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5662, 5732 (iii); 10286 (v).
Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tel., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. Chisholm) 1131 (i).
Armouries, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Arsenal, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7434 (iv); 12154 (vii).
Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
——— Negotiations for Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1509 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1737 (i).
Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4584 (iii).
——— Return *re*: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 5914 (iii), 6465 (iv).
Boot Contract, Attack *re*: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 10739 (vi)
Brampton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10891 (vi).
British Pensioners, Notice from Imp. Govt. of Deductions: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7501 (iv).
Camp in Eastern Townships, proposed Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3842 (ii).
Camps, Holding of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9779, 9835 (v).
Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Customs Dues: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii), 12155 (vii).
Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 177 (i)
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 556 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).
Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, &c., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1125 (i).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1117 (i).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Esquimalt Naval Station, Cor., &c. *re* Maintenance: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1128 (i).
——— Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Equipment, of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 *See* 'Naval.'
Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6646 (iv).
Fredericton Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Gananoque Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5792 (iii).
Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 353 (i).
Generals, Apptmts. of Names and Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5086 (iii).
Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 9712 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. MacLaren) 9779 (v).
Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10015 (v).
——— Disbandment of, &c: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
——— Discontent *re* Delay of Pay: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
——— Occupation by Imp. Troops: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
——— Retraction of Remarks of Min. of Fin.: Remarks (Mr .Taylor) 5784 (iii).
Halifax, Military Buildings (Wellington Barracks): in Com. of Sup., 7143 (iv).
Halifax Militia Supplies, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6405 (iv).
Hamilton Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7692 (iv).
Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 2161 (ii).
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Ref. to in debate on Budget (Sir Frederick Borden) 5290 (iii).
Kingston, Artillery Park: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).
——— Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 7700 (iv).
——— Military Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
——— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Ranges: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10014 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6644 (iv).
Lethbridge Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Lévis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Lindsay Armoury: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
——— Date of Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
London, Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
——— Pay and Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 12147 (vii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i), 8871 (v), 12147 (vii).
——— Supplies, Provisions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
Militia, Board of Officers, Rep. *re* Pay and Allowance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2165 (ii).
Militia Dept., and Civil Service Commissioner's Report; Stmnt. (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12505 (vii).
——— Quebec, Hours for Work of Masons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 10790 (vi).
——— Report: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 4494 (iii).
——— Threats *re* Officials: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13584 (vii).
Militia,—Memorandum of General Lake: M. to lay on Table (Sir Frederick Borden) 12770 (vii).
——— Pay, Arrears, &c., Reasons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8442 (v).
Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 352 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
Militia Schools, Garrisons, &c., Amounts paid for Provisions, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).
Milltown and St. Stephen's Drill Sheds: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 10897 (vi).
Minnedosa Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 7322 (iv)
Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Montreal Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Naval Defences, Contribution by Canada to Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Naval Instruction, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1119 (i).
Naval Schools, *re* Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 3222 (ii).
Naval Stations in Canada, Arrangements with G. B., *re* Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1117 (i).
——— List of Places: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
Niagara Camp., Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2163 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 9779 (v).
Niagara Falls, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Niagara Land Sale, 13540 (vii).
Oakville Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 10887 (vi).
Pembroke Armoury: Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 10901 (vi).
Permanent Corps, Commission *re* Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1292 (i).
Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops: Ques. (Mr. White) 5791 (iii).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Picton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres leased to Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1348 (i).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com of Sup., 13332 (vii).
——— Properties: in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).
——— Provisions and Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 12150 (vii).
Quebec, Citadel Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7431 (iv).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps: Letter read (Mr. Blain) 8694 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
——— Attendance of Veterans: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7448, 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).
——— Food Supply: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
——— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8851 (v).
——— Number of Troops to be sent, &c.: Rearks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Quebec Tercentenary, Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7992 (iv).
—— Rep. of Commission: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7449 (iv).
—— Transportation of Troops: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8377, 8384; City Corps, &c.: Remarks, 8386 (v).
Rankin, Col., Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 11405 (vi).
Rations, Cost per Day, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
Rifle and Artillery Association Grants: in Com. of Sup., 12152 (vii).
Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1123 (i).
Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5654
Rifle Ranges, Charlottetown,, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6233 (iv).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 11494 (vi).
—— Advances to Co. *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 4773 (iii).
—— Arsenal Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7991 (iv).
—— Bayonets purchased for, &c., Contracts, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
—— Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5786 (iii).
—— Bayonets, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6235, 8176 (iv).
—— Bayonets, Date of Contract, O. C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 8442 (v).
—— Bayonets, Provisions *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
—— Bonus, Loans, Services of the Govt., Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
—— Consignment to N. W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5259 (iii).
—— Contract Price, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8174 (iv).
—— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
—— Correction of Mr. S. Hughes' Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bergeron) 9126 (v).
—— Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* Defects: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5210 (iii).
—— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
—— Evidence before Pub. Accounts Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) 5914 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Ross Rifle, &c., Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4401 (iii).
—— Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3903 (ii).
—— Inefficiency and Extravagance of Militia Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M. for Sup., 8902-8953; Neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090
—— Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3898 (ii).
—— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 178 (i).
—— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
—— Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Accident at Rockliffe Ranges: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10515 (vi).
—— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7209 (iv).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Mr. Bergeron's Denial of Stmnt., 9126, 9330 (v).
—— Rep. of British War Office *re* Cor., Disappearance from Library of H. of C.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Fred. Borden) 4961 (iii).
—— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9713 (v).
—— Rep. from Military Associations, &c., *re* Efficiency: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
—— Reports from Public Accounts Com., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
—— Rifles delivered per Contract, Cost per Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8180 (iv).
—— Rifles, Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
—— Ross Rifle Contract: in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).
—— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
—— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 365 (i).
—— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
—— Target Practice, Suspensions by N.W. M. Police: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3847 (ii).
—— Tests in England, Reps., &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 8167 (iv).
—— Total Number in Use in Canada by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5786 (iii).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. John, Tenders *re* Supplie: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5788 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Royal Military College: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv), 10907 (vi), 12152, 13177 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* at R.M.C.; on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10890 (vi).
——— 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay still Due: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 844 (i).
St. John Fusiliers, 62nd Regiment, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 847 (i).
St. John, Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Military Stables: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
Sabourin, Maj., Cor. with Lt. Col. Malette and Dept.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
S. A. Veterans, Land Grants, to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 563 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Herron) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
——— Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c.: Ques. Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
——— Medals for 3rd Contingent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
Stoney Creek Battlefield Monument: in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Stores and Arms for Rural Battalions, Care of: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Lalor) 5736 (iii).
Stores, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8181 (iv)
Strathcona Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathroy Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Sub-Target Company, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
——— Papers referred to Com. of Last Session: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
——— Ref. to Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 312 (i).
Sussex Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9836 (v).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 569 (i).
——— Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Additional Number: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5257 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5206 (iii).
Thirteenth Hussars, General Service Medal: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13533 (vii).
Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7203 (iv)
Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3429 (ii).
Uniforms and Customs Refunds: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
Valleyfield Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv), 10892 (vi).
Valleyfield Regiment, Organization of, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 356 (i).
Warlike and other Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 12149 (vii).
Western Rifle Associations, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).
Winnipeg, Military Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
——— Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 10969 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 10955 (vi).
Woodstock Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Milk Adulteration: *See* 'B. No. 64..
Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Offices, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wilmot) 2982 (ii).
Milltown and St. Stephen's Drill Sheds: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 10897 (vi).
Mines, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 646 (i).
Mines and Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 12260 (vii).
Mining Regulations published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette': M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5801 (iii).
Mining Rights in Sections 17, 20, 21, &c., Applications, Leases, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Perley) 3851 (ii).
——— Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3238 (ii).
Mining, Surface or Timber Rights, on Section 8, Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses from March, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 562 (i).
*See* 'Travelling,' &c.
Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church: *See* 'B. No. 23.'

Minnedosa Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
Mint Building, Imperfect Ventilation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3036 (ii).
——— Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11296 (vi).
——— Issue of Gold Coins: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2593 (ii).
——— Sums expended, Apptmnts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 557 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 938 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table, 941 (i).
Mint: *See* 'Public Buildings, Ottawa.'
Miscou Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5256 (iii).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Moberley, Mr. H. J., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3848 (ii).
Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 7322 (iv).
Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Moncton Car Shops, Lease, &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
Moncton Car and Locomotive Shops: in Com. of Sup., 12250 (vii).
——— Payments to E. A. Wallberg: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8892 (v).
Moncton-Truro, Additional Line: in Com. of Sup., 12760 (vii).
Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi).
Money-Lenders, Operating in Public Buildings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 1738 (i).
'Montague' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 182 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8172 (iv).
Montague Moore, &c., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended *re* Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Foster) 1886 (i).
——— Collision with C.P.R. Str., Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8086 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* Accident: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8171 (iv), 9715 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Accident: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10121 (v).
'Montcalm,' Str., Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8441 (v).
——— Services as Ice-breaker: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
Montmagny Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9263 (v).
Montmagny Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Montmorency Falls, Retaining Walls, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Montreal Circuit Judges, Increase of Salary: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. on B. 206, 12552 (vii).
Montreal Directory, in Library of House: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 4764 (iii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7423 (iv).
——— Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3319 (ii).
Montreal Excise Officers, Increase of Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Montreal 'Gazette,' Building, Amount paid for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3900 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Amount of Expenditure *re* Cleaning, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 8888 (v).
——— Cement Contract, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 7199, 7499 (iv).
Montreal Harbour, Expenditure *re* Docks and Elevators: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 2170 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).
Montreal Liquor Licenses, Attack of Hon. Mr. Scott: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Gervais) 4064; Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4065; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 4066; Appeal from Dep. Speaker to Speaker, 4071; Ruling, Agreed to (Y. 59; N. 23) 4071 (ii).
Montreal Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Montreal Pneumatic Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
Montreal Post Office Addition, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).
——— Settlement of Strike: Remarks (Mr. Verville) 8608 (v).
Montreal Post Office, Clerks, Pay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9112 (v).
——— Defalcations, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7197 (iv).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7410 (iv).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9274 (v).
Montreal Postal Station B: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
——— Station C: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditure for the last Fifty Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3482 (ii).
Montreal 'Star,' Advertisements in, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7479 (iv).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3436; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3442; Agreed to (Y. 108: N. 53) 3464 (ii)
——— Amounts collected and expended, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1688 (i).
——— Bonds, Payment of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2979 (ii).
——— Claim of Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
——— Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1931 (i).
——— Rep. of Aud. Gen. J. Fraser: M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 2983 (ii).
*See* 'Toll Gates.'
Monuments to Sir L. H. Lafontaine and Robt. Baldwin: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
Monuments to McGee and Brown: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).
Moose Jaw Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch, C.P.R., Extension, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 7654 (iv).
Moose Jaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Moose Mountain Buffalo Herd: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9477; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 9494 (v).
Mortgages as Securities by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
Motions, Unopposed: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8839 (v).
——— Business of the Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8896 (v).
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Mulgrave Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Murray Canal, Bridgemen's Houses: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry., Improved Service, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 6239 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. A. Martin) 10123 (v).
Museum: *See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Muskoday Indian Reserves, Negotiations *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5082 (iii).
Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Govt. Deposit, &c.: Ques.: (Mr. Gauvreau) 3485 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 & 219.'
*See* 'Battlefields.'
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'
Naturalization Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
*See* 'Can. Naturalization.'
Naval Defences, Contribution by Canada to Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Naval Instructions, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1119 (i).
Naval Schools *re* Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 3222 (ii).
Naval Schools, Establishment of, List of Places: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
——— Arrangements with G.B. *re* Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1117 (i).
Neepawa Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).
Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5202 (iii).
'Neptune,' Cruise in Hudson Bay, on Order for Reps.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 850 (i).
N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9714 (v).
——— Claims *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9270 (v).
N.B. Cold Storage Bait Co., Ministerial Connections *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 9283; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 9415 (v).
*See* 'Cold Storage.'
N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt., Ques. (Mr. Porter) 9272 (v).
N.B. Credit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1937 (i).
N.B. Elections and Govt. Employees: Telegram read (Mr. Foster) 3229 (ii).
——— I.C.R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3317 (ii).
N.B. Elections, Interference of Govt. Officials: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3579 (ii).
——— Mr. Pugsley's Political Connection, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7130 (iv).
N.B. Inland Waters Wharfs, Construction Policy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 5465 (iii).
N.B. Post Offices, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).
N.B. Post Office Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vii).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt.: M. (Mr. Foster) to Adjn., 3657 (ii).
N.B. Ry. Mail Service, Vacancy, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).
N.B. Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
New Glasgow Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
New Glasgow Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).
New London Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
Newmarket Canal, Extension to Devil's Elbow: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).
——— Reps., Surveys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
*See* 'Canals—Trent.'

New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
Newspapers in Alberta, Amounts paid to by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 1690 (i).
Newspapers, Amounts paid for Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 509 (i).
Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11298 (vi).
Newspapers, Payments to from 1904 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1511 (i).
——— Postal Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6460 (iv).
——— Rates, List of Publications: M. for Copy* (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i).
*See* 'Public Works—Advertising,' 'Tenders,' &c.
New York Central Ry., Discrimination by Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Niagara Falls Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Cost, Criticism, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6054 (iii).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Niagara Land Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).
Niagara Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Lencaster) 9779 (v).
——— Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2163 (ii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'
Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 12775 (vii).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1283 (i).
Nicolet Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7428 (iv).
Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Contract and Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3838 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
——— Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3840 (ii), 4588 (iii).
——— Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4588 (iii).
——— Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3478 (ii).
Nipigon Ry. (Branch Lines) Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Nipissing Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12390 (vii).
Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5650 (iii).
*See* 'Georgian Bay.'
Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Land Patents to: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 8182 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid and Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 167 (i).
——— Financial Relations with Govt.: Remarks on M. for Sup., 770 (i).
——— Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2392 (ii).
North Bay P. O. Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
North Bay Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).
North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
North Empire Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 7.'
Northern Crown Bank of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Northern Empire Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4773 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5490 (iii).
North Sydney Improvements, I.C. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Northwest Gold Dredging Co., Leases assigned, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 11702 (vi).
N.W.M. Police, Compensations *re* Injuries: in Com. of Sup., 8870 (v).
——— Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 8870 (v).
——— Salaries and Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 8862 (v).
Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
N.W.T. Act (jurisdiction) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 210.'
N.W.T. Govt., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10116 (v).
N.W.T. School Grants: in Com. of Sup., 11117 (v).
Notre Dame de Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).
N.S. Prisons, &c., Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Oakville Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 10887 (vi).
Oaths of Office: See 'B. No. 1.'
Oats, Standards of: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Observatories: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Observatory: *See* 'Astronomical.'
Obstructions in Navigable Streams, Removal of: in Com. of Sup., 3156, 3211 (ii).
Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Owen) on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10016 (v).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10023; (Mr. Speaker) 10024 (v).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Ques. of Order, (Mr. Foster) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ross) 10024: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 10031 (v).
Obstruction Tactics, Discussion of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 9220 (v).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i), 2941, 2949, 3147, 3195 (ii), 5763 (iii).
Ocean SS. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Occidental Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Official Cars, Number and Maintenance: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).
Office Specialty Co., and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244 (iii).
Office Specialty Co., Quantity of Goods supplied to Govt.: Ques. (Br. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 3242 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bennett) 3581 (ii), 5785 (iii).
Oil Borings, Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 13162 (vii).
Old Age Pensions: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Old Age Pensions: M. for Sel. Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2398 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. Fielding) to wthdrw., 3654 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 7722 (iv).
Old Age Pensions Com., Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
Old Man's River: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Olympic Games Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vii).
Ont., Judges of: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Ontario North, Division of Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 8294 (v).
Opium, Amount received *re* Customs Duties, Pet. from B.C. *re* Prohibition: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8614 (v).
Opium, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Speech of Hon. Mr. Brodeur at Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 10123 (v).
Orange Order and Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Orangeville Post Office Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).
Order Paper, Differences between English and French Editions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6740, 6850 (iv).
—— Printing in French: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5407 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, 'Bourinot' quoted, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).
—— Appeal to Speaker from Mr. Chairman's Ruling (Mr. Taylor) Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).
Ordnance Lands, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 218.'
Oriental Immigration, B.C., Legal Expenses *re* Commission: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Original Documents and Returns: *See* 'Documents.'
Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
—— Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
—— Issue of Pass on I.C.R. Express: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse Power: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5471, 5656 (iii).
—— Incorrect Answer: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5566 (iii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
—— Archives Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
—— Elevator Attendants: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
—— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
—— Improvements, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5707 (iii).
—— Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
—— Renewing Skylights: in Com. of Sup., 7816 (iv).
—— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10983 (vi).
—— Repairs, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
—— Sussex Street: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 13478 (vii).
—— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi). *See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Ottawa Grounds, Circular of C. S. Ass'cn: Read (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11499 (vi).
Ottawa Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii).
—— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).
Ouelle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 516 (i).
—— O.C. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Lanctot) 557 (i).
Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'

Owen Sound to Meaford Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
Owen Sound Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
—— Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
—— Contract *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
—— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging, Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3038 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2792 (ii).
Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8606 (v).
Oyster Pond Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5200 (iii).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Pacific Coast Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 10157 (v).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2822 (ii).
*See* 'Blunden.'
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 9579 (v).
—— Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 13081 (vii).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Park Hill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Park Reservations: in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 609 (i).
Parliament, Opening: Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Parrsborough Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11259 (vi).
Parrsborough Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry Service, Rate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1120 (i).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).
Passages of Immigrants to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5468 (iii).
Passenger Ticket Act: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
Passes on Steamers to Members, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Patent Medicines: *See* 'B. No. 146.'
Patent Medicines, Committee of Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3899 (ii).
Patent Medicines, Govt. Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 356 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 608 (i), 2594 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Apptmt. to Special Com., 10689 (vi).
Patent of Eugene Francois Giraud: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Patent of Frederick C. Rehm, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Patents of General Chemical Co.: *See* 'B No. 174.'
Patents of Goodwin Car Co.: *See* 'B. No. 60.
Patents of Metal Shingle and Siding Co.: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Patents of Montague Moore, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Patents of the Sutherland Rifle Sight Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Patent of Wm. B. Smith: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
'Patent Record': in Com. of Sup., 672 (i).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B.C., Sale to: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6002 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6241 (iv).
Patronage *re* Civil Service: M. (Mr. Foster, to Drop, 6243 (iv).
*See* 'Civil Service System.'
Paulding, Ada Katurah Stewart, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Peace River Exploratory Surveys, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 3834 (ii).
Peace River Timber Limits, Cor., &c., *re* Granting: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 3851 (ii).
Peace River Valley and Land Co., Cancelling of Grants: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 11018 (vi).
—— Homesteads leased, sold, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 1295 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2769 (ii), 6010 (iii).
—— M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10403 (vi).
—— Survey of Lands: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
—— Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c., Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
Peace Union, Parliamentary, Meeting at Ottawa: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13581 (vii).
Peat for Fuel Deposits, Development of in Canada: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 515 (i).
Peat Industry, Emplymt. of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 1122 (i).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox': on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sloan), 3934 (ii).
—— Notice of Motion (Mr. Sloan) 3156 (ii).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1940 (i).
Pembroke Armoury: Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 10901 (vi).
Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii), 12265 (vii).
Penitentiaries B.C., Land Purchases: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
Pension Fund of I.C.R. & P.E.I. Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Pepin, J. A., Emplymt. at Windsor Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Perdue, Mr. M. B., Apptmt. as Inspector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 173 (i).
Personal Explanation *re* Land Deals (Mr. Turriff) 1927 (i).
Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops: Ques. (Mr. White) 5791 (iii).
Petawawa Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
—— Ques. (Mr. White) 685 (i).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Peterborough Steamboat Landing: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
Petite Decharge, Lac St. Jean, Removal of Rock: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Petition: M. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Present, 1682 (i).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 1294 (i).
—— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5723 (iii), 9716 (v).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 6464, 7107 (iv).
—— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 10402 (vi).
Petit Rocher Spur Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
'Petrel,' Str., Supplies, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 7937 (iv).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 7937 (iv).
Petroleum Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Phœnix Assurance Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
'Phœnix,' Saskatoon, Number ordered, Payment to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6920 (iv).
Pianos rented for Speaker's Rooms: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 563 (i).
Piche Point (Lake Temiscaming) Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Picton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Pictou Engine House, I.C.R., Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1683 (i).
Pictou Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii).
Pictou Post Office Building, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10518 (vi).
Piegan Indian Reserve, Shipping and Weighing of Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).
Piggeries at Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).
Pilotage and Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 5046 (iii), 13324 (vii).
Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9474 (v).
Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 4588 (iii).
Plains of Abraham, Battle of: *See* 'Nos. 111 & 219.'
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres leased to Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1348 (i).
*See* 'Militia—Ross Rifle.'
Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6403 (iv).
Plessissville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8838 (v).
—— Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9267 (v).
—— Tenders, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Point Pelee Lightship: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3898 (ii).
Point St. Charles, Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).
Pontiac Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
Portage la Prairie, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8617 (v).
Port Arthur Harbour, Dredging Contracts, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 697 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
*See* 'Dredging.'
Port Arthur Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2389 (ii).
Port Burwell Harbour, Contracts, Payments, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 556 (i).

Port Burwell Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Colborne Elevator and Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12146, 12211 (vii).
Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4403 (ii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10513 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4828 (iii).
Porte au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3232 (ii).
Porter's Lake, Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11265 (vi).
Port Hillford Breakwater, Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, Closing Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 11268 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10255 (v).
Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10254 (v).
Port Hope, Inland Revenue Office, Apptmts. of Collector: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 895 (i).
Port Hope Pier Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Joli West, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Maitland Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 690 (i).
——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6919 (iv).
Port Maitland Entrance Pier, Renewal: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
——— Tenders, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lalor) 1294 (i).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Port Mulgrave, N.S., Preventing Boats landing Cargoes: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v).
Port Royal (Madame Island) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Port St. Francois Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9271 (v).
Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 239 (i).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Portuguese Cove Breakwater Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
Postage Stamps, Designs for Quebec Tercentenary, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
*See* 'Post Office.'
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3040 (ii).
——— Statement (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 3159 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3885 (ii).
Postal Note Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9279 (v).
Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8175 (iv).
Postal Rates on N.S. Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3484 (ii).
Postal Regulations *re* Weekly Newspapers, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5901 (iii).
Postal Revenue *re* One-Cent Rate on Letters Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 8381 (v).
Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 352 (i).
——— Deficiency, &c., Complaints *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 559 (i).
——— Delays, &c., Complaints *re* Ret.: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. Armstrong) 7257 (iv).
Postal Service, H. of C., Delay in delivering: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 570 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
Postal Service, Improvements in, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
——— Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4832 (iii).
Postal Stamps, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9111 (v).
——— Special Issue *re* Tuberculosis: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Posters, Prohibition of Indecent Bills, Enforcement of Tariff Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 6461 (iv).
Postmasters' Assessment, Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6458 (iv).
Post Office Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
POST OFFICE:
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 12653 (vii).
Arnprior Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Atlantic Steamers Mail Service, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
*See* 'Mail Service,' &c.
Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 7933 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Bell Rapids P. O., Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 8883 (v).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1291 (i).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Establishment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).

Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).

Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagnoris, Charges *re* Political Activity: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6642 (iv).

Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6404 (iv).

Calgary, P. O. and Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8578 (v).

Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5653 (iii).

Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).

Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9474 (v).

Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7203 (iv).

Drop Letter One-Cent Rate: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 3158 (ii).

Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5257 (iii).

Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7731 (iv).

Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).

Glencoe Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3846 (ii).

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. A. F. MacLaren) 184 (i).

Hamilton Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7696 (iv).

Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11704 (vi).

'La Gazette d'Arthabaska.' Postal Privileges *re*: Ques. (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6058 (iii).

Letter Carriers, Boots, Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).

——— Hours of Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7728 (iv).

Literature, &c., distributed through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).

Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980

Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).

Macleod Post Office, Report *re* Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road P. O.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 5087 (iii).

McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I. Post Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5087 (iii).

Mails from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12653 (vii).

Mail Matter lost in C.P.R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re*: (Mr. Lake) 9281 (v).

——— Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C.P.R. Accident: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9724 (v).

Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing, Inspection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).

Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2214 (ii).

Mail Service in B.C., Improvements *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3754 (ii)

Mail Service between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4828 (iii).

Mail Service, Irregularity of in Argenteuil County: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).

Mail Service in N.B. and N.S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 852 (i).

Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).

Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).

Mail Steamer, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).

Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).

Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5799 (iii).

Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 7199 (iv).

Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Offices, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wilmot) 2982 (ii).

Montreal Pneumatic Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).

Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9274 (v).

Montreal Postal Station B: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).

——— Station C: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).

Montreal Post Office, Addition, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).

——— Clerks, Pay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9112 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Montreal Post Office, Defalcations, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7197 (iv).

——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7410 (iv).

N.B. Post Offices, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

——— Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vii).

N.B. Ry. Mail Service, Vacancy, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).

——— Postal Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6460 (iv).

Newspaper Rates, List of Publications: M. for Copy* (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i).

——— Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11298 (vi).

*See* 'Weekly Newspapers.'

Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).

——— Contract and Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3838 (ii).

——— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).

North Bay P. O. Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).

North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4773 (iii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5490 (iii).

Orangeville Post Office Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).

Ottawa Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii).

——— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).

Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).

Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 4588 (iii).

Point St. Charles Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).

Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).

Porte au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3232 (ii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3040 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3885 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4832 (iii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Postal Arrangements between Can. and U.S.: Re-arrangement of: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 3159 (ii).

Postal Note Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9279 (v).

Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8175 (iv).

Postal Revenue *re* One-Cent Rate on Letters: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 8381 (v).

Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 352 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 559 (i).

——— Improvements in, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).

Postmasters' Assessment, Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6458 (iv).

Post Office Buildings built since 1904, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 4761 (iii).

Post Office Dept., Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 93 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii), 8872 (v).

——— Outside Service: in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v), 13152 (vii).

——— Returns, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6405 (iv).

——— Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. Crocket) 6288 (iv).

Post Office Inspectors, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).

——— Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).

Post Office Irregularities in Western Canada: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).

P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 355 (i).

——— Delays in Distributing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).

Printing for Postal Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5472 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1130 (i).

Quebec Terentenary Postage Stamps, French and English Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (iv).

——— Designs for, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).

——— New Series, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6397 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8895 (v).

——— Postage Stamps, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. McColl) 12414 (vii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).

Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v).

Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8176 (iv).

Rivard, Mr. S., Emplymt. on Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (v).

Riviere du Loup Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).

Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11297 (vi).

Rural Postmasters, Salary, Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 183 (i).

Ryan, Mr. G. M., Apptmt. of Successor as Ry. Mail Supt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7504 (iv).

St, Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5797 (iii).

St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office Savings Bank Opening, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4589 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4828 (iii).

St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).

St. Irene des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5795 (iii).

St. John's Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).

St. Mary's Post Office, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).

——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11937 (vi).

——— Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11019 (vi).

St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3236 (ii).

St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1686 (i).

St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Dismissal of Mrs. Mary Finlay, Letters, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2170 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1687 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 2786 (ii).

Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5472 (iii).

Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).

Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).

Savings Banks, Increase of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 691 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Scotch Hill East, Establishment of Post Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2793 (ii).

Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4829 (iii).

Stamps, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9111 (v).

——— Special Issue *re* Tuberculosis: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).

*See* 'Quebec,' &c.

Suburban Mail Delivery: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3276 (ii).

Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).

Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2594 (ii).

Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 609 (i).

Valleyfield, Clock in Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).

Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 11297 (vi).

Victoria Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).

Weekly Newspapers, Postal Rates in N.S., Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3484 (ii).

Weekly Newspapers, Postal Regulation *re*, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5201 (iii).

Winnipeg Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).

Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 3216 (ii).

Woodstock, N.B., Mr. C. L. Smith, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2794 (ii).

——— Interference in Eelctions: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 2886 (ii).

Yukon Mail Service, Complaints *re* (Mr. Thompson) 2022 (ii).

Pound Net Licenses granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 2795 (ii).

Prefontaine, Hon. R., Date of Sailing, Acting Minister of Marine: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7732 (iv).

Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).

Presbyterian College of Halifax: *See* 'B. No. 154.'

Presbyterian Ministers' Widows and Orphans Fund: *See* 'B. No. 23.'

Preston, W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 360 (i).

Prince Albert Penitentiary Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).

Prince Albert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 359 (i).
P.E.I. Fishing Bounties, Stmnt. of Payments: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 1295 (i).
P.E.I. and G.B. SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
P.E.I. Harbours and Rivers, Expenditures: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
P.E.I. Ice-breaker, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8444 (v).
——— Date of Signing of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 10254 (v).
——— Progress *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 365 (i).
P.E.I. Life Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
——— Lighthouses, Supplies, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 358 (i).
P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-establishing of:, Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8383 (v).
P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 355 (i).
P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2171 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8696, 9893 (v).
P.E.I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6642 (iv).
——— Bear River Station-master's Dwelling, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1737
P.E.I. Branch Lines: *See* 'B. No. 202.'
P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 3242 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on B. 215, 13482 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry., Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1123 (i).
——— Construction of Freight Sheds, &c., Specifications, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5086 (iii).
——— Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8383 (v).
——— Freight Rates, Delegates from P.E.I., Reps. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 6240 (iv).
——— Harmony-Elmira Branch, Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 12052 (vii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) on M. for Sup., 2740 (ii).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Foster) 2882 (ii).
——— remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 7100 (iv).
——— Mail Service, Delays in Distributing &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com of Sup., 9092 (v).
P.E.I. Ry., Montague Branch. Claims of James Maher, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3834 (ii).
——— Montague Branch Extension: M. to dsch. Bill (Mr. Graham) 11405 (vi).
——— Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure and Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 848 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. A. McLean) 850 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Extension, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4829 (iii).
——— Station Agents, Salaries, Pets., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3236 (ii).
——— Subsidy, Deductions *re* Hillsborough Bridge: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5079 (iii).
——— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
——— Tenders *re* News Agency: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
——— Time-Table, Protest *re* Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1123 (i).
——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 568 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with G.B.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 13353 (vii).
P.E.I., Terms of Union with Dom., Nonfulfilment of, &c., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5801 (iii).
P.E.I., Telegraphic Communication, Com. from Commercial Cable Co. *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8515 (v).
P.E.I. Tunnel Construction, Reps., &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 4589 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
——— Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 562 (i).
P.E.I., Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2546 (ii).
——— Freight carried, Freight Rates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 936 (i).
——— Georgetown and Cape George Route, Tests *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 895 (i).
——— Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Discussion of: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1109 (i).
——— Withdrawal of Steamer from Georgetown, Discussion: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1207 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 1513 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Ice-Breaker Str., Rep. *re* Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4583 (iii).
——— Mail Service, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. Martin) 1203 (i).

P.E.I., Progress *re* Construction of Ice-breaker: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 5796 (iii).
—— Winter Communication: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 4496 (iii).
P.E.I Winter Service, Str. 'Stanley,' Route, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 172 (i).
—— Total Quantity of Freight, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 843 (i).
Prince Rupert, Customs Collectors, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 6401 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Electric Motor Machines: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
Printing and Lithographing done outside of Canada, Amounts expended: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1732, 1931 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
*See* 'Lithographing.'
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
Printing of Parlt., 5th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Parmelee) 10915 (vi).
Printing for Postal Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5472 (iii).
Printing and Stationary Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
Printing in 'Sun,' &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 5661 (iii).
Printing, Supt., Apptmt. of a Frenchman: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Prisons and Reformatories Act *re* N.S.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Prisoner, Released: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Private Bills Com., Extension of Time: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 891 (i).
Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10122 (v).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' *re* Attack on French Canadian Ministers: (Mr. Talbot 4221 (iii).
—— Ques. of *re* Registrar of Grey County (Mr. Telford) 11302 (vi).
Privy Council, Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).
—— Office, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 610 (i).
Prohibition Vote in Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13580 (vii).
—— Mess. from Senate: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13587 (vii).
—— Speech from Throne, 13590 (vii).
Protection Tariff, ref. to in Debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 74 (i).
Provincial Elections and Federal Ministers' Speeches: Remarks (Mr. Robitaille) 8850 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Amount paid before and after Adjustment: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8616 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present Agreement and Previously: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 315 (i).
—— Dates of last Payments, &c., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
—— Dates of Payments, Sums owing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
—— Increased Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 173 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 79; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 61 (i).
Provincial Voters' Lists: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
*See* 'Man.,' &c.
Public Accounts Com., Evidence *re* Investigation, Freedom of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3070; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 103) 3145 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3083; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3085 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
—— Meetings and Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1439 (i).
—— Meetings concurrently with Sittings of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9504 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 4495 (iii).
Public Accounts Rep. and Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: M. to ref. to Public Accounts Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 311 (i).
Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 2159 (ii); M. (Mr. Johnston) to conc., 9890 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1383 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Sittings concurrently with Hse.: M. (Mr. Finlayson) 9579 (v).
Public Accounts Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
Public Bills and Orders, Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 13493 (vii).
—— Precedence of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3405 (ii).
*See* 'Business of the House.'
Public Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
—— Policy of Erection, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
—— Works, Initiated since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bovce) 2170 (ii).
Public Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Public Lands of Dom., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 70 (i).
Public Works Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 555 (i).
Public Works in Harbours and Rivers., Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 559 (i).
Public Works, Labour Hours: *See* 'B. No. 97.'

PUBLIC WORKS:
Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6232 (iv).
Advertisements for Tenders *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4702; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 95) (iii).
Annapolis Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11207 (vi).
Anse a la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Anse a l'Ilot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Antigonish Public Building: in Com, of Sup., 7110 (iv).
Architects on Public Works, Payments, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Arthabaskaville Public Buildin: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Ashouapmouchouan, Peribonka Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Aylmer Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11219 (vi).
Baie St. Paul Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Barachois Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11223, 12029 (vi).
Batiscan River, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Batiscan Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8576 (v).
Bay St. Lawrence Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Beaver Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Becancour, &c., Counties, Dredging at during 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3040 (ii).
Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2392 (ii).
Belle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
Belleville Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 4744 (iii).
Belleville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv).
Berthier Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
——— Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 9713 (v).
Big Lorraine Harbour, Dredging Entrance Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Blind River Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Bonaventure River Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244 (iii). *See* 'Dredging,' &c.
Brantford Public Building Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector of Port Maitland Pier: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (iv).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5913 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 12133, 12138 (vii).
Bronte Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii).
——— Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Buctouche Channel, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Burlington Channel Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4403 (iii).
Buildings, Administrative, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).
Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi). 13338 (vii).
Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12661 (vii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 12771 (vii).
Buildings Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
——— Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
——— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Buildings, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 10953 (vi), 13335 (vii).
——— Man. and N.W.T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v).
Buildings in Man. and N.W., Amounts paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 698 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Buildings, N.B.: in Com. of Sup 7186 (iv), 13328 (vii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv), 13326 (vii).
———Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7467 (vi), 13331 (vii).
Buildings, Policy of Erection, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
Buildings and Public Works, Initiated since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2170 (ii).
Buildings, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).
——— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
——— Saskatchewan and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Campbellton Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Campbellton Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
——— Tender *re* Piling Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Cape St. Mary Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Caraquet Wharf, Ice-breakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
Caribou Island Causeway: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 513 (i).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 685 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5202 (iii).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7937 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8174 (iv).
Chicoutimi Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*: Que. (Mr. Bennett) 7203 (iv).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 12030 (vi).
——— Public Works, Expenditures, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Church Point Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Chute a Blondeau Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Clarke City, Seven Islands: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
——— Expenditure *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Clerks of Works on Public Buildings: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 695 (i).
Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4831 (iii).
Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 359 (i).
——— Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
Colborne Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii)
Colchester Point, Essex County Pier, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12096 (vii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr Monk) 9277 (v).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Cumberland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
——— Valuation of Site: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Dawson City, Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re*, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5464 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5801 (iii).
Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11226 (vi).
Docks, Piers, &c., Constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2397 (ii).
Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 13060 (vii).
Dover Wharf on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 11692 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9710 (v).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9773, 10259 (v).
——— Midland, &c., Renewals without Tender, O.Cs. *re*: M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 6741 (iv).
——— Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Dredging Contracts, Quebec Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7104 (iv).

——— Renewal without Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6633 (iv).

*See* 'Midland,' &c.

Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8839 (v).

Dredging at Midland, &c., Advertisements *re* Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 7195 (iv).

Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3896 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4247 (iii).

Dredging, Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).

Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 1129 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9276, 10008 (v).

Dredging Plant (new) for Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).

Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River (lower): in Com. of Sup., 4754 (iii).

Dredging in Quebec Counties in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3240 (ii).

Dredging in Quebec Province, Claims Pending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7200 (iv).

Dredging at Rigaud River, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyer) 6240 (iv).

Dredging in Vaudreuil County, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii)

East Templeton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).

Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).

Elmwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).

Emerson Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).

Escoumains Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).

Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).

Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).

Father Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).

Fernie Public Building, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10866 (iv).

'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days Working, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7199 (iv).

Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3844 (ii).

Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 355 (i).

Georgetown Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (iv).

Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Glace Bay, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7139 (iv).

Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7486 (iv), 13331 (vii).

Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Retirement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).

Goderich Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).

——— Claims of Smeeth & McGillicuddy: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).

Gore's Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).

Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8892 (v).

——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5085 (iii).

*See* 'Wharfs.'

Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).

Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).

Grand Marais Harbour, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 12140 (vii).

Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).

Grand Mere Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).

Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13059 (vii).

Grande Riviere Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).

Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8382 (v).

Graving Docks, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).

Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 13338 (vii).

Halifax, Dominion Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (v).

Hall's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).

Hamilton, Public Works Employees at, Delay in Payment: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10015, 10119 (v).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11693, 12031 (vi).

——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii).

——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).

——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).

——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 133350 (vii).

Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Higgin's Shore Pier Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 694 (i).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2980 (ii).
—— Divisional Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
—— Name of Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3037 (ii).
Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 11702 (vi).
Hudson, Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8582 (v).
Hunter, J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5792 (iii).
Inverness Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).
—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5997 (iii).
Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6980 (iv).
Juniper Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iv).
'King Edward' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13063 (vii).
Knowlton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Lachine Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).
Lachute Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
'Lady of the Lake,' Str., purchased by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3434 (ii).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8176 (iv).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Lake Aylmer, Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Lakefield Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Lake Francois Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11299 (vi).
Lake St. Francis Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Peter Piers: in Com. of Sup., 4752 (iii).
Lakeville Harbour Opening: in Conc., 13568 (vii).
Lavaltrie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi)
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
Leonardsville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lesser Slave Lake, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Little Current Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2397 (ii).
Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
Longueuil Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7304 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Lotbinière Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lower Newcastle Wharf on Miramichi River: in Com. of Sup., 11695 (vi).
Lunenburg Public Building Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
McGregor's Creek, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
McPherson's Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11229, 11292 (vi).
Madawaska River, Extension Dyke: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Magdalen Islands, Breakwater and Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).

Magnetawan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Magog Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).

Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Maple Creek, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).

Margaree Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).

Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).

Mar. Provs. Harbours and Rivers, Creosoted Timber: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).

Markham Public Building: in Com of Sup., 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).

Maskinonge River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).

Matane Breakwater and Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 566 (i).

Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).

Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).

——Contract *re* Heating System: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 10791 (vi).

Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).

Michipicoton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Middle River, Shear Dam Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).

Midland Harbour, Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).

Midland and Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).

——Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3428 (ii).

Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8181 (iv).

Milford Haven, N.S. Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13060 (vii).

Miscou Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).

Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).

Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi).

'Montague' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 182 (i).

——Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8172 (iv).



PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).

Montmagny Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Montmorency Falls, Retaining Walls, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).

Montreal Harbour and St. Lawrence River, Dredging and Elevator Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).

Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditure for the last fifty Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3482 (ii).

Moose Jaw Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).

——Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).

Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).

Neepawa Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).

N.B. Inland Water Wharf, Construction Policy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 5465 (iii).

New Glasgow Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).

New London Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).

New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).

Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 12775 (vii).

Nicolet Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7428 (iv).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).

——Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3840 (ii), 4588 (iii).

Nicolet River Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3478 (ii).

North Bay, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).

North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).

Notre Dame de Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

——Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).

Old Man's River: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).

Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa Buildings, Archives Fitting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
——— Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
——— Corry Building, Total Rental per Annum, Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 11938 (vi).
——— Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
——— Elevator Attendants: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
——— Improvements, Repairs, &c.: in Com of Sup., 5707 (iii).
——— Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Mackenzie Avenue: in Com. of Sup., 1505 (i).
——— Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 11015 (vi).
——— Mint, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
——— Mint Building, Imperfect Ventilation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3036 (ii).
——— Renewing Skylights: in Com. of Sup., 7816 (iv).
——— Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10983 (vi).
——— list read (Mr. Pugsley) 10998 (vi).
——— Repairs, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
——— Rideau Hall, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
——— Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5467 (iii).
——— Sussex Street Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 13478 (vii).
——— Sussex Street Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii)
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).
——— Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
——— progress *re* construction: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on conc., 13568 (vii).
——— Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Ouelle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Owen Sound Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
——— Contract *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Owen Sound Public Building, Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Building Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2792 (ii).
Oyster Pond Breakwater Extension: in Com of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Park Hill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Parrsborough Harbour Improvements: in Com., of Sup., 11259 (vi).
——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup, 13327 (vii).
Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1940 (i).
Petawawa Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
——— Ques. (Mr. White) 685 (i).
Petite Descharge, Lac St. Jean, Removal of Rock: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 1294 (i).
——— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5723 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 6464 (iv).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 10402 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7107 (iv).
——— Stmnt. as to Missing Letters: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 9716 (v).
Piche Point (Lake Temiscaming) Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Pictou Post Office Building, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10518 (vi).
Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. A. A. Martin) 685 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9474 (v).
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3898 (ii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
——— Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8838 (v).
——— Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9267 (v).
——— Number of Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Port Arthur and Fort William, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Dredging, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8617 (v).
Port Arthur Harbour, Dredging Contracts, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 697 (i).
Port Arthur Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Port Burwell, Harbour Improvement: in Com .of Sup., 12135 (vii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2389 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 556 (i).
Port Colborne Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12146 (vii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10513 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4828 (iii).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi)
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11265 (vi).
Port Hilford Breakwater, Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, Closing Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 11268 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10255 (v).
Port Hope Pier, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Joli West, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Maitland Piers, Tenders, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Lalor) 1294 (i).
——— Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 690 (i).
——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6919 (iv).
——— Entrance Pier, Renewal: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
Port Royal (Madame Island) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Port St. François Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
——— Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 239 (i).
Portuguese Cove Breakwater Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
Post Offices, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).



PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Prince Albert, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
——— Penitentiary Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).
P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
Public Works Dept., Architectural Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11096 (vi).
——— Clerical and Temporary Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 11099 (vi).
——— Ass't Dep. Minister, Apptmt. of : in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 7 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 12917 (vii).
——— Engineering Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11093 (vi).
——— Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 5661 (iii).
——— Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5730 (iii).
——— Gratuities to Public Works Officials: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).
——— New Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13061 (vii).
——— Ret.: on Inquiry for (Mr. Pugsley) 6223 (iv).
——— Technical Books of Reference : in Com. of Sup., 11100 (vi).
——— Telegraph Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11097 (vi).
——— Unprovided Items: in Com. of Sup., 11119 (vi).
Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagant Expenditure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7145 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures : Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4868, 4886; Neg. (Y. 43, N. 99) 4959 (iii).
Public Works Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 555 (i).
Public Works in Harbours and Rivers, Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 559 (i).
Pugwash Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Quebec County, Expenditures by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3847 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 3853 (ii).
Quebec Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Specifications, Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5802 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
Quesnel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10867 (vi).
Rainy River, Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (ii).
——— Correction of Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
Red Head Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
Renfrew Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Richelieu River Ice Piers, St. John: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Richibucto, Extension of Piers: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
——— Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 12412 (vii).
Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10013 (v).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Rivière a la Graisse Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 686 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 3689 (ii).
Rivière du Lievre, Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Rivière du Loup Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (Fraserville) Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Roberval, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Roche's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Rossport Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11282 (vi).
Ruscombe River Works, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11293 (vi).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 12011 (vi), 12145 (vii).
St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3230 (ii).
——— Expenditure and Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1935 (i).
——— Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3479 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
——— Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4246 (iii).
——— Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5999 (iii).
St. Francis River, Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6918 (iv).
——— Piers at Richmond, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Francois Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Fulgence Pier, Signatures on Paymaster's List: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1115 (i).
——— Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1130 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. Ignace de Loyola Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jacques River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. John, Dom. Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
St. John Harbour Improvements, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
——— Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11700 (vi).
——— Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
St. John River, Removal of Snags, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 3477 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
——— Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
——— Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
——— Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8890 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

St. Laurent Wharf: Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 895, 1121 (i).

St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

St. Louis River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).

St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853 (i).

St. Maurice, Dam at Grande Piles: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).

St. Omer Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

St. Pierre les Becquets Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

St. Rochs Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7433 (iv).

St. Simeon Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

St. Thérèse Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).

Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).

——— Purchase of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8380 (v).

——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8381 (v).

Sarnia Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7829 (iv).

Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).

Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).

Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).

Scotch Town Wharf, Application: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7202 (iv).

Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).

Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).

Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).

Seven Islands, Public Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).

Severn River, Improvement of Waterway: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).

Shawenegan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).

Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).

Shellmouth River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).

Sherbrooke Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12027 (vi).

Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).

'Sir Wilfrid Laurier,' Dredge, Completion, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).

Skinner's Cove, Pier Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).

——— Boat Channel, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10012 (v).

Slides and Booms Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).

Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 567 (i).

Sorel, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

Souris Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).

——— Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1685 (i).

Souris Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1939 (i).

Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).

Souris Wharf, Permission to Build, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7728 (iv).

Southampton Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).

Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4764 (iii).

Spillumcheen River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).

Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2391 (ii).

Stanley Island Wharf and Pier, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5720 (iii).

Strathcona Horse, Barracks, Stables, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10975 (vi).

Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).

Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).

Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13343 (vii).

Surveys, Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).

Sydney Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).

Taché, J. C., Apptmt. in Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8180 (iv).

Tancook Island Breakwater :in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).

Tatamagouche Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).

Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11701 (vi).

Temiskaming Wharf, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Thames River Wharf, Damages to: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 7506 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Thompson River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).

Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).

——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).

——— Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8892 (v).

Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5709 (iii), 13351 (vii).

Tignish Breakwater, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).

——— Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Leurgey) 682 (i).

——— Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3229 (iii)

Tilbury Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).

Tilsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).

Tobermory Harbour Booms: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).

Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9711 (v).

Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).

Toronto (eastern gap) Harbour, Amount of Dredging, &.: Ques. (Mr. Madonell) 354 (i).

——— Contract, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 10014 (v).

——— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1507 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).

Toronto (western gap) Harbour, Construction of Entrance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354, 518, (i), 4587 (iii).

——— Delay in Contract: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 5915 (iii).

Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5564 (iii).

Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5472 (iii).

Tracadie Lazaretto, Laundry, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).

Tracadie Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).

Uxbridge Public Building: Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).

Vancouver, Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).

——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10868 (vi).

Varennes Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).

Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).

Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5471 (iii).

Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).

Victoria Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).

Victoria Harbour, Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8803 (v).

Walkerville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).

Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).

Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).

Welland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv).

Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).

Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7179 (iv).

——— Total Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9474 (v).

Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).

Wharfs and Bridges in Quebec, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2391 (ii).

Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Expenditure since 1895: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5078 (iii).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 5476 (iii).

——— Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 5800, 5802 (iii).

Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4867 (iii).

Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).

White Head Wharf, Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).

Wiarton Dredging, Payments to Mr. Bowman: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6407 (iv).

——— Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6236 (iv).

Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).

William's Head Quarantine Station Building: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).

Winnipegosis Lake Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).

Winnipeg River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Yamaska River Lock: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Yarmouth, N.S., Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11500 (vi).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11291 (vi).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7180 (iv).
Pugwash Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Pulp Wood Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Pulp Wood Export Duty: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4774 (iii).
*See* 'Wood.'
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Change: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1940 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1130 (i).
——— Last Deficit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6459 (iv).
Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3481 (ii).
Quarantine Public Health: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Quarter Sections, 35, 31, 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 8176 (iv).
Quebec Battlefields: *See* 'B. Nos 111 and 219.'
Que. Bridge and Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 217.'
Quebec Bridge Accident, Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8173 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Bank Claims, &c.: Corrected Information (Mr. Fielding) 6059 (iii)
——— Change of Plans *re* Height: Ques. (Mr Armstrong) 5202 (iii).
——— Construction Materials, Customs Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5793 (iii).
——— Cor., Plans, Specifications, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 605 (i).
——— Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2394 (ii).
——— Govt. Grants, Investigation *re*: M. for Sel. Com.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2547 (ii).
——— G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rentals: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13227 (vii).
——— Horse and Vehicle Traffic: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 10739 (vi).
——— Material, Customs Duties collected &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5200 (iii).
——— Material on Hand, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1290 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Moneys contributed *re* Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5566 (iii).
——— Names of Jurymen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 7991 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Commission: in Com of Sup., 12769 (vii).
Quebec Bridge, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 30; (Mr. Monk) 535 (i).
——— Report, Distribution of Printed Copies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5914 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 10302 (vi).
——— Evidence, &c.: M. (Mr. Maclean) to ref. to Special Com., 10401 (vi).
——— Inquiry for Report (Mr. R. L. Borden) 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3043, 4494 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Haggart) 6223 (iv).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 4566 (iii), 10915 (vi).
Quebec Bridge, Commission's Report, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8608 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Barker) 3901 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Special Com.: M. (Mr. Chisholm) to conc., 13353, Amt. (Mr. Monk) 13363, Neg. (Y. 52; N. 103) 13414 (vii).
Quebec Bridge, Salaries to Officials: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13517 (viii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy, Apptmt. of Committee, 8440 (v).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Rollers: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Quebec, Citadel Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv).
——— Cliff Walls, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).
Quebec Conty, Expenditures by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3847 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 3853 (ii).
Quebec, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7431 (iv).
——— Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Specifications, Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5802 (iii).
Quebec Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Judges, Apptmt. to Superior Court: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 11825 (vi), 12190 (vii).
——— Additional Apptmts.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).
——— Apptmt. of Additional Judge: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).

Que. and N. B. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 128'
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Branch Lines Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Quebec Port Improvements, Expenditure since Confederation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Quebec Religious Feuds, Letter of Rev. Mr. Dumesnil to Papal Ablegate, Signed 'P.M. G.': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lemieux) 11501 (vi).
Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Quebec Reviews, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup. 13176 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps: Letter Read (Mr. Blain) 8694 (v).
—— Attendance of Veterans: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).
—— Battlefields: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 129.'
—— Food Supply: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
—— Joint Meeting of Members and Senators: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 6061 (iii).
—— Legal Holidays: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
—— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8851 (v).
—— Number of Troops to be sent, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).
—— Par. in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4669 (iii).
—— Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7992 (iv).
—— Rep. of Commission: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7449 (iv).
—— Rural Corps, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
—— Transportation of Troops: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8377, 8384; City Corps, &c. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8386 (v).
Quebec Tercentary Postage Stamps, French and English Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (v).
—— Issue of: Ques. (Mr. McColl) 12414 (vii).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8895 (v).
Quebec Tercentenary, Visit of Prince of Wales, Par. in Halifax 'Chronicle': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5209 (iii).
Quesnel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10867 (vi).
Questions, Answering of, Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 234; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 234 (i).
—— Precedence of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 350 (i).
Ques. of Privilege, Anti-Catholic Article in 'Leader' (Mr. Bergeron) 8604 (v).
—— *re* Doukhobors: (Mr. S. Hughes) 7321
—— Hunter, Mr., and French Canadians (Mr. Robitaille) 8465 (v).
—— Par. in 'La Presse' *re* Vote on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 2022 (ii).
—— *re* Stmnts of Mr. Conmee (Mr. Boyce) 7995 (iv).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Ry. Act. Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 85 and 100.'
Ry. Act, B. 3: Ques. of Order, ref. to debate in Senate: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 577 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on Order for 2° (remarks) 938 (i).
—— B. No. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Johnston) 5211 (iii).
Ry. Act (construction) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
—— (demurrage) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
—— (8-hour day) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
—— (employees' liability) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
—— (expropriation) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
—— (fire damages) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
—— (level crossings) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
—— (mileage books) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
—— (ry. commission) Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 & 112.'
—— (ry. commission) Amt. B. No. 118 (Mr. Graham) rsmg. adjn. debate on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3° (Mr. Aylesworth) 11590; Amt., Neg. (Y. 36, N. 77) 11600; Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 11602; Amt. (Mr. (Mr. Monk) 11603; Neg. (Y. 36, N. 89) 11608 (vi); Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11614, 11619; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 74) 11631; Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11632 (vi).
—— (securities) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
—— (telegraphers, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
—— (trains on time) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
—— (wires, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
—— (working hours) Amt. B. No. 157 (Mr. R. Smith): Remarks (Mr. Monk) 10120 (v)
Railway Commission, Applications *re* Crossing of Tracks, by Water Mains, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 1294 (i).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
—— Increase of. *See* 'B. No 112.'
—— Jurisdiction of: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
—— Legal Expenditures: in Com. of Sup., 10362 (vi).
—— Salaries and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 10385 (vi).
—— Total Expenditure in Counsel Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10256 (v).
Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).

Ry. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Railway Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 5046 (iii).
Railway Tracks, Crossing by Water Mains, Applications to Board, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 1109 (i).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9269 (v).
RAILWAYS :
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 892 (i).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G.T. Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Northrup) 2796 (ii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Connections, Charges against Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1429 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. Hse., 186 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 432 (i).
*See* 'G.T.R..' &c.
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ontario Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 236 (i).
Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
Canadian Northern Ry., Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Missions: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 13475 (vii).
C. P. Ry., Compensation *re* Right of Way: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii).
——— Land Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
——— Saskatchewan Bridge Subsidy: in Com of Sup., 13305 (vii).
——— Taxation Cases: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 5049 (iii).
Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4767 (iii).
Falconer, K., Payments by Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St. John, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 2397 (ii).
French Language on Ry. Crossings, &c. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2021 (ii).
Govt. Railways System: *See* 'I.C.R., &c.'
G.T. Ry., Connection at Brockville: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
——— Connections at Prescott: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 433 (i).
*See* 'Brockville,' &c.
G.T. Ry. and C.P.R. Connection at Wingham: Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 191 (i).
RAILWAYS—*Con.*
G.T. Ry., Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 556 (i).
G.T.P. and N.T. Ry., Disputed Questions: (Mr. Barker) 6235 (iv).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Knowles) 6291 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Financial Review, 13467 (ii).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W .J. Roche) 5789 (iii).
——— Railway Building to Fort Churchill, &c., Cor., Documents, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Schaffner) 1689 (i).
——— Surveys, Locations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
Indiantown and Blackville Branch Ry., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stocks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4246 (iii).
Inverness County, Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. McLennan) 12233 (vii).
Labour Organizations *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8289 (v).
Land Grants, Amounts and Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4766 (iii), 9271 (v).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1st, 1896; Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13512 (vii).
Land Grants in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6920 (iv).
Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 8182 (iv).
Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-06: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8613 (v).
National Transcontinental: *See* 'G.T.P.'
N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Balance of Subsidy, Claims *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9270 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9714 (v).
New York Central, Discrimination by Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9269 (v).
Railway Arbitrations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10329 (vi).
Railway Bridge Subsidies: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. on Res., 13309 (vii).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9271 (v).
Railway Connections, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) 434 (i).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
——— Extra Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 10342

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Railway Estimates, Obstruction in Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10129 (v)
——— Vote for: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 10007 (v).
Railways Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 10341 (vi).
Railways, Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 10357 (vi).
Railways and Municipalities, Agreements, Penalties *re* Violations: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 6987 (iv).
Railways Statistical Branch: in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Railway Statistics Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 1346 (i).
Ry. Subsidies, Applications for, Memorandum: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).
Ry. Subsidies: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12771 (vii).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3901 (ii).
White Pass Ry. Co., (Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 10736 (vi).
Rainy River. Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8610 (v).
Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c,: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5209 (iii).
Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Receipts, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5258 (iii).
Ranchvale Sub-land Agency, Closing of: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4829 (iii).
Rankin, Col., Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 11405 (vi).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
——— Correction of Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
Rattenbury & Co., Purchase of Seed Oats, Assignment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 12392 (vii).
Receiver-General's Office: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).
Red Ensign Flying from Merchant Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 12775 (vii).
Red Head Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
Reformatories Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v).
Rehm, Frederick C., *et al*, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Reinhardt, Mr. Paul, Emplymt. by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10331 (vi).
Reinhardt, Mr., Interference in Quebec Provl. Elections: Cor., &c., read (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10986 (vi).
*See* 'Caron.'
Renfrew Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Representation from Mar. Provs.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) 9891 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 9892 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9892 (v).
Representation in H. of C. for the Mar. Provinces: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Daniel) 9780 (v).
Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate: M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).
——— 1st Rep.: Presented (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 13510 (vii).
Restraint of Trade, Conspiracy in: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
Returns delayed: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13082 (vii).
Returning Officers, Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Telford) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).
Returns, Detention of by Members: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5048 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 2024 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 13081 (vii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2384 (ii), 6847 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 2384 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1018 (i), 3318, 2309 (ii), 4223, 4832, 6010 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 4495 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Macdonell) 569 (i), 2885 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. A. Martin) 5491 (iii), 7722 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8516 (v).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 2738 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 2024 (ii).
Returns ordered, Lost, &c., Placed in Record Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2882 (ii).
Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to Complete, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 4242 (iii).
——— Retention by Members: Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4660 (iii).
*See* 'Documents,' &c.
Returns unopposed: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5914 (iii).
Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 6983 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii), 6232 (iv).
Richard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
Richelieu River Ice Piers, St. John's: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).

Richibucto, Extension of Piers: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 12412 (vii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8613 (v).
*See* 'Canals.'
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5467 (iii).
——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads: Letter from Mr. Seaman read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9992 (v).
——— Timber Reserve, Preservation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).
——— Squatters' Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
Rifle and Artillery Association Grants: in Com. of Sup., 12152 (vii).
Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5654 (iii).
Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1123 (i).
*See* 'Ross Rifle.'
Rifle Ranges, Charlottetown, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6233 (iv).
Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10013 (v).
Rimouski, Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of 'Lady Evelyn': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7727 (iv).
*See* 'Post Office.'
Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8176 (iv).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Rivard, Mr. S., Emplymt. on Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, &c., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 686 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 3689
Rivière du Lievre, Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Rivière du Loup Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (Fraservile) Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Rivière du Loup, Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
——— Post Office, Improvement to Grounds: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Station, Improvement *re* Platforms: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5468 (iii).
Rivière du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6462 (iv).
River St. John, Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4763 (iii).
——— M. for Papers (Mr. Ames) 5210 (iii).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion *re* Interior Dept: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Roberval Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Roche's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rocky Mountain Park: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Rolla L. Crain, Amounts paid to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 3435 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3239 (ii).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Rossport Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Ranges, Par. in 'Ottawa Citizen' *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10515 (vi).
——— Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 11494 (vi).
——— Advances *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 4773 (iii).
Ross Rifle Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5786 (iii).
——— Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6235, 8176 (iv).
——— Date of Contract, O.C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 8442 (v).
——— provisions *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Bonus, Loans, Services of Govt. Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
——— Contract: in Com. of Sup., 13542 (ii).
——— Contract Price, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8174 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Consignment to N.W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5259 (iii).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* Defects: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5210 (iii).
——— Delivered per Contract, Cost per Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8180 (iv).

Ross Rifle, Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
——— Evidence before Pub. Accounts Com., Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) 5914 (iii).
——— Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4404 (iii).
——— Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3903 (ii).
Ross Rifle. Inefficiency and Extravagance of Militia Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M.for Sup., 8902-8953 (v); Neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090 (v).
——— Correction of Mr. S. Hughes' Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bergeron) 9126 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Mr. Bergeron's denial of Stmnt., 9330 (v).
Ross Rifle, Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3898 (ii).
——— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 178 (i).
——— Number ordered, Payments, Total Number, delivered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
——— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
——— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7209 (iv).
——— Rep. of British War Office *re* Cor., Disappearance from Library of H. of C.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Fred. Borden) 4961 (iii).
——— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9713 (v).
——— Rep. from Military Associations, &c., *re* Efficiency: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Report from Public Accounts, Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
——— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of: Ques (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
——— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 365 (i).
——— Target Practice, Suspension by N.W. M. Police: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3847 (ii).
——— Tests in England, Reps., &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 8167 (iv).
——— Total Number in Use in Canada by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5786 (iii).
Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11297 (vi).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11289 (vi).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. John, Tenders *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5788 (iii).
Royal Commission Return: Inquiry for (Mr Porter) 6288, 7447 (iv).
*See* 'Commissions'.
Royal Military College Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv), 12152, 13177 (vii).
——— Barracks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
——— Investigation into Conduct of Cadet Lancaster: on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
Royal Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8612 (v).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Caron) 5210 (iii).
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 1451
*See* 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Rules of the House, Amendments to: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2984 (ii).
Ruscombe River Works, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Russian Govt. Payments *re* Compensation to B.C. Sealers: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
——— Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2391 (ii).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11293 (vi).
Ruthenian Catholic Mission, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
Ryan, Mr. G. M., Appt. of Successor as Ry. Mail Supt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7504 (iv).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 12011 (vi), 12145 (vii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements, Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 238 (i).
St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe Waterway from Lake St. Francis, Letters, Plans, Surveys, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1690 (i).
St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3230 (ii).
——— Expenditure and Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1935 (i).
——— Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3479 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Ste. Anne de Sorel Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7731 (iv).
Ste. Barbe Floods, Rep. of Engineer: Remarks (Mr. R. N. Walsh) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).
——— Damages *re* Floods: Remarks (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 6987 (iv).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
St. Boniface Public Building, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4246, 5999 (iii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
St. Cyrille Ry. Diversion, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12756 (vii).
St. Francis River Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6918 (iv).
St. Francis River, Richmond Pier, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Francois, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5797 (iii).
St. Fulgence Pier, Paymaster's List, Signatures, &c., Apptmt. of Dr. Savard, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1130 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1115 (i).
St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office, Savings Bank, Recommendation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4828 (iii).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4589 (iii).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10890 (vi).
St. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay still Due: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 844 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. Ignace de Loyola Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5795 (iii).
St. Jacques River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. John and Cumberland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 12263 (vii).
St. John, N.B., Cold Storage Co., Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3580 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 3690 (ii).
——— Names of Stockholders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1938 (i).
*See* 'N.B.'
St. John, N.B., Dom. Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
St. John Fusiliers, 62nd Regiment, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 847 (i).
St. John Harbour, Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11700 (vi).
St. John Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
St. John, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
St. John Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Military Stables: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. John Port, Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
——— Quarantine Station, Partridge Island: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
——— Quarantine, Partridge Island Water Service: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Steam Sterilizer: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
St. John River, Removal of Snags, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 3477 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
——— Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
——— Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
St. John's, Que., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8890 (v).
St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 895, 1121 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Lawrence Canals, District Office: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Rapids Dam, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Gervais) 2996 (ii).
*See* 'Deep Waterways,' &c.
St. Lawrence River Route, Wrecks and Collisions: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 10739 (vi).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5035 (iii).
St. Louis, H., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i), 2977 (ii).
——— Payments to by Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
St. Louis River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Mary's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11937 (vi).
——— Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11019 (vi).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853 (i).
St. Maurice, Dam at Grand Piles: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Omer Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3236 (ii).
St. Pierre les Becquets Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1686 (i).
St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Charges against Mrs. Finlay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1687 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2170 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 2786 (ii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instructions to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2217 (ii).
——— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 7990 (iv).
——— Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1932 (i).
St. Rochs Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7438 (iv).
St. Rosalie Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
St. Simeon Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Therese Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Holidays for Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2791 (ii).
——— Meat Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Leonard) in Com. of Sup., 5519 (iii).
——— Officers and Municipal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2791 (ii).
——— Warden Beauchamp, Interference in Elections, Charges *re* (Mr. Leonard) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).
Sabourin, Maj., Cor. with Lt. Col. Malette and Dept.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Saccharine Standards, &c., *re* Sugar Manufacture: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).
Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).
Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5472 (iii).
Saguenay Boom and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid Govt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 183 (i).
*See* 'Chicoutimi.'
Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Purchase of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8380 (v).
——— 'Storm King, Tug, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8381 (v).
Salaries of Judges: *See* 'Judges.'
Salmon Licenses granted in B.C., Exclusive Privileges, Penalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5801 (iii).
——— Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 5651 (iii).
——— in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5652 (iii).
Salmon Fishing Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5652 (iii).
Salmon Fishing Licenses, Number granted, in B.C., Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5998 (iii).
Salmon Net Fishing in Restigouche River Privileges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13518 (vii).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau: Ques. of Priv. (Mr .A. Lavergne) 7094 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
——— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2390 (ii).
Samovici, A., and H. Bolacan, Applications for Cancellation of Homestead Rights, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr .Lake) 557 (i).
Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, imported from G.B. in 1904-5-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 1506 (i).
Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7829 (iv).
Saskatchewan and Alta., Assurance Fund: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Saskatchewan Act, May 23rd, 1906, Constitutionality of, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lake) 3435 (ii).
Saskatchewan Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 351 (i).
Saskatchewan Legislature Acts, Reports *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6400 (iv).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4761 (iii).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9280 (v).
——— Land Grants, Patents, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5801 (iii).
——— Sale of Homestead Lands: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9127 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Stmnt. Read (Mr. Oliver) 10402 (vi).
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).
Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11501 (vi).
'Sault Express,' Amounts paid to for Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 696 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853, 1129 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 898 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 13470 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9278 (v).
Sawmill Owners, Applications refused *re* Timber Cutting: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 557 (i).
School Lands Exchange: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
School Acts, Saskatchewan, Disallowance of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6644 (iv).
——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6647 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6854 (iv).
School, Timber and Coal Lands in Man., &c., Average Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3430 (ii).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Scotch Hill East, Post Office, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2793 (ii).
Scotch Town Wharf, Application: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7202 (iv).
Scrip received on Account of Lands, Mines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3431 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 3852 (ii).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Sec. of State, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i).
Section 14, Southeast Quarter, Applications for: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Herron) 5476 (iii).
Section 32, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 8383 (v).
Securities of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
Seed Control Act, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5500 (iii).
Seed Grain in N.W., Distribution to Settlers, Apptmt. of Mr. R. E. A. Leech: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3040 (ii).
Seed Grain, Distribution, Duties of Mr. Leech: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3158 (ii).
Seed Grain, Buying and Distribution, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420 vii).
——— Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 1438 (i).
——— Delegation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 1840 (i).
Seed Grain for N.W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payment: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2896; Neg. (Y. 58; N. 98) 2937 (ii).
Seed Grain Distribution, Extension to Unorganized Territories: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5408 (iii).
——— Distribution to Settlers in N.W.: in Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).
*See* 'B. No. 96.'
Seed Grain to N.W. Settlers: M. to Adjn. (Mr. Sifton) 1349 (i).
——— O.C. *re* Advances: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6634 (iv).
——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6981 (iv).
——— Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 8185 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 692 (i).
——— Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10121 (v).
Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 3690 (ii).
——— Purchases from P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 3752 (ii).
——— Purchases from P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 3157 (ii).
Seeds Inspection Act: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vii).
Seed Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 12391 (vii).
——— Incomplete Answer (Mr. Blain) 12551 (vii).
——— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 12661 (vii).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Oliver) 13066 (vii).
Seizures of Schooners, B.C., Compensation by Russian Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers and State Papers, Register 'B' *re* Hudson Bay Co., Custody of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1684 (i).
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 9714 (v).

Semaphores on Railways, Standard Ladder and Posts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 239 (i).
Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
——— Days of Sitting, Cost for 1895 and 1906-7, of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114 (i).
Senate Reform: Prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1513 (i).
——— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 70 (i).
Senate Salaries and Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 10489 (vi).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Sessional Paper No. 167b, brought down April 26th: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Sessional Papers and Returns, Number ordered, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Johnston) 2796 (ii).
——— Number presented, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 2592 (ii).
*See* 'Documents,' &c.
Seven Islands, Public Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
*See* 'Clarke City.'
Severn River, Improvement of Waterway: in Com .of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 8894 (v).
Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Shawenegan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Sheep Quarantine by U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 13064 (vii).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Christie) 13537 (vii).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).
Shellmouth River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1295 (i)
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
——— Militia Corps, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Sherbrooke Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Shipbuilding in Canada: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 2947 (ii).
Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12027 (vi).
Shipping Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 12, 17, 183, 209.'
Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) on M. for Com. of Sup., 7732 (iv).
Shipping Companies on Pacific Coast, Amounts of Subsidies: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 6919 (iv).
Shipping Master at Quebec, Apptmnt. of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 11699 (vi).
Shipping Rings, Combination *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5915; Cor. read (Mr. Sproule) 5916 (iii).
Shipping Statistics *re* Tons registered: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2790 (ii) .
Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 4765 (iii).
Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.: *See* 'B. No. 49.'
Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.'s incorp. B. No. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5409; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5445; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5460.
Signal Dues at Halifax: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
Sioux Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
'Sir Wilfrid Laurier' Dredge, Completion, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Six Nations Indians, Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 6242 (iv).
——— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6239 (iv).
Skinner's Cove Boat Channel, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10012 (v).
Skinner's Cove Pier Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Sleeping Car Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Slides and Booms Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Smith, O., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4765 (iii).
Smith, Wm. B., Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Smith, Mr. W. Maxwell, Dom .Fruit Inspector, Salary ,&c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2393 (ii).
——— Cor. *re* Salary: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 2398 (ii).
——— Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5085 (iii).
Snag Boats on Red River, Construction and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 567. 891 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
Sorel Irregularities, Allegations against Mr Roy: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 8295 (v).
——— Investigation by Mr. Gaudet *re* Irregularities, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6988, 7099 (iv).
——— Irregularities, Final Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10794 (vi).
Sorel Shipyard Pay Lists, Irregularities: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5408 (iii)

Sorel Shipyard Pay Lists, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 5477 (iii).
—— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet *re* Padding: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7938 (iv).
—— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet: laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 8170 (iv).
Sorel Property for Marine Dept., Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4751 (iii).
Sorel Public Works, Investigations *re* Pay Rolls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c.: M. for Reports* (Mr. Boyer) 6239 (iv).
—— Charges against Overseer, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
—— Comnr. Boyer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12413 (vii).
—— Electric Power, Contract with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10011 (v).
—— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10513 (vi).
—— Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
—— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).
—— Rep. of Mr. Boyer: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
Soulanges Canal, Manning & Macdonald's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Souris Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1685 (i).
Souris Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1939 (i).
Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Souris Ry. Wharf, P.E.I., Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2386 (ii).
—— Permission to Build, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7728 (iv).
S.A. Volunteers' Lands Grants Bill: Prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3316 (ii), 11938 (vi).
—— Land Grants to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M S. McCarthy) 563 (i).
—— Land Grants: Remarks (Mr. Herron) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
—— Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
—— Medals for 3rd Contingent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
—— School Teachers, Recognition of Services by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2791 (ii).
South African Volunteers, Bounty to: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Southampton Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).



Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7729 (iv).
South Huron By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 16.'
Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4829 (iii).
Spain, Commander, Expenditure re Wrecks Investigations: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3150 (ii).
—— Travelling Expenses, Cor. with Aud. Gen.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4405 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 4670
—— Papers *re* Travelling Expenses: Laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 4825 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
—— Statement (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4764 (iii).
Speakers' Expenses, House of Commons, Comparison, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
—— Reply (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1584 (i).
'Speedy,' Str., Purchase, Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 565 (i).
—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii).
Spillumcheen River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Spratte, Hattie, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Springhill Increased Accommodation: in Com of Sup., 12233 (vii)
Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2391 (ii).
Squatters Claims in Alberta: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Squatters on Turtle Mountain Forest Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 4739 (iii).
Standard Accident and Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
Standard Mutual Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Standard Plate Glass Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'
Stanley Island Wharf and Pier, &c.: in Com of Sup., 5720 (iii).
'Stanley,' Passenger Accommodation *re* Staterooms: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 687 (i).
Stanstead By-election Papers, Destruction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8087 (iv)
—— Disappearance of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).
—— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8887 (v).

Statistical Branch, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 10317 (vi)
—— List of Officers: Read (Mr. Graham) 10317 (vi)
Steamboat Inspection Act: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
—— Rep. presented (Mr. Brodeur) 3896 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Steamboat Inspection: *See* 'Canada Shipping Bills.'
Steamship Subsidies and Subventions, Total Amount paid for Five Years, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 853 (i).
Steel Concrete Co., Payments to by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 3850 (ii).
Stellarton Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Chartered Accountant, Amounts paid to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. White) 3233 (ii).
Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor I.C.R., Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).
Stoney Creek Battleford Monument: in Com of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Stoney Lake Damage Claims: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5565 (iii).
Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5564, 5649, 5786 (iii).
Strathcona Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathcona Horse, Barracks, Stables, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10975 (vi).
Strathcona Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathroy Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Students of Technology: *See* 'Govt. Works.'
Subsidiary High Court of A. O. F.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Sub-Target Company, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
—— Papers referred to Com. of Last Session: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
—— Ref. to Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 312 (i).
*See* 'Sutherland Rifle Sight,' &c.
Suburban Mail Delivery: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3276 (ii).
Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12413 (vii).
Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Sugar Manufacture, Regulations *re* Saccharine Standards: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13343 (vii).
Summerside Harbour and Str. 'Stanley': Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 6160 (iii).
Superannuation and Retirement Acts, Payments under: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7989 (iv).
Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission: Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5802; Neg. (Y. 44; N. 99) 5880; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) 5826, Agreed to (Y. 93; N. 43) 5879; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Blain) 5847, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 90) 5877 (iii).
Supply Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 94, 136, 186.'
Supply—Changes in Procedure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1884 (i).
—— Conc.: M. (Mr. Fielding) 5499, 5915 (iii).
—— M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— Obstruction *re*, Charges by Govt: on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
*See* 'Obstruction.'
SUPPLY:
Committee:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 671 (i).
Census and Statistics, 673 (i), 12879 (vii).
Exhibitions, 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
Experimental Farms, 12549 (vii).
Fruit and Dairying Industry, 10397 (vi).
Fumigation Stations, 12879 (vii).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibits, 10623
Live Stock Industry, 12894 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 12893 (vii).
Patent Record, 672 (i).
Seed Control, &c., 5500 (iii), 12891 (vii).
Year Book, 677 (i).
Charges of Management:
Dom .Notes, 5562 (iii).
Offices of Assistant Receivers General, 12160 (vii).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 645 (i), 12878 (vii).
Auditor General's Office, 635 (i).
Board of Civil Service Examiners, 12917 (vii).
Customs, 637 (i).
Finance, 637 (i), 5562 (iii), 12914 (vii).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 610 (i).
Inland Revenue, 645 (i).
Interior, 616 (i), 9693 (v).
Justice, 5505 (iii), 10396 (vi)
Labour, 12156 (vii).
Marine, 976 (i), 12915 (vii).
Militia and Defence, 611 (i), 8871 (v).
Mines, 646 (i).
Northwest Mounted Police, 8862 (v).
Post Office, 8872 (v).
Printing Bureau, 612 (i).
Privy Council, 610 (i), 12902 (vii).
Public Works, 638, 645 (i), 5698 (iii), 12916 (vii).
Railways and Canals, 10325 (vi), 12755 (vii).
Secretary of State, 611 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 648 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Customs:
Printing, &c., 9577 (v).
Revenue Cruisers, &c., 9578 (v).
Salaries, &c., 9223, 9439 (v).
Salaries, Inspectors of Ports, &c., 9536 (v).
Departments Generally:
Charwomen, 10508 (vi).
Dominion Lands:
Salaries, &c., 10038 (v).
Surveys, &c., 9987 (v).
Dominion Police, 5509 (iii).
Excise:
Methylated Spirits, 820 (i).
Distillery Duty, 814 (i).
Duty collected, Expenses *re*, 817 (i).
Provisional Allowances, 817 (i).
Salaries, &c., 813 (i).
Stamps for Tobacco, 816 (i).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 814 (i).
Fisheries:
Dog Fish, Reduction Works, 13325 (vii).
Protection Service, 13326 (vii).
Salaries to Overseers, &c., 5777 (iii), 12261 (vii).
Geological Survey:
Boring for Oil, &c., 13162 (vii).
Maps, &c., 12260 (vii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Specimens, 12261 (vii).
Govt. of the Northwest Territories:
General Vote, 10116 (v).
Govt. of the Yukon:
General Vote, 10107 (v).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 9769, 9840 (v).
Contingencies, &c., 9948, 9964 (v).
Deporting Immigrants, 9882 (v).
General Expenses, 5751 (iii), 13169 (vii)
Winnipeg Hospital, &c., 9982 (v).
Indians:
British Columbia:
Salaries, 12752 (vii).
Generally:
Destitute Indians, Relief, 5762 (iii).
Printing and Stationery, 5762 (iii).
New Brunswick:
Salaries, 12736, 13170 (vii).
Sioux, 5762 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec:
General Vote, 12729 (vii)
Inspection of Staples:
Salaries, 12264 (vii).
Justice:
Exchequer Court, 5505 (iii).
Printing and Binding, 5508 (iii).
Supreme Court:
Contingencies, 12917 (vii).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Contingencies, 10502 (vi).
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 10508 (vi).
General Vote, 10490 (vi).
Printing and Binding, 10507 (vi).
Salaries, 10501 (vi).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimate, 10503 (vi)
Voters' Lists, 10508 (vi).



SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Legislation—*Con.*
Library of Parliament:
General Vote, 10503 (vi).
Senate:
General Vote, 10489 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 5039 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, 5039, 5773 (iii), 12265 (vii)
Dockyards, Maintenance, 5039 (iii).
Lightship at Point Pelee, 13325 (vii).
Limekiln Crossing, 13323 (vii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 5039 (iii).
Pilotage, Str. 'Eureka,' 5046 (iii).
Pensions to Pilots, 13324 (vii).
Repairs to Lightships, 5039 (iii)
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Signal Service, 5045 (iii).
Thunder Bay, Ice Breaking, 5041 (iii).
Wireless Stations, 5045 (iii).
Mail Subsidies:
Can. and Australia, 13152 (vii).
Can. and G. B., 12728 (vii).
Can., Japan and China, 13152 (vii).
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Marine Hospitals:
Further Amount, 5782 (iii).
Militia:
Annual Drill, 5662, 5732 (iii), 10286 (v), 13176, 13540 (vii).
Battlefields, Monuments, 13177 (vii).
Customs Dues, 5662 (iii), 12155 (vii).
Dominion Arsenal, 12154 (vii).
Gratuity to Caretaker J. Donovan, 13177 (vii).
Gratuity to Mrs. C. D. Murray, 13177 (vii).
Military Properties, Construction, &c., 12148 (vii).
Quebec Cliff Repairs, 12148 (vii).
Ordnance, &c., 12505 (vii).
Pay and Allowances, 12147 (vii).
Provisions, 5662 (iii), 12150 (vii).
Rifle Associations, Grants, 12152 (vii).
Royal Military College, 12152, 13177 (vii).
Salaries and Wages, 12147 (vii).
Warlike Stores, 12149 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Can. Bank of Commerce, Yukon Services, 13167 (vii).
Chinese Riots, Vancouver, 13155 (vii).
Royal Commission, 13156 (vii).
Civil Service Commission, 13168 (vii).
Cotton Industry, Quebec, Commission, 13156 (vii).
Grant to National Gymnastic Society, 13167 (vii).
Jamaica Earthquake, 5784 iii).
Japanese Riots, B.C., 5783 (iii).
Labour Dept., 12261 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries, Investigation, 13169 (vii).
Mounted Police, Compensation, 8870 (v).
Olympic Games, Can. Representatives, 13167 (vii).
Oriental Labour Question, 13156 (vii).
Park Reservations, 5755 (iii).
Prince Fushimi's Visit, 5783 (iii).
Seed Grain Relief, 2770 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Mounted Police:
General Vote, 8863 (v).
Ocean and River Service:
Ice-breaker for Northumberland Strait, 1885, 1895 (i), 2941 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, Ice-breakers, &c., 1033, 1060 (i), 5763 (iii).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii).
Wreck Investigations, 3147, 3184, 3195 (ii).
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 12918 (vii).
General Vote, 5509, 5522 (iii), 12265 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 12918 (vii).
Pensions:
Rebellion of 1885, *re*, 8870 (v).
Post Office:
Durston, Robt., Apptmt., 5561 (iii).
Mail Service, 5561 (iii).
Miscellaneous, 5562 (iii).
North Bay Office, 13152 (vii).
Salaries and Allowances, 9092 (v).
Public Works—Capital:
Buildings:
Archives, 5700 (iii).
Astronomical Observatory, 1450, 1485 (i).
Eastern Building, 1504 (i).
New Buildings, 1504 (i), 5701 (iii).
Parlt. Buildings, Additions, &c., 1486 (i).
Royal Mint, 1451, 1470 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers:
Manitoba:
St. Andrew's Rapids, 5701 (iii).
Ontario:
Port Arthur, &c., Harbour Improvements, 12144 (vii).
Quebec:
Lake St. Peter Piers, 4752 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Improvements, 12144 (vii).
Sorel Property, 4751 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 5035 (iii).
Dredging Plant, 4754 (iii).
Transportation Facilities:
Georgian Bay to Montreal, Surveys, 12145, 13326 (vii).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 12146 (vii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, 12145 (vii).
Marine Dept.:
Gratuity to mother of late J. Carbonneau, 13321 (vii).
Public Works—Collection of Revenue:
Graving Docks, Maintenance, 5731 (iii).
Land and Cable Lines, Lower St. Lawrence, 5731 (iii).
Telegraph Lines:
Ashcroft-Dawson, 5731 (iii).
Cape Beale Lines, 5731 (iii).
Operating Expenses, 13178 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Chilliwack, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Cranbrook, Public Building, 10864 (vi).
Cumberland, Public Buiing, 10864 (vi).
Fernie, Public Building, 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi).
Grand Forks, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Greenwood, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith, Public Building, 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Quesnel, Public Building, 10867 (vi).
Revelstoke, Public Building, 13339 (vii).
Vancouver, Examining Warehouse, 13339 (vii).
——— Public Building, 10868 (vi).
Vernon, Public Building, 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Victoria, Immigration Building, 10874 (vi).
——— Post Office, 10883 (vi).
Williams Head, Quarantine Station, 10883 (vi).
Generally:
Construction of Armouries, 10886 (vi).
Experimental Farms, 10904 (vi), 13339 (vii).
General Vote, 10886 (vi).
Manitoba:
Brandon, Drill Hall, 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
Dauphin Public Building, 8519 (v).
Elmwood, Public Building, 13335 (vii).
Emerson, Public Building, 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Neepawa, Public Building, 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).
Portage la Prairie, Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Selkirk, Public Building, 8547 (v).
St. Boniface, Public Building, 8566 (v).
Souris, Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Winnipeg, Examining Warehouse, 8566 (v).
——— Immigration Building, 8573 (v).
Winnipeg, Military Buildings, Hospital, 10955 (vi).
——— Fort Osborne Barracks, 10969 (vi), 13336 (vii).
Winnipeg, Post Office, Land and Building, 8575 (v).
Winnipeg, Postal Station 'B,' 8576 (v).
New Brunswick:
Fairville, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Fredericton, Military Buildings, 13328 (vii).
Grand Falls, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Hillsborough, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Moncton, Armoury, 13328 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
New Brunswick—*Con.*
St. John, 5703 (iii), 7186 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 7187 (iv).
Nova Scotia:
Antigonish, Public Building, 7110 (iv).
Bridgewater, Public Building, 7135 (iv).
Glace Bay, Public Building, 7139 (iv).
Halifax, Dom. Buildings, Repairs, 7140 (iv).
——— Immigrant Building, 7142 (iv).
——— Immigrant Detention Building, 7143 (iv).
——— Military Quarters, 7143 (iv).
——— New Building, 7144 (iv).
——— Quarantine Station, 7171 (iv).
Inverness, Public Building, 7172 (iv).
Lunenburg, Public Building, 13326 (vii).
Parrsborough, Public Building, 13327 (vii).
Shelburne, Public Building, 7173 (iv).
Westville, Public Building, 7179 (iv).
Wolfville, Public Building, 13327 (vii).
Yarmouth, Public Building, 7180 (iv).
Ontario:
Arnprior, Public Building, 7454 (iv).
Belleville Armoury, 7454, 7678 (iv).
Brantford, Public Buildings, 7455 (iv).
Dominion Public Buildings, 7467 (iv).
Glencoe, Public Building, 7473 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Guelph Armoury, 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Hamilton Drill Hall, 7692 (iv).
——— Post Office, 7696 (iv).
Harriston, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
Kincardine, Public Building, 7698 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings, 10907 (vi).
——— New Gun Shed, 7700, 7814 (iv).
——— New Guard-house, 7701, 7814 (iv).
——— New Hospital, 7702, 7814 (iv).
——— Royal Military College, 7702 7819 (iv).
——— Royal Military College, Stables, 10907 (vi).
——— New Magazine, 10907 (vi).
Leamington, Public Building, 7701, 7815 (v), 13331 (vii).
Listowel, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
London, Military Buildings, 7705 (iv).
Markham, Public Building, 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Mount Forest, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
Mitchell, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Niagara Falls, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
North Bay, Public Building, 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).
Ottawa, Departmental Buildings, Sky-lights, 7816 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Ottawa Post Office, 5705 (iii).
——— Printing Bureau, 7817 (iv).
Owen Sound, Public Building, 7817 (iv).
Parkhill, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Peterborough, Armoury, 13332 (vii).
Port Arthur, Public Building, 7825 (iv).
Renfrew, Public Building, 7825 (iv).
St. Mary's, Public Building, 7826 (iv).
Sarnia, 7829 (iv), 13332 (vii).
Seaforth, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Simcoe, Public Building, 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
Sudbury, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Tilsonburg, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Uxbridge, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Waterloo, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Walkerville, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Welland, Public Building, 7830 (iv).
Whitby, Public Building, 7833 (iv).
Prince Edward Island:
Georgetown, 7182 (iv).
Quebec:
Arthabaskaville, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Chicoutimi, Post Office, 7279 (iv).
Cookshire, Post Office, 7281 (iv).
Dominion Public Buildings, 7286 (iv).
Dundee, Custom House, 7286 (iv).
Farnham, Post Office, 7287 (iv).
Grand Mere, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Grosse Isle, Improvements, 7289 (iv).
Grosse Isle, Disinfecting Apparatus, 7290 (iv).
Joliette, Armoury, 13329 (vii).
Knowlton, Public Building, 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Lachute, Public Building, 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Lake Megantic, Public Building, 7294 (iv).
Lévis, Public Building, 7294 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Longueuil, Public Building, 7304 (iv).
Magog, Public Building, 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Marieville, Public Building, 7306 (iv).
Megantic, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Montreal, Barracks, 7407 (iv).
——— General Post Office, 7410 (iv).
——— Military Buildings, 7418 (iv).
——— New Postal Station, 'B,' 7418 (iv).
——— New Postal Station, Point St. Charles, 5703 (iii), 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
——— Eastern Postal Station, 7419 (iv).
——— New Examining Warehouse, 7423 (iv).
Nicolet, Public Building, 7428 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Plessisville, Public Building, 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Quebec Citadel, Drill Shed, 7430 (iv).
——— Governor General's Quarters, 7431 (iv).
——— Drill Hall, 7431 (iv).
——— Examining Warehouse, 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Building, 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Hospital, 7433 (iv).
——— Military Building, 7434 (iv).
Quebec East, Public Building, 7438 (iv).
Roberval, Public Building, 13330 (vii). (vii).
St, Henri, Post Office, 7439 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe, Public Building, 7440 (iv).
St. Johns, Military Buildings, 7440 (iv).
——— Public Buildings, 7444 (iv).
St. Therese, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Shawenegan, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Sherbrooke, Drill Hall, 7439 (iv).
Sherbrooke, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Three Rivers, New Building, 13330 (vii).
Westmount, Public Buildings, 13330 (vii).
Rents, Repairs, &c.:
Dom. Public Buildings, Rents, 10981 (vi).
Electric Light, &c., 11011 (vi).
Elevator Attendants, 11011 (vi).
Furniture, 11007 (vi).
Grounds, 11012 (vi).
Heating, &c., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
Immigration Buildings, 11008 (vi).
Major's Hill Park, 11015 (vi).
Post Office, 11007 (vi).
Quarantine Stations, 11008 (vi).
Rideau Hall, 11005 (vi).
Telephones, 5706 (iii), 11012 (vi).
Ventilation, Lighting, &c., 5707 (iii), 10981 (vi).
Yukon Buildings, 11005 (vi).
Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Barracks for Permanent Corps (Strathcona Horse), 10975 (vi).
Battleford, Public Building, 8576 (v).
Calgary, Public Building, 8578 (v).
Edmonton, Public Building, 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Estevan, Land Office, 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Humboldt, Public Building, 8582 (v).
Lethbridge, Armoury, 13336 (vii).
Maple Creek, Public Building, 8600 (v), 13337 (vii) .
Medicine Hat, Public Building, 8601 (v).
Moose Jaw, Armoury, 13337 (vii)
——— Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Prince Albert, 8601 (v), 13337 (vii).
Regina, Post Office, 8602 (v).
Saskatoon, Public Building, 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Saskatchewan and Alberta—*Con.*
Strathcona, Buildings, 13338 (vii).
Wetaskiwin, Public Buildings, 13338 (vii).
Yorkton, Public Building, 8603 (v).
Yukon Territory:
Commissioner's Residence, 10883 (vi).
P. O. Building, 13339 (vii).
Dredging:
Mar. Provs., New Plant, 12142 (vii).
Ont. and Quebec, 13351 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Spillumcheen River, 13351 (vii).
Thompson River, 13351 (vii).
Manitoba:
Grand Marais Harbour, 12140 (vii).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake, 12141 (vii).
Mar. Provs.:
General Vote, Creosoted Timber, 12028 (vi).
New Brunswick:
Beaver Harbour, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Buctouche, Channel, 11679 (vi).
Campbellton, Wharf, 11685 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Caraquet, Wharf, &c., 11685 (vi).
Dorchester Wharf, Addition, 13344 (vii).
Dover, Wharf, 11692 (vi).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 11693 (vi).
Harvey Bank, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Leonardsville, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Lorneville, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Lower Newcastle, Wharf, 11695 (vii).
Madawaska River, Extension of Dyke, 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Miscou, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Moncton, Wharf, 11696 (vi).
New Mills, Wharf, 13345 (vii).
Richibucto, Extension of Piers, &c., 11698 (vi).
River St. John, including tributaries, 11698 (vi).
River St. John, Wharfs in Tide Water, 12000 (vi), 13345 (vii).
St. Andrews, Harbour Improvements, 12011 (vi).
St. John Harbour, Improvements, 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
Shippegan, Harbour, 12027 (vi).
Tracadie, Protection Works, 13349 (vii)
Nova Scotia:
Annapolis Harbour Improvements, 11207 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf, 11219 (vi).
Barachois, Training Pier, 11223 (vi).
Bay St. Lawrence, Harbour, 12224 (vi).
Big Lorraine Harbour, 11224 (vi).
Breton Cove, 11224 (vi).
Cape St. Mary, Breakwater, 11224
Cariboo Island, Causeway, 11224 (vi).
Charlo's Cove, Breakwater, 11225 (vi).
Church Point, 11225 (vi).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) 11225 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Digby, Harbour, 11226 (vi).
Fort Lawrence Wharf—Extension of head block, additional trestle approach, &c., General Vote, 13341 (vii).
Glace Bay, 11228 (vi).
Hall's Harbour, 11228 (vi).
Lake Ainslie, Boat Channel, 11228 (vi).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 11229 (vi).
Margaree River, Shear Dams, &c., 11229 (vi).
Middle River (Lower) 11229 (vi).
New Glasgow, Extension of Wharf, 11257 (vi).
Oyster Pond, 11258 (vi).
Parker's Cove, Improvements, 11258 (vi).
Parrsboro', Harbour Improvements, 11259 (vi).
Poirierville, Landing Pier, 11260 (vi).
Porter's Lake, Boat Channel, 11260 (vi).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 11265 (vi).
Port Hilford Breakwater, 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, 11268 (vi).
Port Joli West, Herring Rocks. Breakwater, 11279 (vi).
Port Royal, Madame Island, Wharf 11278 (vi).
Portuguese Cove, Breakwater, 11279 (vi).
Pugwash, Wharf, 11279 (vi).
Round Hill, Wharf, 11282 (vi).
Scotch Cove Breakwater, 11290 (vi).
Skinner's Cove, Dredging Channel, &c., 11290 (vi).
Sydney Harbour, Wharf, 11230 (vi).
Tancook Island, 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay, Wharf, 11290 (vi).
Yarmouth Harbour, Improvements, 11291 (vi).
Ontario :
Beaverton, Harbour Improvements, 12090 (vii).
Belle River, Dredging, 12090 (vii).
Blanche River, Improvement, 12090 vii).
Blind River, Dredging, &c., 12091 (vii).
Bronte Dredging, 5708 (iii).
Bronte Harbour, Repairs, 12091 (vii).
Burlington Channel Piers, 12092 (vi).
Chute à Blondeau, Wharf, 12092 (vii).
Cobourg, Dredging, &c., 12095 (vii).
Colborne, Wharf, 12095 (vi).
Collingwood Harbour, Improvements, 12096 (vii).
Goderich Harbour, Improvements, 12101, 13350 (vii).
Gore's Landing, Wharf, 12101 (vii).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 12101 (vii).
Juniper Island, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Lakefield, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Little Current, 13350 (vii).
McGregor's Creek, 12103 (vii).
Magnetawan River, 13350 (vii).
Meaford Harbour, Improvements, 12103 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Michipicoten, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Midland and Tiffin Harbours, 5709 (iii), 12103 (vii).
Montreal River, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Petawawa, 12133 (vii).
Peterborough, Steamboat Landing, 12133 (vii).
Point Edward, Dredging, 5713 (iii).
Port Burwell, Improvement to Harbour, 12135 (vii).
Port Hope, Repairs, 12135 (vii).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements, 12136 (vii).
Rainy River, Improvements at Long Sault Rapid, 12136 (vii).
Roach's Point, Wharf, 12136 (vii).
Rondeau, Harbour Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Rossport, Wharf, 12137 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Wharf, 12137 (vii).
Severn River, 12137 (vii).
Southampton, Repairs to Chantry Island Breakwaters, 12137 (vii).
Stanley Island, Wharf, 5720 (iii).
Tobermory, Harbour, 13351 (vii).
Toronto Harbour, Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Victoria Harbour, Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Winnipeg River, Improvements, 12138 (vii).
Prince Edward Island :
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 11292 (vi).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 11292 (vi).
New London, 11292 (vi).
Rustico Harbour, Breakwater, 11293 (vi).
Souris, Knight's Point, Strengthening Breakwater, &c., 13341 (vii).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 13343 (vii).
Quebec:
Anse à la Barbe, Breakwater, 12028 (vi).
Anse à l'Ilot, Landing Pier, 12029 (vi).
Baie St. Paul, 12029 (vi).
Barachois de Malbaie, Training Piers, &c., 12029 (vi).
Batiscan, Dredging, 12029 (vi).
Berthier, Wharf, 12029 (vi).
Bic Harbour, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Cap St. Ignace, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Chateauguay, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Chicoutimi Harbour, Improvements, 12030 (vi).
Clarke City, Wharf Improvements, 12031 (vi).
East Templeton, Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Escoumains, Pier, 12031 (vi).
Father Point, Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Grand Méchin, Breakwater, 12031 (vi).
Grand Rivière (Gaspé), Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 12031 (vi).
Lake Aylmer, Wharf, 12032 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Lake Megantic, Piers, 12032 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers, Repairs, &c., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Francis (Beauce) Wharfs, 12033 (vi).
Lavaltrie. Wharf, 12033 (vi).
Les Eboulements, Repairs, 12033 (vi).
Lotbiniere and Portneuf Counties, Government Wharfs, 12033 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwaters, &c., 12033 (vi).
Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter, 12034 (vi).
Matane Breakwater, &c., 12034 (vi).
Montmagny, Wharf, 12034 (vi).
Nicolet Harbour, 12034 (vi).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf, 12034 (vi).
Petite Decharge, Lac St. Jean, 12034 (vi).
Piché Point (Lake Temiskaming) Pile Wharf, 12035 (vi).
Point aux Trembles, Wharf, 12035 (vi).
Rimouski, Wharf Improvements, 12035 (vi).
Rimouski, Dredging Approach, &c., 12035 (vi).
River Ashouapmouchouan, Training Dykes, &c., 12035 (vi).
River Batiscan, Dredging Channel, 12036 (vi).
River Bonaventure, Training Pier, 12036 (vi).
River du Loup (Fraserville) Harbour Improvements, 12036 (vi).
River du Loup (en haut) Dredging, &c., 12036 (vi).
River du Lièvre, Lock and Dam, 12037 (vi).
River Maskinonge, Dredging, 12037 (vi).
River Ouelle, Dredging, 12037 (vi).
River Richelieu, Ice Piers, 12037 (vi).
River Richelieu, Improvements, 12038 (vi).
River Saguenay, Dredging, &c., 12040 (vi).
River St. Francis, Ice Piers, &c., 12040 (vi).
River St. Lawrence, Ice Piers at River St. Jacques, 12041 (vi).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 12040 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Channel between Grandes Piles and La Tuque, 12041 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Dam at Grandes Piles, 12041 (vi).
River Yamaska, Lock, &c., 12041 (vi).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Addition to Wharf, 12041 (vi).
St. Anne des Monts, 12041 (vi).
St. Francois, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).
St. Ignace de Loyola, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
St. Laurent, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).
St. Omer, Landing Pier, 12042 (vi).
St. Pierre les Becquets, Pile Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Siméon, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Wharf, 13349 (vii).
Varennes, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Yamaska River, Dredging, 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Lesser Slave River, 5719 (iii), 13351 (vii).
Old Man's River, 12142 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Architectural Branch, Salaries, 11096 (vi).
Cement Testing Laboratory, 11078 (vi).
Deep Waterways Commission, 11101 (vi).
Gratuity to Mrs. Thos. O'Leary. 5730 (iii).
Engineering Branch, Salaries, 11093 (vi).
Insufficient Appropriations, 11119 (vi).
International Commission, Red River of the North, 11118 (vi).
Monuments to late Sir L. H. Lafontaine, R. Baldwin, 11118 (vi).
Monuments at Brantford *re* Telephone Invention, 11118 (vi).
Surveys, &c., 11071 (vi).
Technical Books, 11100 (vi).
Telegraph Service, Salaries, 11097 (vi).
Temporary Assistance, &c., 11099 (vi).
Roads and Bridges:
Shellmouth Bridge, 12143 (vii).
Telegraph Lines:
General Operating Expenses—Lower St. Lawrence, &c., 12143 (vii).
Maritime Provs.:
Generally, 5730 (iii).
Quarantine:
Salaries, Public Health, &c., 5504 (iii).
Railways and Canals—
Canals—
Carillon:
Dam. 12768 (vii).
Chambly:
Macadamizing Towpath, 12226 (vii).
Cornwall:
Gate Lifter, 12226 (vii).
Repairs to Bank, 12768 (vii).
Galops:
Generally, 5671 (iii).
Generally, 5696 (iii).
Sunday Work, 13174 (vii).
Lachine:
J. Richard, Loss of Horse, 13174 (vii).
Leak at Lock No. 1, 5672 (iii).
Slope Walls, 5663 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
Lachine—*Con.*
Staff, 5696 (iii).
Walls, 12226 (vii).
Murray:
Houses, 12226 (vii).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Roller, 12225 (vii).
Rideau:
Generally, 5689 (iii).
Improvements, 12227 (vii).
Sault St. Marie:
Construction, 12223 (vii).
St. Lawrence Canals, District Office, 12225 (vii).
Soulanges:
Improvements, 12225 (vii).
Manning and Macdonald's Claim, 5668 (iii).
Trent:
Construction, 12225 (vii).
Dam at Buckhorn, 12227 (vii).
Improvements, 12227 (vii).
New Lock, &c., Lindsay, 12227 (vii).
Properties, Damages *re* Flooding, 12768 (vii).
Welland:
Dredge Slide in Deep Cut, 5673 (iii).
Electric Lighting, 12195 (vii).
Port Colborne, Improvements, 12211 (vii).
Port Maitland, Entrance, 5673 (iii).
Queenston, St. Bridge, &c., 12207 (vii).
Surveys, 12207 (vii).
To Purchase Boat, 5691 (iii).
Widen Canal, 12210 (vii).
Railways:
Hudson Bay Ry., Surveys, 12704 (vii).
Intercolonial Railway:
Additional Line, Moncton to Truro, Survey, 12760 (vii).
Amherst Improvements, 12233 (vii).
Antigonish, Accommodation, 12229 (vii).
Campbellton, Improvements, 12258 (vii).
Chatham, Improvements, 12757 (vii).
Double Tracking, 12236 (vii).
Fredericton, Improvements, 12758 (vii).
General Vote, 5693 (iii), 10126 (v).
Halifax Accommodation, 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
Increased Accommodation, &c., 12259 (vii).
Indiantown and Blackville, Improvements, 12258 (vii).
Machinery for Shops, 12257 (vii).
Moncton Shops, &c., 12250 (vii).
Mulgrave, Improvements, 12229 (vii).
New Glasgow, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
North Sydney, Improvements, 12229 (vii).
Petit Rocher, Spur Track, 12759 (vii).
Pictou, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
Rolling Stock, 5549 (iii), 12257 (vii).
St. Cyrille and Drummondville, 12756 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial Railway—*Con.*
St. John, Accommodation, 12257 (vii).
Ste. Rosalie, Improvements, 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
Sackville, Improvements, 12235 (vii).
Springhill, Accommodation, 12233 (vii).
Stellarton, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
Strengthening Bridges, 12259 (vii).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation, 12229 (vii).
Sydney Mines, Extension, 12229, 12759 (vii).
Truro, Accommodation, 12231 (vii).
National Transcontinental Ry.:
Surveys and Construction, 12238, 12728 (vii).
Prince Edward Island Railway:
Hillsborough Bridge, 12762 (vii).
Surveys of Branch Lines, 12764 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitrations and Awards, 10329 (vi).
Compensation to C.P.R. *re* Right of Way, 5561 (iii).
Extra Clerks, &c., 10342 (vi).
G. T. P. Ry., Inspections, 10390 (vi).
International Congress, Subscription, 10377 (vii).
Legal Expenses, 10357 (vi).
Miscellaneous Works, 10328 (vi).
Ry. Commission, 10361, 10385 (vi).
Ry. Statistics, 10328 (vi).
Remuneration to A. Brunet, 10378 (vi).
Staff and Repairs, 10304 (vi).
Statistical Offices, 10317 (vi).
Surveys, &c., Canals, 10338 (vi).
To provide for Quebec Bridge Plans, 12769 (vii).
Scientific Institutions:
Astronomical Observatory, 9737 (v).
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Hydrographic Surveys, 13169 (vii).
Steamboat Inspection:
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Supt. of Insurance:
General Vote, 12160 (vii).
Trade and Commerce:
Chinese Immigration Act, 12264 (vii).
Concurrence:
Assay Office, Vancouver, 13573 (vii).
Geological Survey, Explorations, &c., 13574 (vii).
J. G. Artz, Salary, 13578 (vii).
Mines Branch, Investigation of Ore Deposits, &c., 13569 (vii).
Sessional Clerks, 13577 (vii).
South Lake, N.S., Opening Channel, 13568 (vii).
Telephone Invention, Monument *re*, 13567 (vii).

Supreme Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Supreme Court of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Supreme Court, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
——— Registrar's Official Uniform: in Com of Sup. (Mr. Owen) 5507 (iii).

Surveys of Dom. Lands: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Surveys of Public Lands: *See* 'Dom. Lands.'
Surveys, Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Sussex Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9836 (v).
Sussex St. Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle, Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii). *See* 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Sutherland Rifle Sight Co. Ltd., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re* Additional Number: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5257 (iii).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5206 (iii).
—— Number, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 569 (i).
Swamp Lands in Man.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 693 (i).
—— Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
—— Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Sydney Cement, Quality, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. C. Ross) in Com. of Sup., 11227 (vi).
Sydney Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Sydney Mines, Extension, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
—— Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
Sydney to Sydney Mines, Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7201 (iv).
Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Taché, J. C., Apptmt. in Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8180 (iv).
Tancook Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11701 (vi).
Technical Books of Reference, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 11100 (vi).
Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry: Prop. Res. (Mr. Gutherie) 2856 (ii).
—— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12660 (vii).
Tecumseh Park Breakwater, Dangerous Condition: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 12657 (vii).
Telegraph Branch, P. W. Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11097 (vi).
Telegraph Cos.: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
Telegraph Lines, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
—— Marconi System: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
—— Operating and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vii).
Telegraphs and Telephones, and Man. Boundaries, Legislation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3042 (ii).
Telegraph, Yukon, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup,. 13178 (vii).
——ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
Telephone Invention, Monument at Brantford: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
Telephone Rates: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
Telephone Wires, Applications to cross Ry. Tracks: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 690 (i).
Temiskaming Wharf, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Terms of Settlement, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 4774 (iii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1126 (i).
Temporary Govt. Loans, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 233 (i).
*See* 'Finance,' &c.
Tenders, List of Papers *re* Advertisements: Read (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).
Tenders, Opening of: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Haggart) 2738 (ii).
Tenders for Public Works, &c.: *See* 'Advertisements.'
Tercentenary at Quebec, Apptmt. of French Canadian Commission: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4770 (iii).
Tercentenary at Quebec: *See* 'Battlefields,' 'Quebec,' &c.
Territories Real Property Act, Payments *re* Land to Alberta and Saskatchewan: prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 7094 (iv).
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number Cared for: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 892 (i).
Thames River Wharf, Damages to: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 7506 (iv).
Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 13085 (vii).
Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
'Thin Red Line': *See* 'Dom. Elections Act.'
Thirteenth Hussars, General Service Medal: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13533 (vii).
Thompson River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).

Three Rivers, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Thunder Bay, Ice-breaking, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5041 (iii).
Tidal Service: in Com. of Sup., 3215 (iii).
Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 682 (i).
——— Breakwater Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3229 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Tiffin Harbour Dredging: in Com .of Sup., 5709 (iii).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8892 (v). *See* 'Midland,' &c.
Tilbury Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).
Tilsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Timber Berths awarded between June, 1904, and July 15th, 1896, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crawford) 3851 (ii).
Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W.T., Petition by Original Grantees: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2546 (ii).
Timber Berths: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 4833 (iii).
Timber Berth, East Sask., Conditions of Ownership: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3839 (ii).
Timber Berths in Man. and N.W. Ters. under Licenses, Applicants' Names, Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 852
Timber Berths Nos. 645, &c., Original Tenders, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. McCraney) 4247 (iii).
——— Nos. 652, &c., Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. McCraney) 4589 (iii).
——— Nos. 1031, &c., on Order for Ret.: Amt. (Mr. White) 850 (i).
——— Nos. 1046, &c., Original Applications: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 4247 (iii).
——— Nos. 1048, &c., on Order for Ret.: Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 850 (i).
——— Nos. 1050, &c., Bonuses, Rentals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 852 (i).
——— No. 1100, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 364 (i).
——— No. 1168, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 363 (i).
——— Nos. 1220-1272: on Order for Ret., Amt. (Mr. Lake) 849 (i).
——— No. 1279, Applications, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Timber Berths, Opening of Tenders: Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Mr. Foster (Mr. Turriff) 11303; Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 11304; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11304 (vi).
Timber Berths, Original Documents: M. for Papers (Mr. Lake) 2855 (i).
——— Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2856 (ii). *See* 'Documents.'
——— Original Documents: M. for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2983 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 3318 (ii).
Timber Berths, Par. in Toronto 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) 5077 (iii).
——— Tenders, &c., Original Documents: M. for Ret. (Mr. White) 2983 (ii).
Timber Berths, &c.: *See* 'Documents, Original.'
Timber Cutting by Sawmill Owners, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2168 (ii).
Timber Lands, Sale to Messrs. Rutherford, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1293 (i).
——— Sale or Lease, subsequent to Ret. of April, 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Timber Leases *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.: on M. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 8697 (v).
Timber Licenses, Applications to Mr. Mackenzie's Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3242 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3038 (ii).
Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 181 (i).
Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 359 (i).
——— Grants to Messrs. McLeod, Lundy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 236 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1739 (i).
Timber Licenses in Manitoba and N. W. Ters., Renewal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 691 (i).
——— during 1896-7: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2396 (ii).
——— Man., Sask. and Alberta, Renewals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1127 (i).
——— Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 181 (i).
Timber Limits, Application of Mr. Gentles: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7100 (iv).
——— Denial *re* Application (Mr. Taylor) 7100 (iv).
Timber Limits, Applications, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Talbot) 3578 (ii).
Timber Limits, Leasing, Alienation, &c., Com. of Investigation *re*: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2269, 2310, 2466, 2595; Amt. neg. (Y. 55; N. 111) 2736 (ii).
Timber Limits, Statement quoted by Mr. Turriff: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2386 (ii).
Timber Limits: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3580 (ii).
Timber Marking Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Timber Permits to Settlers, *re* Cutting in Twp. 39, Range 11: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11495

Timber Permits to Sawmill Owners, O.C. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 179 (i).
Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8751 (Amt.) 8778; Neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 8833 (v).
Timber Sales, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Burrows) *re* Par. in Winnipeg 'Telegram,' 9023 (v).
Tobacco Customs Seizure at Charlottetown, Penalties, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2982 (ii).
Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 566 (i).
Tobacco, Foreign, Total Amount of Refund, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 4402 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Amt. to Inland Revenue Act, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dubeau) 178 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers, in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 363 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers in P.E.I., Violation of Inland Revenue Act: Cor. read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9514 (v).
Tobacco, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
Tobacco Prohibition, Res. from Moral Reform Associations: Remarks (Mr. Telford) 11302 (vi).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, Pets., &c., *re* Amt. to Inland Rev. Act: M. for Copies (Mr. Dubeau) 899 (i).
Tobacco Resolutions: in Com. on Ways and Means, 6118 (iii).
Tobacco Stamps, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Tobacco Stamps for Imports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 816 (i).
Tobermory Harbour Booms: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Tobique Manufacturing Co.: *See* 'B. No. 8.'
Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3299 (ii).
*See* 'Montreal Turnpike,' &c.
Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9711 (v).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3901 (ii).
Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7203 (iv).
Toronto (eastern gap) Harbour, Amount of Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354 (i).
——— Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 10014 (v).
——— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1507 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Toronto (western gap) Harbour, Construction of Entrance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354,518 (i).
——— Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4587 (iii).
——— Delay in Contract: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 5915 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4586 (iii).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5564 (iii).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2594 (ii).
Torrens Land Title Fund, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10916 (vi).
Townsend, Arthur James, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 196.'
Townsend Whaling Licenses: *See* 'Whaling.'
Town Site Property, Section 32, Public Works, &c., *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1125 (i).
Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5472 (iii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Laundry, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
Tracadie Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
Trade and Commerce, Agents' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
——— Chinese Act: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i), (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5199 (iii).
Trade and Nav. Returns: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).
Trading Stamps: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Trans.-Canada Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 107.'
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Expenses in Salaries, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13517 (vii).
Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
*See* 'G.T.P.,' &c.
Transportation Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).
——— Georgian Bay Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12145, 13326 (vii).
Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9476 (v).
Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7204 (iv).
Travellers Life Assurance Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 35.'
Travelling Expenses, Minister of Marine at Colonial Conference: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 985; (Mr. Foster) 998 (i).
——— ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 562 (i).
*See* 'Colonial Conference.'
Treasury Board: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Treaty-Making Power, Status of Canada: Notice of Motion (Mr. Thompson) 3172 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-opening of: Remarks (Mr .Owen) 609 (i).
Trent Canal, Bradford Canal, Building of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 13476 (vii).
—— Buckhorn Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Cameron Lake Water Levels, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
—— Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
—— Clearing of Logs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com .of Sup., 10310 (vi).
—— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
—— Contracts, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1734 (i).
—— Damages *re* Floods: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
—— Engineers Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6925 (iv).
—— Extension from Balsam Lake to Gull River, Reps., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2991 (ii).
—— Holland River Dredging Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
—— Holland River Extension: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11939 (vi).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Lindsay Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 10338 (vi).
—— Surveys, Reports *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6988 (iv).
—— Tributary Works, Completion of Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1115 (i).
—— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 12652 (vii).
Trueman, Mr., and N.B. Cold Storage Co.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9343 (v).
Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3429 (ii).
Truro Inreased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12231 (vii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3480 (ii).
Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'
Tuberculin Tests, Results of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 9270 (v).
Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to the Senate: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (iv).
Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, Preservation of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) on M. for Sup., 7647 (iv).
Two-Cent-a-Mile Rate: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Under-Secretaries of State, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 25 (i).
U.S., Treaties with: *See* 'Anglo-American,' &c.
U.S. Warships on Great Lakes, Inquiry *re* Armaments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7502 (iv).
U.S. Warships passing through Canadian Canals: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5338 (iii).
—— Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5788 (iii).
—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 5800 (iii).
Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8616 (v).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 569 (i).
Vacant Land Reservation, Instructions to Agents *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1935 (i).
Valleyfield Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv), 10892 (vi).
Valleyfield, Clock in Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).
Valleyfield Floods on Lake St. Francis, Damage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 7996 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 11297 (vi).
Valleyfield Regiment, Organization of, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Vancouver Bank: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Vancouver Bank incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 779 (i).
Vancouver Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Vancouver, New Westminster and Yukon Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10868 (vi).
Varennes Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Vautelet, Mr., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).

Venoit, Mr., Collector of Customs at Bathurst, N.B., Political Interference: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6406, 7730 (iv).
Ventilation of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).
*See* 'Public Works, Ottawa".
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5471 (iii).
Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt. Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 356 (i).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
Victoria Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
——— Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8893 (v).
Victoria Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 10874 (vi).
Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
*See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Victoria Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
'Victor' Tug, Repairs to by Govt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9774 (v).
'Vigilant' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 682 (i).
Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks: (Mr. Bergeron) 13066 (vii).
Walker, Andrew, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Walkerville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Wallace, Michael J., Emplymt. in Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7500 (iv).
Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contract *re* Cement, Patent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3230 (ii).
——— Contracts with Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3843 (ii).
——— Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3842 (ii).
——— Payments to by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5085 (iii).
——— Purchase of Cement for Heath Point Works: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).
Warlike and Other Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 12149 (vii).
Washington Fisheries Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1732 (i).
Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2165 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
Water Carriage of Goods: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 13416 (vii).
Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Water Mains across Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Water Power Privileges in Alberta, Sale or Lease of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8378 (v).
Watson, Mr., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6848 (iv).
*See* 'Cassels.'
Waugh and Perrin, Immigration Agents, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Waugh, James, Immigration Agent, Refund to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4765 (iii).
*See* 'Immigration.'
Ways and Means—The Budget—Financial Statement, 5137 (iii).
——— For Debate: *See* 'Budget.'
Ways and Means: M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
——— in Com. on Tobacco Resolutions, 6118 (iii).
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. Nos. 65, 78 & 93.'
Weather Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
Wednesday Evening Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).
Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
Welland Canal, Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Deepening, Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).
——— Dredging Deep Cut Slide: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
——— Electric Lighting, Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 12195 (vii).
——— Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lalor) 852 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 174 (i).
——— Piers and Bridges at Queenston Heights: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 12210 (vii).
Welland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Western Rifle Associations, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.: *See* 'B. No. 55.'
West Indian Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1860 (i).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 24.'
Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v)

Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7179 (iv).
——— Total Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9474 (v).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c.: M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10259 (v).
Whaling Licenses, B.C., Moneys Due, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5996 (iii).
Wharfage Dues in Soulanges County, Amounts received. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9276 (v).
Wharfs and Bridges in Quebec, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2391 (ii).
——— Harbours Expenditure since 1895: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5078 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 5476 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 5800, 5802 (iii).
Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L .Borden) 1130 (i).
——— and Revenues Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4867 (iii).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution of in Thetford Mines: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 9894 (v).
*See* 'Yukon.'
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
White Head Wharf, Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Whitehorse Townsite, Portions sold and retained, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11496 (vi).
White Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 10736 (vi).
Wheat Frozen in Shipping from Man., &c.: M. to adjn. House (Mr. Blain) 825 (i).
Wheat Shipments, Feed, Special Arrangements with Ry. Cos.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 893 (i).
Wheat Transportation, Financial Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1938 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 173 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Foster) for copies of Memorials, &c., 899 (i), 2173 (ii).
——— Negotiations with Banks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
*See* 'Grain,' 'Finance,' &c.
Wiarton Dredging, Payments to Mr. Bowman: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6407 (iv).
——— Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6236 (iv).
Wilberforce Dam, Obstructions to Traffic, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2988 (ii).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
*See* 'Yukon.'
William's Head Quarantine Station Building: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Williams, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2388 (ii).
Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11498 (vi).
Wilson Cordage Co., Cor., Accounts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 1129 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. A. Smith: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Winding-Up Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 95, 102, 144.'
Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
Windsor, Detroit and Belle Isle Ferry Co., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 1131 (i).
——— Expiration of Franchise: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1940 (i).
Windsor Pump and Foundry Co., Ltd., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
Winnipeg Bank: *See* 'B .No. 19.'
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
——— Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
——— Military Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
——— Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 10969 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 10955 (vi).
——— Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).
Winnipeg River, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 9982 (v).
Winnipegosis Lake, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 3216
*See* 'P.E.I.'
Wireless Tel. Stations on Pacific Coast, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Wireless Stations, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
*See* 'Marconi.'
Wires Across Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Women's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 568 (i).
Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 7449 (iv).
*See* 'Pulp.'

Woodstock Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com .of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster C. L. Smith, Interference in Elections: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 2886 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2794 (ii).
Woollen Industry, Deputations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 13082 (vii).
—— Legislation *re* Relief: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 12772 (vii).
—— Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7504 (iv).
—— Reply to Manufacturers' Ass'cn. by Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
—— Specific Duty: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 6988 (iv).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada: Ques. (Mr .Stanfield) 5201 (iii).
Wrecks, Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 3147, 3184, 3195 (ii).
Wrecking Plant Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 3221 (ii).
Writs of Elections: *See* 'B .No. 66.'
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Yamaska River Lock: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11291 (vi).
—— Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11500 (vi).
Yarmouth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7180 (iv).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 677 (i).
Yeomans, Indian Agent, Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Knowles) 1513 (i).
York, Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1018 (i).
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).
Yukon Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 150.'
YUKON:
Bank of Commerce Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vii).
Boyle Concession, Memorials from Dawson Legislature: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 509, 562, 681 (i).
Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5474 (iii).
Buildings, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
Clements. Mr. W. H. P., Services in Yukon, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
—— O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 5801 (iii).
YUKON—*Con.*
Commissioner's Residence, Dawson: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 10301 (v).
Charges against Administrators, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1690 (i), 2170 (ii).
Charges of Dr. Pringle *re* Immorality, &c.: (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 9580 (v).
Congdon, Mr. F. T., Instruction *re* Trust Estates: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12413 (vii).
—— Investigation *re* Estates and Trusts: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12050 (vii).
—— Reply from Yukon: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
—— Stmnt. *re* Estates Administration: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10111 (v).
Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
—— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 841 (i).
—— Amt. (Mr. Foster) *re* Ret., 1691 (i).
*See* 'Wiley,' &c.
Corruption Charges in Public Officials, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
—— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5785 (iii).
Elections Conspiracy, Cor., &c., *re* Trial: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
Expenditures, Total Amount: Remarks *re* Question (Mr .Foster) 1128 (i).
Financial Administration, Rep. of Mr. Beddoe: M. for Copy* (Mr. Foster) 1132 (i).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 6464 (iv).
*See* 'Revenue.'
Finnie, Mr. O. S., Investigation *re* Charges, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Thompson) 1513 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 4316 (iii).
Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commissioners *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 894 (i).
Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11938 (vi).
Gold Commissioner's Office, Number of Clerks, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).
Gold Cos., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7725 (iv).
Govt. Officials, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10107 (v).
Judges' Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11123 (vi).
Liquor Permits, Agents, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).
—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Oliver) 5048 (iii).
Lithgow, J. V., Girouard, J. E., and F. F. Congdon, Emplymt. by Govt., Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5999 (iii).

YUKON—*Con.*

Mail Service: Complaints *re* (Mr. Thompson) 2022 (ii).

Mail Service during Winter: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 5136 (iii).

Mining Regulations published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette': M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 5801 (iii).

Money Transmission, Rates *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2979 (ii).

Morality Charges, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Thompson) 1513 (i).

——— inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10303, (vi).

——— Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 10689, 11016 (vi).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10303, 11122 (vi).

Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4245, 4588 (iii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 4589 (iii).

Placer Mining Act, Grants *re*, Claims, Names, &c., for one year: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 698 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

Revenue and Expenditure from March 31st to June 30, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114, 1346 (i).

*See* 'Finance.'

Sunday Observance Law, Instructions to N.W.M.P. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).

Telegraph Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).

Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).

——— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vii).

Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Gobt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1126 (i).

White Horse Ter., Original Grants of Land, Names, &c.: M .for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2796 (ii).

Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).

*See* 'Congdon.'

Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).

a